HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 15, 1975

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

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO presented a petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

OVAL LIQUOR PRICES

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (October 1).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: When issuing booth certificates for use at ovals, the Licensing Court stipulates that the price charged for liquor shall not exceed the authorised public bar prices, plus 2c for the appropriate glass sizes in the area where the booth is being conducted, and in the case of unsealed cans and bottles the price shall not exceed the local authorised bottle department price, plus 2c. Beer may be sold in 40oz. jugs and the price shall not exceed $1·60 a jug in the area defined by the Liquor Industry Council as Division 1 (Metropolitan) and $1·65 elsewhere. A list showing the prices charged for all liquor available for sale must be exhibited at each booth, in a position and of such a size that it can be easily read by the customers. Where glasses are used, satisfactory washing facilities must be provided.

BUDGET ERRORS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say how many additional errors have been discovered so far in the sums placed on various lines in the Estimates for 1975-76; in what areas these inaccuracies have been found; and what steps are now being taken to scrutinise that part of the Budget document that was not examined in this House, because of the Government's use of the guillotine? On Tuesday of last week the Minister of Education, in response to a Question on Notice, stated that an error had been found in the sums placed on the Estimates for grants payable to St. Patrick's School for Handicapped Children, the Suneden Retarded Children's Welfare Association, the Autistic Children's Association, and the South Australian Oral School. He went on to say that the matter had now been rectified. Honourable members are only too well aware that the Government did not allow examination of more than half the Budget, leaving about $500 000 000 worth of proposed expenditure unscrutinised by the Opposition when the Government unexpectedly imposed the guillotine half-way through that debate. These errors were discovered in the unexamined portion of the Budget, and the Opposition has no way of knowing whether they are the only ones, and whether these errors have been corrected in the document considered by another place. The present incident shows quite clearly the need for unhindered Opposition examination of the State's financial documents in Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know of no other errors. If the Leader knows of any, perhaps he will raise them. I must confess that, in my experience of Budget debates, for the Opposition to have picked up such an arithmetical error in the lines would be an impossibility. I cannot conceive that any member opposite would have picked up such an error. I do not believe there is anything in the Leader's contention that members had insufficient time to consider the Budget, because the reason for that is on their own shoulders.

Dr. Tonkin: Rubbish!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In fact, the Leader had more time available to consider this year's Budget than he took to debate the Budget last year.

SECOND-HAND MOTOR VEHICLES ACT

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs say whether amendments will be considered to the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act in order to encompass motor cycles? These days it is possible for people to pay a considerable sum to purchase secondhand motor cycles. It is therefore reasonable that such buyers should have the same consumer protection as have people buying secondhand cars.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I understand certain amendments are needed to the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act, and I will certainly ensure that the honourable member's suggestion is taken into account when the matter is brought before the House. I understand a considerable problem is involved with the purchase of motor cycles. Members will be aware that since the Act came into effect there has been a large increase in the use of motor cycles in the community. Accordingly, the problem is much greater than it was when the Act was passed. I assure the House that, when the amendments are brought before the House, this matter will be considered seriously.

JUVENILE COURT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Attorney-General believe there is any truth in allegations made by Mr. Stuart, Special Magistrate, regarding the operation of the juvenile court? If there is any truth in those allegations, does the Attorney intend to take action to remedy the situation? Some weeks ago I asked the Premier a question about the growing public alarm at the operation of the juvenile court and whether he intended to do anything about the veil of secrecy that surrounds it. Rather more trenchant criticism was made recently by Mr. Stuart, who said:

> The Adelaide Juvenile Court was clearly subservient to the Department for Community Welfare . . . two judges recently expressed concern at the low esteem, judicially speaking, in which juvenile courts were held. The court was clearly subservient to the department. It implemented departmental recommendations, and its opportunities of choice were limited and self-evident.

He then goes on at some length, but I will not read it all. However, he says that the court is unsatisfactory in three ways. The report continues:

> Mr. Stuart said the new system, however, was fraught with at least three appalling disadvantages. The first principally concerned the rights of the community, and the other two the rights of the offender.

I shall not detail the rest of the article. The Attorney is no doubt aware of the criticisms which have been made strongly by Mr. Stuart and which follow criticisms made by other magistrates. The Attorney must also be aware of public concern in this area, so I ask whether he discounts these criticisms, or whether, if he believes there is some vestige of truth in what has been said by these responsible people, he intends to do anything about the matter.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I was not aware of the criticism referred to by the honourable member. I understand that that criticism was not as widely published as he suggests, because in fact it was only in the country edition of the *Advertiser* that that report appeared. I personally did not have the opportunity of seeing it. However, I will look into the matter. I might say that I think the criticisms that the honourable member has referred to and supported have little substance in them. The Adelaide Juvenile Court is, amongst people who are involved in the law and in community welfare, particularly with reference to juveniles, held in very high regard. Members will be only too well aware of the fact that the Juvenile Courts Act, under which the Adelaide Juvenile Court operates, was world-leading legislation when it was introduced in this Parliament by the Hon. Mr. Justice King, the then Attorney-General, and that measure was supported by all members of this Parliament, as I recall. Certainly in recent times there have been some difficulties regarding that jurisdiction. Those difficulties have not related to the good work being done with juveniles but to the administrative problems involved in setting up the Australian Family Court. This situation has developed owing to the fact that some of the judges from the Adelaide Juvenile Court, or as it then was, the State Family Court, were seconded to the Commonwealth to the Australian Family Court for the purpose of assisting in setting up that court. That has left the juvenile court with fewer judicial officers than would be desirable in normal circumstances. However, I assure the honourable member that this short-fall in the judicial officers is being looked at; I am giving it urgent attention and we will ensure there will soon be further judicial appointments to that court to replace the officers who have now gone to the Australian Family Court. As to the suggestion of the honourable member that the court was in any way subservient to the Community Welfare Department—

Mr. Goldsworthy: That was the comment by Mr. Stuart, S.M.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As to that criticism, all I can say is that that view is certainly not widely held either by members of the legal profession or by other persons who are involved in the administration of that court. As far as I am aware, the view of people involved in that jurisdiction is that that court has done an excellent job and, although the results are not as yet readily available for all to see, as the court has not been operating sufficiently long really to ascertain its value, the people involved in that jurisdiction are convinced that when these results are to hand they will fully justify the policy that was involved in setting up the juvenile court.

USED CAR DEALERS

Mr. WELLS: Does the Minister of Labour and Industry intend to take action against used car dealers who are blatantly ignoring the provisions of the Early Closing Act? I have recently been approached by two used car dealers who have complained bitterly that members of the used car industry are ignoring altogether the provisions of the Early Closing Act, and are even trading on Sundays in the sale of used cars. I am informed that the responsible people in the used car sales industry would like to see a substantial fine imposed on people who flagrantly break the law in this way and bring disrepute on reputable dealers in the industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Only yesterday I received a deputation of three senior officers of the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce to discuss this problem with me; in the *Advertiser* this morning reference is made to that deputation. On September 1, because of a change in the regulations relating to definitions, secondhand car yards came within the definition of "shop". My department has had inspectors on all the main roads in Adelaide where most of the secondhand car yards are situated. It has been necessary to write to only five of these people, informing them of small contraventions of the Act. As a consequence of the deliberate inspections undertaken, my department believed that, generally, the secondhand car yards were obeying the regulations. Much to my surprise, the officers of the chamber told me that one of the major dealers (and I think I should give the name—Bowden Ford) opened on Sunday and Monday of the long weekend. Unfortunately, this dealer was not caught by my inspectors, but a close watch will be kept on him and others during forthcoming weekends. I have no hesitation in saying that dealers who commit breaches of the regulations will be dealt with as far as the Act allows us to deal with them. The people who came to see me were concerned that the law was being broken. It was suggested to me that, to prevent these breaches, the penalties ought to be increased from $100 to $1 000. These people argue, I think quite rightly, that $100 is not much of a deterrent to a secondhand car dealer who is likely to make a profit of $300 or $400 (and those are their figures, not mine) on the sale of one secondhand car. I will seriously consider their request. Undoubtedly the law, as well as fair competition, must be upheld, because, if 95 per cent (or 98 per cent, as the Automobile Chamber of Commerce representatives told me yesterday) of dealers are obeying the law, obviously the other 5 per cent or 2 per cent of dealers must obey it, too. They must not be allowed to dispose of their cars to the detriment of someone else who is obeying the law.

Since September 1, 1975, used car yards have come within the definition of "shop" in the Industrial Code. Under the Industrial Code there is no provision for the registration of a shop to be revoked or cancelled, nor for an application for registration to be refused. A person selling secondhand cars, in addition to registering his premises as a shop, is also required to obtain a secondhand dealer's licence through the Magistrates Court under the Secondhand Dealers Act. This Act provides that the Commissioner of Police (or any person authorised by him) may at the hearing oppose the issue, renewal or transfer of a licence, and the commissioner (or any person authorised by him) has the power to apply to the court at any time for a licence to be revoked. Licences can be opposed or revoked on the grounds that the applicant has convictions under the Act or is guilty of such conduct as makes it undesirable that he be granted a licence. There is a similar provision that a licence can be opposed or revoked on the grounds that the employee of a licensee has convictions under the Act or is of unsatisfactory character. Section 17 of the Secondhand Dealers Act makes it an offence to sell secondhand goods on any day on which the dealer's premises should be closed pursuant to the early closing provisions of the Industrial Code. It could therefore be argued that, if a secondhand car dealer was convicted of several breaches of the early closing provisions of the Industrial Code, application could be made to the Commissioner of Police to oppose the issue of or revoke the secondhand dealer's licence on the grounds that such breaches were also breaches of the Secondhand Dealers Act. I think it is fair to say that I have warned secondhand car dealers in this State of the possible consequences if they continue to defy the law.

HIGH COURT HEARING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have a question that I think I had better address to the Premier, although no doubt the Attorney-General would be able to handle it, but it is a matter of policy. Does the Government intend to seek an early hearing of proceedings reported to have been taken in the High Court by the South Australian Government against the Commonwealth of Australia, the Chief Electoral Officer, and the Divisional Returning Officer for Bonython? I understand that the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament (Mr. Fraser) has announced within the past few minutes that his Party intends to move to block Supply in the Senate, and that heightens the significance of my question, because I believe the State of South Australia has taken proceedings in the High Court today seeking a series of five declarations and an injunction against the defendants based on sections 19 and 24 of the Commonwealth Electoral Act. The object of the proceedings, as I understand the position, is to prevent an election in South Australia being held on the present boundaries, at least until the matter has been disposed of. Because of the conjunction of the announcement by the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition and the issue of the writ, and my suspicion that there has been some communication about this matter between the Commonwealth Government and State Government, I ask the Premier whether it is intended to seek an early hearing in the High Court or whether it is intended to drag out the matter as long as possible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only part of the honourable member's information that seems to be inaccurate is that the writ was issued some days ago.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I didn't look at the date.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was an announcement today. The fact that the writ had been issued was drawn to the attention of the press today, but it had been issued for some time.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, on October 9.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, while I was Attorney-General.

Mr. Millhouse: It's more appropriate still that I ask you the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will seek an early hearing. The Government of this State has always believed that it is necessary for us to have in Australia a one vote one value system, which we are entitled to have for the people of this State under the Commonwealth Constitution. The disgraceful denial of the report of the electoral commissioners in respect of this State by a group in the Senate unrepresentative of the views of most people of this State needs to be corrected by the appropriate legal authority, and I assure the honourable member that the earliest opportunity will be taken to get a hearing on this matter.

HOTEL TRADING

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Attorney-General have investigated the practice of some hotelkeepers who trade on Sundays by creating a so-called social club or clubs, this practice apparently allowing the hotelkeeper legally to, in my opinion, glorify open beer trading in lounges, dining-rooms, beer gardens and, in the latest instance in Whyalla, in Kelley pool rooms. I am well aware that the law provides for hotels to trade on Sundays, but I remind the Minister that the practice to which I have referred violently cuts across the limited trading hours of licensed clubs and the general conception of hotels trading on Sunday contemplated by the law, and at least questions the part that so-called hotel social clubs are supposed to be playing in the community and what legal requirements are involved.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall be pleased to have this matter investigated for the honourable member. I am aware of some of the facts surrounding the honourable member's complaint and it seems that, on the surface, there certainly are some grounds for complaint in this situation. The hotels to which the honourable member has referred have been obtaining special permits to trade on Sundays in Whyalla and it would seem, from one application that has come to hand, that the *bona fides* of the clubs making the applications are open to some doubt. This application indicates that a darts match is to be held on a certain Sunday. Apparently, darts, as a sport, is undergoing an unprecedented popularity boom in Whyalla, because the application indicates that about 400 people are expected to watch this match. On those facts, it appears that there is some need to investigate the matter, and I shall be pleased to do so for the honourable member.

VEHICLE WEIGHTS

Mr. BLACKER: As the newly established office of the Motor Registration Division at Port Lincoln is not geared to handle truck gross vehicle mass assessments, will the Minister of Transport consult the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to ascertain the possiblity of having a departmental officer visit Port Lincoln to deal with gross vehicle mass and gross combination mass assessments? Considerable confusion still exists regarding truck weights and registrations and, in some cases, permits have been operating for many months, during which there has been a flood of correspondence back and forth. However, if a departmental officer well versed in truck weights and measures could visit Port Lincoln for a short time, most of the problems could be solved on the spot, with the officer's being able to see for himself the vehicles in question. As this matter concerns many of my constituents, I am only too willing to advertise the visit and to try to contact as many people involved as possible to make such a visit by the officer practicable.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The procedure that has been followed with regard to this problem has been that we have established a committee, headed by a highly qualified engineer, together with a representative from one of the major private trucking companies and one other person (whose name escapes me at the moment). The committee has been engaged for well over a year now in assessing the gross vehicle weight or gross combination weight of trucks throughout South Australia. The committee has travelled around for the purpose of making inspections to determine the gross vehicle weight or the gross combination weight of vehicles, and I am surprised to hear the honourable member suggest (as I think his question did) that it had not been to Port Lincoln. Although I find that difficult to believe, I will speak to the Registrar to see whether that is the case and, if there is a need for the committee to go to Port Lincoln to determine the weights of vehicles that have been modified, I am sure that arrangements can and will be made for that to happen.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Works inform the House on the present holdings in our reservoirs, saying whether they compare favourably with those of last year and whether the present position will ensure that no water restrictions will be imposed this summer?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am delighted that the member for Unley is showing a continued interest in our water supplies. He raised in the House recently the problem we had with crustaceans in the water supply, and his question capped the question of the member for Davenport.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He soon lost interest.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Davenport seemed to think that the question belonged to him. He did not seem to realise—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable the Minister's attention to the fact that the matter under discussion is a question asked by the honourable member for Unley.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have the necessary information and I shall be pleased to give the reply, but I point out that the member for Unley also has an interest in the same water supply as the member for Davenport. Actually, it would not be the same water supply: it would be different water. I am pleased to be able to report that the situation regarding the metropolitan water supply is extremely good at present, although not quite as good as it was at this period last year. The total capacity of the reservoirs serving the metropolitan area is 188 680 megalitres. The storage at this time last year was 186 633 M*l*, and the present storage is 161 077M*l*. This shows that the situation is extremely good. Usually, when the honourable member asks a question about water storages, it rains the following weekend, so the position probably will improve by next week. I have details of the various reservoir holdings for the information of honourable members who are interested, and I ask leave to have those inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

STORAGES

Supply	Capacity M*l*	Storage Last Year M*l*	Storage Present M*l*	Increase for Week M*l*
River Onkaparinga—				
Mount Bold	47 300	47 300	46 397	1 013
Happy Valley	12 700	13 191	12 294	—73
Clarendon Weir	320	320	287	—17
River Myponga—Myponga	26 800	26 800	26 170	1 050
River Torrens—				
Millbrook	16 500	16 500	16 008	829
Kangaroo Creek	24 400	24 400	13 453	—306
Hope Valley	3 470	3 486	2 914	461
Thorndon Park	640	580	594	1
River South Para—				
Barossa	4 510	4 159	4 355	458
South Para	51 300	49 417	38 047	179
River Murray—				
Mannum	220	144	183	31
Murray Bridge	520	336	375	—5
Swan Reach Pipeline	—	—	—	—
Taken into storage from pipelines	—	—	—	—
Taken into storage from pipelines				
Totals	188 680	186 633	161 077	3 621

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I assure the House that there will be no need for any restrictions in the metropolitan area this year.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Premier tell me the required constitutional and other procedures necessary to allow a producer group in a specific area of South Australia to negotiate directly and trade with an international customer? One of the United Kingdom Commonwealth Parliamentary Association delegates who was here last week spent some time with me on Kangaroo Island last weekend, and amongst other things he suggested an avenue that Kangaroo Island meat producers should explore in order to (*a*) secure a long-term and more attractive market for its beef-mutton; (*b*) obtain the necessary oversea finance to facilitate the processing of these products before despatch; and (*c*) establish a direct transport delivery arrangement between Kangaroo Island and the outlet. When one considers the economically disastrous situation that has applied generally with island-mainland shipping of livestock, the embarrassing situation for the Government at Gepps Cross service works, the financial burden this outlet causes our producers, Australia's depleted oversea meat markets, and the urgency of the position, it appears high time we investigated all possible export avenues, and the one mentioned sounds to the people on Kangaroo Island well worth exploring. Hopefully, a pilot scheme of the kind described, if successful, would benefit many growers in the State. In particular, following an announcement by the Minister of Transport recently that the life of the *Troubridge* was somewhat limited and that various proposals to link Kangaroo Island with the mainland were being considered, it would seem appropriate to consider seriously the matter that I have raised. Accordingly, I look forward to an indication of the Premier's attitude and, of course, to his continued co-operation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member gives me information about what has been proposed in this matter, naturally we will investigate and try to facilitate the achievement of oversea orders. Several proposals for meat marketing are currently being considered by the South Australian Government, and information relating to them has been given to the Department of Overseas Trade in Canberra. Oversea trade deals need to be cleared with the Australian Government, particularly where, for instance, as in many cases with currently proposed arrangements, they

include barter deals; those have to be arranged in relation to foreign exchange arrangements. Investment within Australia by foreign capital must fall within the guidelines laid down by the Commonwealth Treasury. I think the proposal can be investigated and facilitated if the honourable member gives me details of it. The Minister of Agriculture and the Development Division of my department are already engaged in investigating several such proposals, and will be pleased to assist the honourable member in relation to his proposal.

HOLDEN HILL BUILDING

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare give me a report on any plans that the Community Welfare Department has to use a building facing North-East Road, Holden Hill, which was previously used and which was known as the Holden Hill Drop-In Centre? If there are any such plans, will the Minister say for what purpose the building will be used? I refer the Minister to a letter I received from him dated July 30 this year, part of which stated that the South Australian Youth Clubs were relinquishing the lease on the property used for the centre, following the closing of the centre. The clubs do not intend to reopen the centre, although at first it was hoped that a new partnership programme could lead to its reopening. The letter then went on to outline a partnership programme in which volunteer workers further tentative young people, which programme was being developed in each major centre.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I recall sending the letter to the honourable member but, as some time has elapsed since then, I shall be delighted to obtain a report for her.

PREFABRICATED HOUSE

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Housing say whether the housing construction techniques of B.P.A. in Stockholm, Sweden, have been examined by Housing Trust officers? The third paragraph on page 7 of Parliamentary Paper 174, an extremely authoritative document compiled by the member for Murray following a recent oversea visit, states:

Sweden has one of the largest construction companies in Europe known as B.P.A. which was formed in 1967 as a result of 20 construction companies merging, and its turnover is approximately $400 000 000 (Aust.) per annum. The Swedish Trade Union movement and the Swedish Co-operative Union own B.P.A. and employ 15 000 people. One particular prefabricated dwelling made in one of B.P.A.'s five factories can be erected in one day by four tradesmen with mechanical equipment assistance.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In view of the honourable member's reference to the document compiled by the member for Murray, I am reminded of Lucky Jim and the thesis he wrote, the title of which was "The Economic Influences on Shipbuilding in the 1640's in the United Kingdom". The thesis commenced with the words, "This strangely neglected subject". However, I have complimented the honourable member previously on his report, so perhaps he will forgive me for that remark. The Housing Trust has examined and been in close touch with the work of the I.B.S. group in New Zealand. I am not aware of any information that exists here about the Swedish group to which the honourable member has referred. I will take up the matter with the trust and, if it seems worth while to follow it up, I will certainly have it followed up.

CHIROPODISTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to introduce a scheme whereby chiropodists would visit kindergartens to advise parents and to keep in check problems young children are having with their feet? If the Government intends to introduce such a scheme, when will it start? Some kindergartens are now inviting chiropodists to attend and advise children and their parents about foot problems being suffered by children. As the Minister will realise, this is an important matter. Indeed, many children have foot problems that are not recognised at an early stage. This scheme could be coupled with the dental scheme, which already operates. I understand this matter has been considered, so I ask the Minister what is the Government's policy.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Government intends that a full range of medical services be made available on an occasional basis to children in pre-school centres. The honourable member has referred to regular dental inspections. How quickly such schemes could be phased in is a little clouded, but I will get up-to-date information for the honourable member about this service and give the House the benefit of that information.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. EVANS: Is the Minister of Works aware that the Public Buildings Department has issued amendments to general conditions of contract whereby the payment of nominated subcontractors has, to all intents and purposes, been taken out of the hands of the contractor and assumed by the department? I refer especially to a draft of a special condition of contract which was issued recently by the department and which dealt with nominated subcontractors. I suggest that proposed subclause 10.4 of that draft raises several problems. First, it is totally ambiguous when read with clause 41 of the general conditions, in that clause 41 accepts the obligation of the Public Buildings Department to make all payments to the contractor, whereas subclause 10.4 assumes the right of the department to pay nominated subcontractors. Secondly, subclause 10.4 assumes the right to submit to arbitration disputes between contractors and subcontractors when they may have entered into separate subcontract agreements dealing with arbitrations in an entirely different matter. How does the department seek to bind contractors and subcontractors to this form of arbitration? In reply, will the Minister state whether it is intended to take this matter further so that the department can pay all subcontractors who are nominated or otherwise? It is deemed that subclause 10.4 is ambiguous and may be severed from the general conditions of contract because of its ambiguity and because it is not essential to the main purport and substance of the agreement. Will the Minister get a report on whether this matter is being taken out of the hands of contractors?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have not seen the document to which the honourable member refers, but some time ago I discussed the principle of this matter with Mr. Dunn, the Director, Public Buildings Department. At that time I agreed that variations should be made to the conditions of contract documents. That agreement was made at about the time several large companies crashed. The honourable member would be aware of the difficulties that could arise with nominated subcontractors, and indeed their own subcontractors, as a result of that happening. It was as a result of that that this step was taken. When it was put into effect it was an administrative matter. However, I agree with the principle of the amendments. I will have the matter investigated to see whether the points raised by the honourable member are ambiguous. The Government certainly does not intend to go further than nominate its subcontractors in relation to payment. The

honourable member would appreciate that such action would create many difficulties, and we have no desire to do that. However, I cannot say that it will never happen. What I am saying is that the Government does not intend, nor does the Director of the department suggest, that we would go to that extent. I will discuss with the Director the specific points raised by the honourable member and get a report for him. If an alteration is necessary to clear up the matters raised by the honourable member, I will see that it is made.

ROCK LOBSTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. VANDEPEER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Fisheries what action is being taken to convene a meeting of the Rock Lobster Advisory Committee? That committee has not met in 1975. It met only once in 1974 and once in 1973. Before that time it had met twice a year. I understand there is some difficulty in obtaining Australian Government representation on the committee. That representation is necessary, and the fishermen are concerned about the lack of Government action in calling the advisory committee together.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will put the question to my colleague. However, I should point out that the committee is an advisory committee and that, if the Minister does not call for advice, there is no point in its meeting. Of course, that may not be the reason for its not meeting. I do not know. The honourable member should appreciate that advisory committees usually meet when a matter is referred to them for discussion and advice. There seems to be an implication in the honourable member's question that the Government has not done much about fisheries. This Government certainly has a better record on this matter than any previous Government had. If the honourable member went back several years and examined the question of fisheries in this State, he would see the tremendous emphasis placed on this industry that was not previously the case. If some members of the advisory committee are getting their fingers in a knot about not being called to Adelaide to meet on a specific matter, they should get in touch with the Chairman (who is the Acting Director of Fisheries) to ascertain whether or not there is any cause for them to meet. There is no point in the honourable member's trying to make small capital out of this matter to impress fishermen in the ports he represents. That is not at all advisable.

Mr. Mathwin: But he has to represent them, doesn't he?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether the advisory committee has given him good advice, but I will refer the matter to my colleague to see whether I can get some information for the honourable member. However, I imagine nothing has arisen that should be referred to the committee for advice.

INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier say what steps he has recently taken to expand the research facilities in this State following the closing down or withdrawal of support for the Industrial Research Institute of South Australia? My question relates to the activities of Techsearch, a body of which I am sure the Premier is aware. This is a research organisation under the aegis of the South Australian Institute of Technology that does work similar to some facets of the work previously done by the Industrial Research Institute of South Australia. As Techsearch Incorporated is flourishing and doing excellent work, will the Premier consider making some of the work that was previously done by Mr. Fry's organisation available to Techsearch, which can do this type of work and which has the capacity and facilities for undertaking it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly have a look at the matter. I point out to the honourable member that in fact research was for the most part not carried out by the Industrial Research Institute itself. It was there to organise facilities for research for specific projects, and it did so with available research facilities within the State. It also assisted people to apply for grants for research from the Australian Government. I will certainly talk to the committee that is looking at this matter to see whether some work can be channelled towards Techsearch which has not already been channelled towards it. As far as I was aware, Techsearch had originally been included in the work organised by the Industrial Research Institute: that is, the institute put work towards Techsearch where appropriate.

ROAD SIGN

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Transport consider adding the name "Port Augusta" to a road direction sign at the road junction about 3 kilometres north of Port Wakefield on Highway 1? For some considerable time, travellers have been missing the turn and ultimately finding themselves in Kadina. A service station operator has told me that often he has given directions to travellers, particularly interstate travellers, who wish to go through Port Augusta. I live on the main road from Adelaide, and I have been aproached at my home at midnight, and even after, by people who have missed the way. Round the bend at this junction there is a sign containing the words "Port Augusta". The signboard has three names (Port Broughton, Kadina and Crystal Brook). The local people know the importance of Crystal Brook, but travellers do not know that Crystal Brook is on the road through to Port Augusta. Because of the inconvenience caused to many interstate and other travellers, I ask whether the Minister will consider this matter. It would not be costly to do, and in my opinion there is sufficient room on the sign for the words "Port Augusta" to be added. I believe that would overcome the problem.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to the Commissioner of Highways, but I fear, Mr. Speaker, that you might want the words "Port Pirie" added. I am wondering where we stop. I think we ought to do something before (to use the honourable member's words) they go around the bend.

SKATE BOARDS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Education investigated the possibility of authorising school principals or school councils to give approval for the use of skate boards in schoolyards? In the *Australian* of Monday, October 13, I noticed a report that the New South Wales and Victorian Government Ministers were in favour of schoolyards being used for the purpose of students using their skate boards. I understand the difficulty has been, particularly in New South Wales, that whilst the Minister has put the onus on the school principals and school councils, he realises that members of the staff are not paid to stay back in the afternoon, or, of course, over a weekend to supervise the children. I am wondering whether the Minister or the department has looked at this matter to see whether anything can be done?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As I understand the question, it is the after-hours component that is the problem.

Mr. Becker: Yes.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: At present, principals, in consultation with the school councils, have the power to allow this activity to go on, but there would be problems where no supervision was available for it. I will look into the matter. I believe, particularly in view of the recent tragic accident associated with this sport, that it requires a certain amount of supervision as well as a controlled area in which it can take place. I think the suggestion is most reasonable. It is a matter which in time can be partly covered by our attempt to extend the concept of vacation schools, play groups after hours, and so on, and also greater community involvement in the schools. To be realistic, that would take some time to develop on a State-wide basis. I will take up the matter for the honourable member and see what can be done.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Dr. EASTICK: Does the Attorney-General bring to his new office any new or changed views with respect to the appointment of justices of the peace? We have seen, during the course of the Dunstan Government from 1970 onwards, two approaches regarding the nomination of justices of the peace in this State. More recently, it has been the prerogative of a person wanting to become a justice of the peace to submit an application form direct, it being no longer necessary for the application to be lodged through the local member of Parliament. His Honor Mr. Justice King, as Attorney-General, decided that a number of persons with certain qualifications or classifications within the community were to be denied the opportunity of serving as justices of the peace. Does the Attorney-General hold any new or any differing views that he intends to apply to this important area of community activity?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The short answer is "No", but I should like to elaborate slightly on that, because I think some important issues are involved in this matter. As the honourable member has pointed out, persons who desire to become justices of the peace in South Australia are able to submit their names direct to the Attorney-General for consideration. Under Mr. Justice King's system, which I intend to continue, the names are submitted to a committee, which until recently, was under the chairmanship of Judge Marshall, but because of his appointment to the Australian Family Court we will be appointing a new Chairman to that committee. That committee considers the applications on their merits having regard to certain classifications of persons who the Government considers are not suitable to be appointed justices of the peace. For example, it is well known that the Government considers it undesirable to have licensed bailiffs as justices of the peace. The Government believes that persons who could find themselves in a compromise position should not be appointed justices, and I intend to continue that practice. The honourable member has referred to the fact that applications can now be made direct to my department. I have instructed my department that, when applications come direct to it and are referred to the committee, the names should be sent to the relevant House of Assembly member for comment, because I recognise that the persons most able to know the calibre and qualifications of applicants are members of the House of Assembly. I do not believe that the appointment of justices has ever depended on political beliefs or anything of that kind: it has been considered an important role of members of the House of Assembly to make recommendations. The recommendations will not be mandatory: they will be sent to the committee, which, in the light of the comments made by members of Parliament, will determine whether or not an applicant should be appointed a justice of the peace.

WINE INDUSTRY

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier give any hope of financial assistance to the wine industry? An article in the press recently stated that the Premier had been to Canberra to try to get assistance for the wine industry, and he made some comments to the press about his visit. Can the Premier say anything more about what assistance can be given to the wine industry in this State, particularly in the light of the situation that seems to be developing—that if they do not hurry it may be too late, as there may be a change of Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have vivid memories of what the last Liberal Government did to the wine industry. At this stage I have not received a reply from the Commonwealth Treasurer to my submissions; I am awaiting it. I made the submission, as I undertook to this House to do, and when I have an announcement to make I will make one.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EMERGENCY FIRE SERVICES

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House:

(*a*) the Government should immediately proceed to build new headquarters for the Emergency Fire Services;

(*b*) that the Director of the E.F.S. be given more staff and facilities for the coming fire season; and

(*c*) that the Government immediately introduce the proposed Country Fire Services Act.

These matters have caused great concern to the people who have the responsibility of protecting the country from the ravages of bush fires. During the past few months, it has become evident that the Government is deliberately stalling in relation to accepting its responsibilities in this matter. The Emergency Fire Services throughout the State, in co-operation with local government bodies, has contacted the Minister and also members on this side. In 1973, the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Casey) released a report of the working party set up to examine the Emergency Fire Services in South Australia, and that report made many recommendations. Since that time there has been a running battle between the Government and Mr. Overall, of the Fire Brigades Union. It has become obvious to many people in the community that the only reason why the recommendations of the working party have not been implemented by the Government (and it has had two years to do so) is that Mr. Overall has had his way with the Australian Labor Party. It is interesting to examine a motion that was passed at the recent A.L.P. conference. Prior to that occasion, Mr. Overall had made other statements at the previous A.L.P. conference, and following one of those statements the member for Fisher and Mr. Overall clashed in the press many times. Naturally, I support the course of action taken by and the criticism made by the member for Fisher in relation to this matter. In the *Herald* of September, 1975, appeared the following report of the motion:

That the State Government establish a committee of inquiry into all aspects of organisation and control of South Australia's fire prevention, fire protection and fire-fighting services, such committee to be given terms of reference designed to recommend to the Government the necessary legislation which will provide the most efficient fire safety standard for the people of South Australia.

I understand that motion was moved by Mr. R. Overall and seconded by Mr. T. Jones. It was carried, and it has served only as a vehicle to delay the implementation of the course of action that had been requested for a long time by the people who have the responsibilty for protecting the country against the ravages of bush fires. It should be appreciated how much work the working party put into its report. The working party, which submitted recommendations to the Minister in 1973, comprised responsible people who understood situations currently prevailing throughout South Australia in relation to bush fire control. They have all had wide experience in these areas. One of the recommendations, made on page 31 of the report, is as follows:

The working party recommends that separate South Australian Fire Brigade and volunteer country fire services be retained in South Australia.

This is probably the most contentious matter concerning the Government at the moment, because at present it is under the complete dictation of Mr. Overall, who wants to replace existing volunteer services, which have served South Australia so efficiently, with salaried officers. Another recommendation was as follows:

The working party recommends that all existing powers held by local government under the Bush Fires Act, 1960-1968, be retained.

I think local government has proved that it is the best authority within the local community to liaise with the Emergency Fire Services to administer control. Another recommendation was as follows:

The working party recommends that the Minister of Agriculture should control all operational and legislative aspects dealing with fires embraced by the Bush Fires Act in country areas.

I think that it is essential that this recommendation be put into effect immediately, because currently the Emergency Fire Services is under the control of three Ministerial departments, and I believe this is unsatisfactory. I will not read any more of the recommendations, but I draw attention to one or two comments made by people who are concerned about this matter. I quote from a recent edition of *Stock Journal* an article headed "Morale of E.F.S. depleted", which states:

E.F.S. members would not join with the South Australian Fire Brigade under any circumstances, Mr. E. H. V. Riggs said this week. Mr. Riggs, chairman of the action committee established by regional officers and firefighting association delegates, was commenting on the establishment by the Government of a committee which will examine the feasibility of bringing the E.F.S. and the S.A.F.B. under one planning control. "I am happy with the composition of the committee, but it should not cause further delays in the implementation of the working party's report," he said.

Most Opposition members would agree with those comments. Not only has the Government failed to implement the committee's report but it has also failed to construct a new headquarters at Keswick to be used by the projected Country Fire Services. I understand that the Public Works Committee has recommended that this project, which will cost more than $500 000, should proceed. The present facilities of E.F.S. are unsatisfactory, and the Director does not have sufficient staff to undertake efficiently his functions. Previously, I have raised these matters in the House, but they are worth repeating. A letter from the District Council of Kimba, signed by the clerk, and dated August 13 states:

This council along with many other councils is perturbed with the movement to have country fire services brought under control of the Fire Brigades Board. At the annual meeting of the Eyre Peninsula Fire Fighting Association held at Wudinna on the 11th instant it was resolved that the following resolution be forwarded to the Chief Secretary and the Minister for Local Government:

1. Conference welcomes the recent press release by the Minister of Local Government re-iterating Government's policy of consolidation of the Volunteer Country Fire Services; and urges that the new Act, which has been drafted, be introduced without delay this session.
2. That the new headquarters at Keswick be built without delay.
3. Conference is strongly opposed to another committee of inquiry into the affairs of Emergency Fire Services, which will only cause delay to the Country Fire Services Act, and new headquarters.
4. That the Director of Emergency Fire Services be given urgently needed staff and facilities for the coming fire season.

Council requests that you use your every endeavour to bring about the implementation of the matters referred to in the resolution.

That letter expresses the sentiments of all E.F.S. members who have been concerned for some time at the attitude of this Government. Some time ago, at an E.F.S. parade in my district, I discussed this matter with its officers from all parts of this State, and they expressed similar sentiments to those stated in that letter. The Mount Barker E.F.S. is also of the same opinion, and I could quote from submissions that have been made to Opposition members (and no doubt to Government members) concerning the matters to which I have referred. This year we are facing a potentially serious fire hazard in many parts of the State, and it is essential that the E.F.S. should have enough manpower and equipment to control such a hazard. Many people believe that the Government has not accepted its responsibility, but has deliberately used stalling tactics when propositions have been put before it by responsible and competent people.

I hope that the Minister in his reply will tell us what are the Government's plans, and will assure us that Mr. Overall and his colleagues will not frustrate the E.F.S. by having its duties taken over by salaried officers of the Fire Brigades Board. I understand that the E.F.S. in this State costs about $500 000 a year to operate, whereas at Port Pirie the Fire Brigades Board branch costs the same sum. There would be about 9 000 members of the E.F.S., so that the cost in relation to the number of people available to protect some inner city areas and country areas is minimal. Should salaried officers be employed the cost would be prohibitive, and efficiency would not be improved. Who wants this move to be made? It seems to be another example of the trade union movement trying to interfere with an efficient organisation for the personal gain of that movement, but such action would have a retrograde effect on the whole community. Increased taxes would be inevitable, and it is clear that the Government should be condemned for its inefficiency and inaction in relation to this important matter.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I second the motion. It would be fair to say that most Government members live in areas without any E.F.S. service operating and others would live in areas in which that organisation operates on the outer fringe only. Even you, Mr. Speaker, serve an area in which the Fire Brigades Board operates. Generally, communities served by the E.F.S. are satisfied with the service provided and have full confidence in that organisation. That situation is a credit to the community and to those who serve it through the E.F.S. The community supports the organisation by contributions, donations, or attending at fund-raising functions, the proceeds of which enable equipment to be supplied that will protect the community from a major disaster from fire and also prevent fires starting.

The motion requests the Government to build immediately the new headquarters for the E.F.S. We are waiting

anxiously for the Government to create the Country Fire Services but, in the meantime, these headquarters should be built at Keswick at a cost of about $500 000. That is a small and insignificant amount compared to the money that has been saved by voluntary firefighters, and what will be saved in future. The main contribution to this organisation is in voluntary man hours, which are usually provided outside normal working hours. A bush-fire cannot be fought as quickly as a fire in a factory, multi-storey building or house in the metropolitan area; sometimes it takes days to control such a fire. Even if the Army was called in, the result would be the same in terms of time of fighting a fire in rough and steep terrain, particularly in the Adelaide Hills. We found that that was the case recently in the outback of the State. Imagine the cost to the State if all the people fighting that type of fire were paid employees who received penalty rates, overtime and all the other payments that would have to go to people who fought fires under those conditions. The Government has a responsibility to spend this $500 000, which is not a large sum in terms of the State Budget and the sums we spend in other areas.

There was no hesitation about looking for $200 000 for Trades Hall: there was not even a whimper from the Government then. So, money can be found if the cause is close enough to the hearts of Government members. I understand their lack of concern for the E.F.S., because, in the main, they have none of those authorities to answer to as sitting members of Parliament, and they do not have volunteer workers in their areas. The community that is served by this organisation (and if another head-quarters was built for it, it would be even better served) has one slight advantage over the volunteers that is significant in the long term, namely, cheaper rates of fire insurance on their houses. The rate of insurance for those served by the Fire Brigades Board is much higher; I think it goes in some places up to 50 per cent higher than in areas served by the E.F.S., for no reason other than that one is a volunteer service, and the other is a paid service to which local government makes substantial contributions. The board is guaranteed an income from the area it serves, so the ratepayers in the metropolitan area pay not only a higher council rate to meet the board's costs but also higher insurance. Why do we need to push that kind of cost on to a community that is already happy with and well served by the service it has? I have heard no general complaint in my area, part of which is a densely populated residential area (the Mitcham hills area), which is served by one of the most efficient E.F.S. units in the State.

The householders there are reasonably satisfied with the time it takes the personnel to get to their properties to help quell fires. There are no multi-storey buildings with which to be concerned and which need special equip-ment of any significance. Flinders University is about the closest building of any significance, and that is close to the St. Marys Fire Brigades unit. There are no factories that need an increased service, so all we are talking about is areas where the E.F.S. operates in the main, namely, in fighting grass or scrub fires, household fires and shed fires, and plant and equipment on farms. In most cases, the plant and equipment and shed fires can be controlled by the equipment that most farmers have on their properties. The farmers accept this responsibility, and possibly if every householder in the metropolitan area accepted a similar responsibility we would find that not so much serious damage would be done by house fires in the metropolitan area.

The motion makes the point that extra personnel should be made available to the E.F.S., and I think that that is a reasonable request. I know that in my area there are perhaps more people to serve, more properties to worry about, and more vacant allotments to be burnt off whenever the owner has not taken the right approach, or the owner may decide that he wants the E.F.S. to burn off the property, thereby making it safe for others. So, there is a bigger demand on this organisation, which is not asking for a massive staff increase or for its personnel to be paid: all the motion suggests is some increase in the staff available to the organisation during the coming fire season and for the future. Paragraph (*c*) of the motion also suggests that a Country Fire Services Act be introduced and implemented.

I will now refer to the matter of the trade union move-ment and the Fire Brigades Board. I do not attack the board regarding its ability and expertise to carry out the functions for which it is employed, but I emphasise the word "employed". A board fire officer has a reasonably well-paid job. The officers of the board now have reason-able hours, and I do not hear any complaint from the people in the community that they serve, except that they have to pay higher council rates. Many of them do not realise this, but the administration in local government realises it. These people also pay higher insurance rates. There is no attack on the board's employees regarding the work they carry out, but I believe that there is justification for suggesting that Mr. Overall has a personal ambition to promote himself and to strengthen the union by numbers and by monetary contributions if he can force his will, through the Australian Labor Party, on the E.F.S. and on the whole of the State's fire-fighting services.

Mr. Venning: That's just not on!

Mr. EVANS: For that to happen would be a crime in a society already struggling to meet the commitments to serve the community in so many areas, yet Mr. Overall is willing to advocate, through his Party machine, the gradual dis-ruption of an effective and successful volunteer service so that he can increase the numbers in his own union organisa-tion and, before long, promote himself to a point where that Party machine (the South Australian section of the A.L.P.) will accept him as a candidate for the political scene.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That's a scurrilous allegation, and you know it.

Mr. EVANS: He has not hestiated to use his position to promote his philosophy through the Party's machine.

Mr. Gunn: That's dead right!

Mr. EVANS: When volunteer people who give their services so willingly face this kind of threat, which they cannot attack, not one Government member stands up and says that he will do everything in his power to protect the E.F.S. as a voluntary organisation or that he believes that Mr. Overall is doing the wrong thing, because this matter has gone through the Party machine at a vote at a meeting to be part of the Party's policy, thereby making it binding. Mr. Speaker, you would be well aware of this matter, because at one time you belonged to that Party, and you know how binding such a matter can be. That is no consolation to the people who serve in the E.F.S. through-out the State. What real incentive is there for the young person who has decided to be trained as an E.F.S. fire fighter and who suddenly finds that there is some threat to the continuity of that organisation's work? What does he do? He tends to walk away and say, "There's no future in it for me." That is part of the plan. If people can disrupt and discredit, there is every chance that they will

eventually be able to say that the organisation is an ineffective service and that it should be replaced. There is one thing in favour of those people who give so keenly to this service: no-one else can say that the service is ineffective or inefficient, or that it does not service the community well. Mr. Overall has enough to worry about with the South Australian Fire Brigades Board personnel, and I believe that they are happy about his position in that union. Otherwise, they would not retain him. However, there is no need to spread the wings of that organisation or try to destroy another successful organisation just for the sake of a philosophy, whether political or otherwise.

I hope that the Government accepts the challenge of the motion and states that it is willing to establish the central headquaters for the E.F.S. and, eventually, to bring into it the Country Fire Services. In my district, and part of the districts of the member for Heysen and other members representing parts of the Hills, is the most difficult terrain in the State in which to fight fires. Once a major fire starts in the heat of the day, it is extremely hard to stop it. I have believed for about four or five years that, if we have a repeat of Black Sunday of the mid-1950's, the result will be disastrous, regardless of whether we have the Army, the E.F.S. or the South Australian Brigades Board trying to fight it. That is because many of the areas that once comprised agricultural land that was cultivated, irrigated or grazed now are no longer in that condition. They now have on them a wilderness of noxious weeds and small native trees that one may regard as regrowth.

Because many people like the environment, they have chosen to live in some bushland areas, and they have flammable material near their houses. The old-timers understood the area and they did not take any chance by letting the bushland grow right to the back door. They and I know that the end result will be disastrous if people do not realise that there must be a balance between what they do, or do not, keep as far as flammable material near a house is concerned.

I hope that people will heed the warning given by E.F.S. personnel over the years about keeping the gutters of the roof of the house clean, keeping dead material away from the house, and keeping highly flammable types of eucalypts a reasonable distance from the house so as to give fire-fighting personnel a chance. I hope that the community takes that advice, because, regardless of how much a property is insured for, much of what is lost cannot be replaced. Heartbreak is caused and there is financial burden on the rest of the State to replace what has been destroyed. The E.F.S. must be retained as a voluntary organisation, with the support of the community for it and faith of the community in it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOVERNMENT CHARGES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I move:

That this House view with alarm the greatly escalating level of Government charges being levied on the people of South Australia as instanced by the recent severe increase in water charges, and call on the Labor Government to revert to policies which will restore confidence in the State, and which will again attract sound investment and development.

I gave notice of this motion some weeks ago but, because private members' business has gone on for a long time, it has not come on for debate until today. I gave notice of the motion at about the time when the Government announced severe increases in water charges and when the Budget was discussed. Members will recall that the Budget debate was disgracefully guillotined in the Committee stage, when it had been only partly considered.

I move this motion to draw the attention of members to the fact that the level of charges in South Australia is reaching alarming proportions. The Premier waxed loud, long and eloquent when the Labor Party was in Opposition about any impost that members of our political Party, in Government, placed in a Budget. He took every opportunity to decry any increase in charges, regardless of how slight the increase was, and he attacked the Government of the day most trenchantly whenever he could, whether it was in this House or on the public platform, and regardless of whether the occasion was appropriate.

I remember one inappropriate occasion, which was when, at the opening of the Modbury Hospital, the present Premier attacked the Playford Administration. I think that was a most ill-timed exhibition of boorishness, if ever there was one. He spoke derisively and trenchantly about the Playford Government's Administration regarding health. I also remember the Minister of Transport doing likewise at the opening of a wine exhibition in part of the Adelaide railway station complex. I attended the function as the representative of a wine-producing district, and we were subjected to a tirade of abuse of our Commonwealth Parliamentary colleagues. I also remember the criticisms levelled unceasingly by the present Minister of Mines and Energy. Those people seized on every public occasion, usually most inappropriate occasions, and in a most abhorrent way tried to criticise and make cheap political capital about what a responsible Liberal Government in Canberra was doing. Now the boot is on the other foot and we have had five years of Labor Administration.

Dr. Eastick: Five years of mismanagement.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It is—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The newly-hatched Attorney-General, the new fledgling Attorney-General, has interjected, lauding the efforts of his colleagues. We have now had five years of Labor Administration in South Australia and almost three years of Labor Administration in the Commonwealth sphere. It has not been a happy combination, because the combined effect of the two socialist Labor Governments has really been disastrous for South Australia and for Australia. Despite the Premier's protestations that "We are the best Government the State has ever had," (there is nothing like a bit of self praise when one is whistling in the dark to keep up one's spirits), history will prove that socialist Labor Governments are the worst for the country.

Whether this Government likes it or not, it is doing what all socialist Governments do in the end: it will throw more and more people on to the public sector and will destroy the core of society. That core has made Australia what it is today: a place where people have had the spirit to look after themselves, pay their own way, own their own houses, and battle on for themselves and their families. More and more people are depending on the State for their existence. The Government is developing in people the mentality of the hand-out. This concept is being accelerated by this Government, and it has been accelerated at an alarming rate by its colleagues in Canberra.

If one goes back through *Hansard* and looks at all the speeches the Premier made on the Budget when he was Leader of the Opposition, one finds that he criticised

Liberal and Country League Governments for hitting the little people. He said South Australia's taxing system must be aimed at big shots (the big guns or tall poppies, as he regularly calls them).

Mr. Mathwin: That was his favourite statement—"Trim the tall poppies."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He was going to trim them off at the knees. Every time he opened his mouth—

Mr. Mathwin: He put his foot in it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am enjoying the interjections being made by the member for Glenelg, but I must not lose my train of thought. The Premier would attack the L.C.L. Government every time for hitting the average man; the little people, as he called them. He said, "We represent the little people in this State." On September 17, 1968, the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition (reported at page 1159 of *Hansard*) and debating the Budget, said:

Let us consider what is being done in this Budget. Where this State has to raise additional finances, in the view of members on this side those finances should be raised in progressive taxation, as far as possible where we have progressive taxing capacity, and we should alter the incidence or our taxes to ensure that taxes are paid progressively in the same way, at least, as they are in other States. Now, South Australia is not receiving from death duties the sum that is being paid per capita in the Eastern States. What is more, the incidence of death duties in South Australia falls more heavily on the smaller estates than it does in other States, and less heavily on the larger estates.

Mr. Hudson, as he then was, then said by interjection that the loopholes were a scandal. The Premier continued.

Of course. Here is unused taxing capacity where taxes could be imposed which would not inhibit business and industrial expansion and which would not scale down business or dampen it at a time when it needs a stimulus and increased confidence. It is progressive taxation that is required.

I do not know what progressive taxation is, but I have read with interest what he said.

Mr. Coumbe: When it grows and grows.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it is progressive because it grinds on inexorably under a Labor Government. This is the sort of waffle the Premier continued with:

It is not taxation across the board that increases the costs of industry, yet the Government will not impose it. Rather it will use flat-rate taxes, definitely and clearly designed to get money out of the pockets of the average wage and salary earner, the average consumer, and the average small business man, because these are the people on whom the imposts, with one exception, will fall.

The exception he referred to relates to gift duty, which is now a particularly heavy tax. He then dealt with stamp duty as follows:

The next proposal is a stamp duty of $2 on certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance designed to assist in public hospital operations. It is all very well to say that this is designed to do that, but it is payable into the Treasury. It will support the money paid out of the Treasury for one purpose or another. The Treasurer may find it necessary to get extra money for hospital expenditure in South Australia, but let us not conceal the fact that this $2 tax is a straight impost that goes into the Treasury and is not designed to improve insurance: it is designed to improve revenues.

And so he continued. In another Budget speech, I well recall his attacking bitterly a proposed increase in stamp duty on new car registration and the transfer of registration. I could take up the remainder of my time quoting the sorts of sentiments the Premier expressed when he was Leader of the Opposition. Now, of course, things are different. A Labor Government is in office, and it was elected, as are all Labor Governments, with a bagful of promises. The same has happened in Canberra, and that Government is faced with the problem of financing those promises. All the eyewash about taxing the tall poppies has proved to be complete garbage and nonsense, because of the sort of taxes levied by this Government.

We do not hear about taxing tall poppies now when new taxing measures are announced in this State. When new water charges were introduced they affected not only the tall poppies but everyone in South Australia. Most of the little people in South Australia would have a water supply to their house. They are the people the Labor Government says it represents. The Premier has given the complete lie to the sort of stuff he was churning out when he was in Opposition. The State's problems have been exacerbated by the activities of the now completely discredited Labor Government in Canberra. The Premier's friendship with the Prime Minister seems to have waxed and waned in the past year or two.

Mr. Mathwin: He's now talking again about divorce.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We do not know whether or not they are still married, because the domestic scene changes each week. I can remember when they marched as comrades-in-arms, in last year's Labour Day march: Gough did not show up this year at the march. Before the Commonwealth Labor Government was elected to office Gough wrote to the Premier about the wine industry and said, "You can assure the boys up on the river that there will be no new impost. You can ask them to subscribe to our campaign funds to elect us to Government. There will be no new taxation coming from us when we are elected. We will get rid of this iniquitous 50c a gallon wine tax imposed by this irresponsible Liberal Government. You can give them my assurance, my word, that there will be no impost on wine." Friend Don (his comrade-in-arms) took the Prime Minister at face value. He wrote a letter to the wineries and collected money from some of them who were trusting enough to subscribe. Friend Gough was duly elected Prime Minister, and he promptly repudiated what he had said, and slapped on the most savage and retrogressive impost on wine stocks and increased brandy excise. By some stretch of the imagination or mental or oratorical gymnastics they were said not to be new taxes.

Mr. Arnold: They were old taxes increased.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, not new taxes. All that Gough could say was, "You know, Frank's having a rough time" (that was the Treasurer before the one before last). It did not matter that he broke his word or led Don up the garden path, this was the situation. Therefore, we do not know the present state of friendship between these two comrades. At the State election, the Premier realised that his erstwhile friends in Canberra were a liability. After announcing the election, and being sure he was going to win, he suddenly had doubts about it. There was only one thing to do and that was to shrug off Gough and company as smartly as he could. He knew if ever he had a liability it was the Prime Minister.

The financial problems of this Government have been exacerbated tremendously by the now discredited Labor Government in Canberra. When one realises that the Prime Minister could be so deceitful as to mislead the Premier of this State, one is not surprised that the Commonwealth Government lurches from crisis to crisis, with the most recent crisis involving Mr. Connor. Inflation is adding greatly to the problems of the

State Government in the level of charges that it is levying. The fires of inflation were well lit by the Government in Canberra in trying to honour the bag of promises that brought it to government. Not hundreds of millions of dollars of increased expenditure but thousands of millions led to the present situation. What has happened to the charges in this State since Labor has come to office?

A new tax has been imposed on the profits of the Electricity Trust. This was one of the taxes, as the Premier said, that was not going to hit the little people. We have to have progressive taxes, whatever they are. He referred to the fact that he must increase succession duties. The Minister of Mines and Energy agreed that was a scandal, and the Government has now had second thoughts about that. It realised that succession duties were hitting even the little people, if we consider that anyone who owns his own home is one of the little people.

Mr. Evans: They're little capitalists.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course they are. The tragedy is that more and more people are being thrown into a situation in which they have to take on welfare housing, which the Government is vaunting and trumpeting about so loudly at the moment. There are fewer and fewer young people who are now able to buy their own home and they are being thrown into low rental or welfare housing. Of course, they have electricity supplied to all of their homes, as far as I know, so these are the people that are being taxed. It is estimated that the increase in revenue from this source has gone from $486 000 in 1970-71 to more than $4 860 000 this year.

That is reflected directly in increased tariffs levied by the Electricity Trust, which has to recoup the value of the tax. It is considered a straight slug on the Electricity Trust and it must be borne by those who use the commodity. I submit that it is complete nonsense to say that it is not hitting the little people; it is hitting every citizen in the community. We heard the Premier speak so critically of the idea of levying stamp duties on new motor vehicle registrations and transfers. This is what has happened in the five years since Labor has been in Government. Before December 1, 1971, the duty payable on a vehicle valued at $2 500 was $25; the duty payable on a vehicle valued at $3 000 was $30, and the stamp duty payable on a vehicle valued at $5 000 was $50. What has this Government done in the intervening period? After December 1, 1971, it announced new charges. The figures were respectively: value $1 000, duty $10; $2 000, $30; $3 000, $55; and $5 000, $105. On January 2, 1975, the figures were $1 000 $10; $2000, $30; $3 000, $60; and $5 000, $140.

If we take the vehicle that the little people aspire to own in this State (the Holden, Ford or Chrysler middle-size vehicle), we can see how inflation has caused the price of that vehicle to increase from $3 000 to $5 000. There has been an effective increased of 400 per cent in stamp duty. That is an alarming increase. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Gunn:

That, in the opinion of this House, a referendum should be held to decide whether daylight saving should continue in South Australia.

(Continued from October 8. Page 1180.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Last week, when I moved this motion, owing to the time factor, I could not complete my remarks. Since then this matter has created much discussion throughout South Australia, particularly through television and other media. The discussion emanating from the motion I moved last week clearly reinforces the proposition that there should be a referendum so that the public can decide on this important social issue. In view of the strong opposition to daylight saving in certain areas and the alleged strong support in other areas, I have no doubt that the interests of the public at large would be served by this democratic proposition. The public should be allowed to judge this issue once and for all. In its wisdom the Government has taken this action without proper consultation. Many articles have appeared in Eyre Peninsula newspapers about this matter. On August 28, 1975, a report in the *Farmer and Grazier* stated:

The Cowell branch believes it can collect 500 signatures opposing daylight saving.

A report in the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune* states:

Parents of children attending the Lock area school are still very much against daylight saving. They have again decided to protest to the Minister of Education and ask that daylight saving be abolished. In his report to the meeting, school council chairman, Mr. R. Glover, said the length of the school bus routes meant that during daylight saving the first children were getting on the buses at daybreak. It was unfortunate that a special committee set up to study school bus routes had been unable to get any extension of the routes.

Another local newspaper report states:

An opinion poll conducted by United Farmers and Graziers revealed strong opposition to daylight saving. Zone 1 secretary said about 80 per cent of people participating in the poll voted against daylight saving.

That poll was conducted in conjunction with the 1973 State election. The *Sunday Mail* ran a poll, and most people who voted were opposed to daylight saving. Now that the New South Wales Government is holding a referendum on the question of daylight saving, I believe this Government is obligated to hold a referendum. Such a referendum could be held in conjunction with a State election, so that the cost would be insignificant. The polls have to be manned, anyway. I would not ask the State Government to spend money on a separate referendum. If it were held with the election, all that would be required would be extra ballot-papers, and the extra cost of printing would be insignificant. Once the people had made a decision the Government would know what action to take. I have been supported in my opinion by people throughout my district. A letter expressing strong feelings against daylight saving appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser* written by one of your constituents, Mr. Speaker. During the past week I have been contacted by many people about this matter. I am pleased to say that groups in Adelaide are organising petitions about daylight saving. I hope we can get as many signatures on petitions as they were able to do in New South Wales.

The Mothers and Babies Association in my district has approached me twice, once in 1973, through Mrs. Chapman, and again on April 29 this year through Mrs. Coser, regarding this matter. I do not think the Minister, if he is fair, can justify the rejection of this motion. When I last moved a similar motion in the House it lapsed because the Government prevented private members' business from continuing. I hope on this occasion the Government will adopt a more realistic and fair approach to this matter, which causes so much hardship in certain areas. I believe that, if members of the Government were confronted with these problems, such as the problem of small children catching school buses early in the morning before daylight, they would take a more realistic and sensible approach to this matter. I commend the motion to members and look forward to the support of members on both sides of the House.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I support the motion because I believe that daylight saving is popular with only a small section of the community, and a referendum would decide how small or large that section was. I believe that a large section of the community does not appreciate or value the introduction of daylight saving. The member for Eyre has already mentioned most of the problems encountered by country people during periods of daylight saving. In the height of summer, dairymen find it difficult in the evenings when they cannot complete milking until late. Their family lives suffer because they do not return to their homes until late in the evening. Weather conditions are often important in reaping crops. On many occasions crops cannot be reaped until the afternoon and the work often continues late into the evening. This means that during periods of daylight saving they do not get home until late and this disrupts family life, particularly that of farmers with young children. Even people in the metropolitan area who have young families face difficulties with daylight saving.

I have received many complaints from various groups, and I believe a referendum would decide how large is the group of people opposed to daylight saving. I think that daylight saving benefits only a minority group. I can understand why they want it because the extra hour of light in the evenings can be spent playing sport or at the seaside, but I suggest they could open their offices and shops an hour earlier in the morning and forget about shifting the clocks. That would have the same effect, although I believe this suggestion would be very unpopular The member for Eyre has explained the situation more than adequately. Many people in the country, particularly families with young children, are against daylight saving. Psychologists are now saying that it is having an effect on family life, and it has a psychological effect on children who have to make an adjustment.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who is your authority?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Only local doctors; I could not quote a positive authority. I believe that some doctors are doing some research into this matter to discover whether or not daylight saving has a psychological effect on children because of the changes in relation to the time of going to bed and rising and the amount of light at these times. I support the motion, and hope that the Government will hold a referendum in order to decide this issue once and for all.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment): The Government opposes this proposal, and I was surprised that the honourable member could obtain a seconder to his motion. I did not think that two members would bury their heads in the sand sufficiently that they would wish to promote such a proposal. When Minister Assisting the Premier, as Minister responsible for the matter I received a few complaints when daylight saving was first introduced about three or four years ago, and some of the letters I received remind me of the approach of the member for Eyre to this and to other matters. I vividly recall one woman drawing my attention to her displeasure at daylight saving because she said it was causing a dreadful waste of water. Before it was introduced she had watered her garden and lawn three times a day, but with the extra hour of sunlight she had to water it four times. Another woman pointed out that she wanted to see the end of daylight saving because the extra hour of sun made conditions in her timber frame house intolerable.

Any member who is in touch with the community will find that there is overwhelming support for the principle of daylight saving. I will not pursue its advantages, because they are well known. We have had enough tests made to realise that a referendum would be a waste of time and of taxpayers' money, because several Gallup polls and other polls have provided sufficient detail in this regard. Perhaps a Gallup poll is not a perfect guide, but it would show a fairly accurate trend. Although official election results and those predicted by a Gallup poll are rarely identical, the poll shows the trend. The most recent poll on daylight saving was held on April 5 last year, and it showed that, in answer to the question, "Should we have daylight saving next summer?", the "Yes" vote in South Australia was 80 per cent and the "No" vote was 20 per cent, with no-one undecided. In New South Wales previous State Governments have acted sensibly and recognised that most of the community favoured daylight saving. However, the present Premier is not strong enough to withstand pressure from influential members of his Party and has weakened to the extent that that State will have the expense of a referendum at the next election. The point I am making will be proved in New South Wales, because the Gallup poll of 1975 showed 74 per cent of the people in favour of daylight saving, 25 per cent opposed to it, and 1 per cent undecided.

People in South Australia and in New South Wales have now enjoyed three or four seasons of daylight saving, and when the New South Wales referendum is conducted I am sure that there will be about 74 per cent of the people favouring it. At each poll the percentage of people in favour of daylight saving has increased, and after this coming summer I guess that any poll will show that 90 per cent of the community favour it. An Australian National Opinion Poll conducted on July 5, 1973, showed that seven out of 10 people in South Australia favoured daylight saving. In country areas throughout Australia, there has been an increase of 4 per cent in the number of people approving of daylight saving. The New South Wales percentage in favour has been higher than the Australian average, and shows clearly that a referendum would vote in favour of daylight saving and would include country voters who, according to the Country Party, are most vocal in opposing it. The A.N.O.P. showed that two in every three people in the mainland States, except Queensand (which is normally barred from any reasonable approach to anything) favoured daylight saving. The figures showed that 79 per cent of the population in Victoria favoured daylight saving, 69 per cent in South Australia favoured it, and 51 per cent in Western Australia favoured it, but only 45 per cent in Queensland favoured it.

People in those States that have had the benefit of daylight saving are showing more and more support for it each year. In the Gallup poll to which I referred people were asked for what period they wanted daylight saving, and the response showed that a significant number of people believed that the period was not long enough. Rather than waste the money and time of the community in dealing with this subject in future, we should realise that most members of the community favour it and the vote in this House should show the mover of this motion that he is living in an area in which he is not in constant contact with the whole of the South Australian community. I think that all views he has expresed in the Chamber go to prove this. He referred to specific problems in the country areas, such as the problem associated with schools, but I do not think that it has ever been denied that inconvenience has been caused in some sections of the community. We recognised this early in the piece when daylight saving was introduced, and we requested that, in regard to those areas where there were problems

in getting the children to school at an early hour, people had the option of determining through their school council or committee a change in hours for those schools. In other words, they could have started an hour later and finished an hour later, which would have meant that they would have commenced and finished school at their normal times, irrespective of daylight saving.

The interesting point about this matter was that last year not one school in this State had taken the opportunity to make such an alteration to its school hours. If the problem was as serious as members have led us to believe, I think that some action would have been taken somewhere. In the light of what I have had to say, and repeating that a referendum on the question is completely unnecessary in view of the obvious public support for what I consider to be a most worthwhile community benefit, I suggest that the House defeat the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Minister must be some kind of seer to get up with such confidence and assert that anyone in touch with the community would realise that the overwhelming majority is in favour of daylight saving, because I do not believe that he can sustain his assertion. This Government's history in relation to referendums is not a very happy one. The Minister has suggested that a referendum on daylight saving would put the public to great inconvenience and cost but, if a referendum was held on the same day as polling day, the added cost and the inconvenience would be minimal, because the public must go to the polling booth anyhow, and to place a "Yes" or "No" in a box alongside a scrutineer is no great hardship. Likewise, as the staff is already available for the election, that would be no great expense.

The last experience we had of a referendum conducted by this Government was on the question of shopping hours, and that was a very sorry chapter in this Government's history. The member for Playford may smile, but he probably remembers more acutely than does the Minister the source of embarrassment that was to the people who lived in his neck of the woods and those who lived at Tea Tree Gully. The Government made a botch of that referendum, which was conducted at great expense to the public. The referendum asked an obscure question that no-one could understand, and it received an inconclusive result. I will refer to the Western Australian referendum, which, to some (certainly to the Minister), had a surprising result. In accordance with the provisions of the Daylight Saving Act, 1974, a referendum was held on March 8, 1975, on the following question:

Are you in favour of standard time in the State being advanced one hour from the last Sunday in October in each year until the first Sunday in March next following?

The results of the referendum were as follows: total number of votes cast in the affirmative, 250 644; total number of votes cast in the negative, 290 179; and total number of informal ballot-papers, 5 287.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Western Australia has some peculiar problems.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister referred to nation-wide support for daylight saving, and I freely confess that the Western Australian result was slightly surprising to me.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How much experience has Western Australia had of daylight saving?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps the Minister had better give us the benefit of his wide knowledge. There is not much he does not purport to know about most things that come before the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Can't you answer the question?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This is not a quiz show.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader must continue with the debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Sir, and I ask the Minister to refrain from interjecting, so that it will not be necessary for me to answer. Western Australians turned down daylight saving. For the Minister to get up with confidence and assert what he has asserted, is nonsense.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It was marginal, whereas here it is overwhelming.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Western Australian figures were not marginal.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That was a 46 per cent "Yes" vote in Western Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must stop this cross-questioning and cross-firing. I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to continue with the debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let the two Ministers sort themselves out on the figures. Many people in the community are not happy about daylight saving. I suggest that there are probably many parents, in particular, in the metropolitan area who are not enthusiastic about daylight saving when it comes to bedtime for some of their young children. I hear consistent complaints from parents that they cannot get their young children to bed at the appropriate hour, or out of bed at waking up time. If Government members have not received such complaints, they are probably not in tune with the little people about whom they talk so much. I have had representations from individuals and have received letters, one from a woman at Angaston, complaining about daylight saving. Last week, I received a letter from the Barossa Co-operative Dairymen Limited. I replied to the letter on October 9, soon after I received the letter, which states:

For some time now the question of daylight saving has been tossed around, with no definite answer received from our rural community. My committee requested me to send out a circular letter to our fellow members of our co-operative (a copy of questionnaire is enclosed). From the questionnaires returned, some 96 per cent of the members are against daylight saving, and I have been directed to request you to make our views known in the appropriate places, and act accordingly.

I hope that the Minister has time to listen to this kind of submission, but he still seems to be arguing with his fellow Minister on some point and not paying attention to what I am saying. The Minister is taking no notice at all, and does not even know that I am talking to him.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to continue with the debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is somewhat disheartening when the Minister decries anything that comes from the Opposition and when he pays no attention to a letter from a large organisation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to continue.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We have woken up the Minister, and I draw his attention to a letter from an organisation that sent out a circular which resulted in 96 per cent of those who were questioned saying that they were opposed to daylight saving. I hope that the Minister will take the time tomorrow to read the letter in *Hansard*. Perhaps I will pass it on to his office so that someone there can read it.

Mr. Arnold: He still won't read it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: At least an officer will read it. This co-operative is vitally concerned about the effects that daylight saving has on its members.

Mr. Russack: The new Minister might take notice of it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will send a copy to the new Minister, too. Individual dairymen have approached me frequently about the matter, as have parents, particularly mothers concerned about the effect on younger children, and it ill behoves the Minister to say we would be putting the public to much expense and inconvenience in conducting a referendum, particularly at the same time as a State election. For him to try to denigrate the Premier of New South Wales for taking this sensible action is completely churlish. If the Eastern States abandon daylight saving, I believe that South Australia will follow suit, despite what the Premier has said. I think he has gone on record as saying that we would do that.

Mr. Slater: Only because of the time factor.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know the reason. Despite all the Minister's assertions, I think we will find that, if the referendum is carried in N.S.W. and the Eastern States abandon daylight saving, we also will abandon it.

Mr. Whitten: What is Jo Bjelke doing this year?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He does what he thinks is appropriate. I support the motion on behalf of a large proportion of the people I represent, and I believe that I have expressed the point of view not only of people in country districts but also of housewives and mothers in the metropolitan area.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I add my support to the motion and agree basically with most of the points Opposition members have made. However, two facets have been completely overlooked in regard to the real reasons why daylight saving is being so bitterly opposed by members representing the western part of the State. I think we all appreciate that the time meridian by which Central Standard Time is set is near the eastern border of the State, and the remainder of the State lags by the appropriate time according to the distance involved. All that part of the State west of Spencer Gulf has been operating under daylight saving time ever since Central Standard Time was set and, when the extra hour is added, an additional burden is placed on us. The farther one goes across the State the greater are the difficulties encountered by all concerned.

The problem about schools has been raised, and I think all persons who have young schoolchildren who must travel long distances by school bus appreciate the difficulties involved there. Another facet is in regard to the grain silos and the extra financial difficulties under which daylight saving places grain producers because of the system. About 80 per cent of the time available for harvesting grain occurs after the silo has closed. Therefore, every grain producer, because of the Daylight Saving Act, is obliged to provide on his property considerably more storage facilities than he otherwise would require.

It may be said that he can sleep in next morning, but that is not so, because the silo is open then and he must empty the bins and get a turn-around. He works late at night according to the clock and rises earlier in the morning to deliver the grain, because the silos are open so much earlier, so the actual work effort required of a grain producer is two hours longer each day, considering the harvesting period and the delivery period next morning. In addition, he must have the extra storage facilities for the extra grain that he is obliged to store on his property. With storage rates at about $1 a bushel, a considerable expense is involved for him because someone has imposed daylight saving on him. In addition to the difficulties because the time meridian is on the eastern border of the State and because much of our producing areas are on the western side, we also have the expense involved and the gross inconvenience to schoolchildren, as well as all the other social aspects which seem to have overridden the practicalities of the whole situation.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the motion. We have heard much about democracy in recent weeks, and I thought the Minister would have jumped at the opportunity to put this to the test. I know that country people do not rate very highly in the Minister's opinion. We have been on the skids in recent weeks, and we will be on them more: at least the few who stay here will be. The only advantage will be that we will have more time to go on this rampage in the vast country districts scattered throughout South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The subject matter is the motion moved by the honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. RODDA: The people of Western Australia have had their say regarding daylight saving, and I think the Minister implied that they had not had a taste of it. Many people in my district and in the city have asked for a referendum, and the member for Eyre is giving the Minister the opportunity to spread his democratic wings and have the matter decided for all time. I have private views on what the result of a referendum would be, but it would satisfy everyone if the referendum was held. My colleagues have canvassed the pros and cons, and I remind the Minister that people in the farming profession, including me, find that the mid-day break is taken in the pleasant part of the day.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you missing *Blue Hills*?

Mr. RODDA: No. The time for *Blue Hills* advances with daylight saving. People do not miss that, but they are subjected to the heat after listening to it. When we secede to Victoria, we will be worse off, because a period of 1½ hours will be involved, and that is one thing not to look forward to.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you personally seceded to Victoria, you would improve the standard of both States.

Mr. RODDA: That is a nice threat, such as we are not unaccustomed to receiving from the Minister. I speak to the motion merely to support the initiative of the member for Eyre. This matter has plagued people for some time, and it should go to a referendum so that the people of this State can decide whether or not they want daylight saving.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): Many members opposite would say that I am biased towards this motion because it incorporates reference to a referendum. Perhaps there is some truth in that, so I will try to be as unbiased as I can in the few remarks I wish to make. I consider that the best speech that has ever been made on this topic was made by Mr. Carnie, the predecessor of the present member for Flinders. I say that with great respect, because it was a beautifully prepared speech and can be found in the 1972 volume of *Hansard*. When the matter of daylight saving was first introduced in South Australia, Mr. Carnie presented a sincere and well-researched contribution on behalf of his constituents.

He said that, just before Federation, New South Wales cunningly and trickily so aligned the meridian that it was right on the tip of the New South Wales and Queensland coastal alignment and, in effect, it gained for New South Wales the advantage of adjusting the meridian to the

greatest extent. Mr. Carnie went on to explain how, taking that meridian as a starting point, as one proceeded west across the continent people were progressively disadvantaged. I was surprised when the member for Victoria spoke to the motion, because I should have thought that, as understanding as members representing districts on the West Coast are, he would not have expressed that view. I was surprised that the member for Victoria would do that or even suggest it. I know he said jokingly that he might secede to the State of Victoria—

Mr. Vandepeer: Who said it was a joke?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRAE: Knowing the member for Victoria as I do, I know it was a joke. No doubt the member for Millicent will form his own view on that matter. I can well understand the attitude of members representing districts in the western part of this State when one bears in mind what Mr. Carnie said in his speech, a speech to which I pay considerable regard. However, I cannot understand why the member for Victoria, with due respect to him, expressed the view he did express. I now turn to some of the criticisms made about the Minister. I have to accept that I am somewhat biased against referendums, because of an unpleasant experience that I had. Nonetheless, let me say—

Dr. Eastick: Will you ever forget that night? Do you still have dreams about that night?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRAE: I am sorry that I cannot reply to the interjection, but other nightmares have supervened that one. The member for Kavel referred to Western Australian referendum figures. I accept those figures, and I believe the Minister accepts them, too, as being correct. The honourable member concluded (I hope I am not doing him an injustice) by saying that the Minister had in some way misled the House. That is not so. I took a note of what the Minister said. He said that one could pay regard to Gallup polls, not in the same way that one could to a referendum but as a trend. "Trend" was the word he used. I clearly remember his saying it. *Hansard* will reveal what he said, anyway. The figures given by the member for Kavel in relation to the Western Australian referendum were that 251 000 people voted "Yes" and that 290 000 people voted "No". According to one of my colleagues on the front bench, about 46 per cent voted "Yes". I accept that that is about right.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you good at mathematics?

Mr. McRAE: I do not hold myself out as a professional mathematician, but I try to keep up with my arithmetic. I accept that the Minister could be out in his calculation by about 5 per cent, but if that is the extent to which he was out it would not be terribly damaging and, if it was reflected into South Australia, it would not be damaging either. In relation to my own district, I have mixed feelings about daylight saving. As far as one can tell, the overwhelming consensus suggests that people are in favour of daylight saving. City and country members alike can gauge the feeling in their districts. We know we cannot always be correct, but we know when we are in trouble or when we are in favour in our districts. We can feel what people are thinking. I venture to say that about 80 per cent of the people in my district support daylight saving. My wife does not support it, because we have three young children. People with young children, at least in the metropolitan area, do not like daylight saving, because, for obvious reasons, children want to stay up and it is difficult to put them to bed when the sun is still shining and it is perhaps hot and uncomfortable.

The Minister accepts that certain sections of the population do not like daylight saving. My own household is a good example of that situation. Other people, however, with teenage or pre-teenage children find that daylight saving is a social delight, because the father can be a real father and can take advantage of daylight saving by taking his children to sporting or recreational activities that otherwise he would not have the opportunity to do. For the family, it is a two-way deal. I understand the position of farmers, especially those on the West Coast. Although I have not been a farmer, I can understand farmers' views on the matter. I can understand the arguments that from time to time have been put on their behalf.

Without being a prophet or a seer, it would be true to say that in South Australia probably about 80 per cent of the population supports daylight saving and that only two sections of the population do not support it. Those sections tend to be farmers and families with young children. The Leader of the Opposition might care to comment on what the member for Kavel said about daylight saving affecting the health of young children. I have not heard any reasons to suggest that it is harmful to young children. Perhaps it inconveniences them, but I do not think it affects their health.

The member for Kavel said that if the Eastern States removed daylight saving tomorrow South Australia would do the same. Of course South Australia would do the same. What an impossible situation would exist if South Australia was not on at least a reasonable time equation with New South Wales and Victoria. That is a fact of life. Whilst we have the advantage of daylight saving operating in all Eastern States except Queensland, it should remain. An overwhelming majority of people in South Australia would support that continuation. As for Gallup polls in the other States, they have been widely reported because people have been interested in them. The Minister has satisfied me on that aspect, and I have been satisfied about it in previous debates, too. My only comment on the Western Australian situation is that it is very curious that that is one State that has not experienced, to my knowledge, the benefits of daylight saving. In brief, and for those reasons (and hopefully in as unbiased a fashion as I can), I oppose the motion.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the motion because of the approaches made to me by many of my constituents. I consider that there are two reasons for opposition in the country. One is the type of work that is carried on mainly through the summer months in agriculture, and the second is the effect on young children and families. In the city, as the member for Playford has just said, daylight saving assists recreation. We must weigh the hardship caused country people because of their avocation and the type of work they do against the benefits regarding personal recreation or pleasure gained by the person in the city. I fully appreciate these two aspects, and I can understand why there is acceptance in the city and rejection in the country of daylight saving.

During daylight saving periods in the country, because of the work in which many people are involved, necessary meetings that normally would be timed to start at 8 p.m., say, are usually timed to start at 9 p.m. This means a late retirement for those attending the meetings, and they must rise early the next day. It does become a most tiring period for country people. That is why I support the motion, to test the situation. The other matter on which I should like to comment is that other States have been mentioned. I think the member for Playford said

that he would assess (he did not claim that his estimate would be absolutely accurate) that 80 per cent of the people would favour daylight saving.

Mr. McRae: In my district.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am sorry. I stand corrected. If this has been accepted by people generally not only in South Australia but also in other States, why is there continued discussion and almost unrest not only amongst country people? I am sure that many city people (mainly young mothers) are concerned, perhaps for personal reasons. Last week in Adelaide a city dweller (not an elderly person by any means) said that he would rather see normal time than daylight saving time. I asked him whether it was only his personal opinion or whether he knew of other people in the city of the same opinion, and he claimed that he knew many. I consider that, right throughout the State, city and country, there are those who accept it and others who reject it. The Minister of Mines and Energy suggested that in Western Australia the referendum was carried because they had not experienced daylight saving. I suggest that it might be a good idea to have a referendum so that, now that South Australia has experienced it, people could express their views and then this matter could be decided once and for all. I support the motion.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I thank my colleagues on this side for their support. I do not think much needs to be said in reply. I believe this is an important social issue, and the people ought to be given the right to express their opinions at a properly conducted poll in conjunction with a State election. It seems from the attitude of the Minister and his colleagues that they do not intend to allow the people of this State their democratic right. I sincerely hope there will be enough members opposite to support the motion so it can be put into effect and finish this controversy once and for all. I do not want to prejudge what the people's decision will be, but I believe they ought to be allowed to make it in a properly conducted poll. I therefore hope the House will support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn (teller), Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott and Broomhill (teller), Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of one for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

STANDING ORDERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That, in the opinion of this House, Standing Order No. 57 should be amended forthwith to restore to every member the right to move the adjournment of the House at any time.

(Continued from October 8. Page 1181.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): This motion is important, and this is perhaps an inappropriate time in which to discuss it. In order to give a proper background to this matter I should explain that I am now and was at all relevant times a member of the Standing Orders Committee and that the motion as it stands seeks to remove part of a package proposal that was introduced by the former Attorney-General and me in October, 1974, and then again in early February, 1975.

The proposal is well known to all members, and its embryo was founded on an idea put forward by the member for Davenport that there should be an opportunity for a grievance debate. At about that time the then Attorney-General (now Mr. Justice King) had visited the West German Federal Parliament and had been impressed with the way in which they could in an orderly manner conduct the business of the House. In a genuine attempt (it was perfectly genuine, contrary to what has been suggested in debate by the mover of this motion) to balance the conflicting forces of the wish of the Government to get on with governing and the right of the Opposition to question and probe the Government at all times, a package proposal that arose from those two concepts was put forward. I brought to the then Attorney-General the proposal of the member for Davenport, the Attorney-General had noticed what had occurred in West Germany, and one way and another the overall proposal was that there should be a system of conferences: that in order to avoid the ridiculous spectacle of Parliament attempting to deal with business in the early hours of the morning we should attempt to prepare a programme. I realise there have been difficulties in getting this system under way. Who is at fault I do not know, and I do not want to enter into that. I find it hard to believe that the system cannot work if members want to make it work. I think the point that was made by the member for Mitcham when he moved this motion arose from the fact that I happened to sleep through a division bell one night, much to my discomfort, but equally any member on this side could have fallen down the stairs and broken a leg or been trapped in the lift and not been able to get out, or be caught in any of a number of invidious situations. If all that the honourable member is seeking to do is regain the situation whereby, if, because of an accident or sickness, one member of the Government is not present, business can be taken out of the hands of the Government, that situation is odious.

Mr. Evans: He did mention 1968.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, I have researched this, and I will give him the fullest credit but I must say his contribution last week was nowhere near as good as was his contribution in February. Although I was in hospital then, I have read the report of his speech in *Hansard*. Last week one had the clear impression that the honourable member wanted to highlight the situation that could arise where a member could take the business out of the hands of the Government. He saw some merit in this, even though the only reason was that a Government member was sick or had suffered an accident. That appeared to be the basis for his reasoning, and, if it was, it was odious. I cannot support that line of reasoning at all. He referred back to the time when the Dunstan Administration in 1968 was forced out of office by an adjournment motion moved by the now Senator Steele Hall, seconded by his colleague. That is not a precedent: that is what I call a true vote of no confidence, because it is apparent that the then member for Ridley, later to become Mr. Speaker Stott, intended to vote for the Hall Government. In the light of that, it is obvious that if the Dunstan Administration insisted on coming in here without the numbers it was perfectly proper for the now Senator Hall and the member for Mitcham to do what they did, and they could do it now if that was the situation. There are four ways open at the moment by which the Opposition can bring the Government down, but to bring the Government down it seems to me to be reasonable that there be a situation where either someone has decided to cross the floor or some unexpected circumstance

that is not covered by the normal conventions has occurred. What other people do in relation to conventions of the Constitution is their business: what we do in South Australia is our business, and this Government has made clear that it will maintain the conventions of the Constitution.

I accept what the Premier says and what my Party states in relation to that matter. It would be a disgrace if they had not adopted that attitude, which it has shown by the High Court writ and the statements in the House today. Let us assume there is a proper cause to bring the Government down: four ways are open, apart from Standing Order 57, as follows: first, an amendment to the Address in Reply; secondly, an amendment to the Budget; thirdly, rejection of Supply; and fourthly, a straight motion of no confidence. By convention, a motion of no confidence is given precedence, and I concede that the member for Mitcham has a classic example in mind.

Since I have been a member I have never seen any member who wished to move a motion of no confidence have that opportunity rejected. What the member for Mitcham has postulated has to be faced. One way of interpreting Standing Order 57, if we disregard convention, would result in a ludicrous situation. Let us assume that one Government member became ill, and the Opposition refused a pair; or a Government member did not attend at a critical division. The member for Mitcham suggests that the vote would be 23 all and, if the Speaker had voted with the Government, what happens? Do we sit and stare at each other? If a Minister has moved the adjournment but cannot get the numbers, do we stay here *ad infinitum*? That is a valid point raised by the member for Mitcham, but there would be a simple answer, provided the conventions were maintained. All I am saying is said in the context of conventions, and shows how critical the situation is today. No matter who is breaking what convention, it shows how dangerous the present situation is. What would happen to the business of the House? It would not continue, and eventually the Premier would have to ask His Excellency to call a general election.

If conventions were flouted, money would finally run out, and we would not have today (at least I do not think so) a Sir Lavington Bonython who could pay the Public Service. I think in the 1930's he just managed to pay the police and teachers, but not everyone. I agree that we could build up a case in unusual circumstances, and say that if a Government behaves dishonourably and disgracefully it is conceivable that worse could follow. I do not believe that such a thing will happen in this State, particularly when we have the Government acting as it does, and when we have an adjournment motion (much to the credit of the Leader) standing as No. 3 on the Orders of the Day by which he agrees with conventions of the Constitution and, presumably, his Party is with him to a man. It could be legitimately argued by the Opposition that it was a package deal and that it agreed with the member for Playford's point that part of the package could not be removed without destroying the rest, but the Opposition could then argue that it had not had a fair go in relation to grievances.

I have tried to be fair and no doubt will be corrected if I am not accurate, but in my calculations (not including today) there have been 24 sitting days and of these there have been 10 days of grievance, with the number of speakers being equal. Of the remaining 14 days, three have been on Address in Reply, and it could not be denied that that debate is an open-slather grievance debate. Three days were spent on the Budget, but I deduct the guillotine evening by way of a further compromise. There were two evenings on which serious constitutional matters had to be discussed by the Government following its promises to the people: they were the electoral redistribution and first past the post voting. These matters were put to the people as a major platform of the Australian Labor Party. The situation is that, giving every reasonable consideration to this part of the question, it seems to me that the Opposition has forfeited in one way or another seven days. If it is said that the Budget debate was a rope around the Opposition's neck (and that has been suggested), we could say that it forfeited nine days. However, the Government could point to yesterday afternoon, when the time sequence agreed to was not adhered to. The Cigarettes (Labelling) Act Amendment Bill was to proceed, and I had been assured by the Minister in charge of it that it would go for about one hour, but the debate went on for 2½ hours. I am not an undemocratic person, and I think that the member for Gouger would agree with that remark, since he is and has been a member of the same Standing Orders Committee as I am and has been at all material times. He would agree that I have attempted to be democratic in what I have done and said on that committee. I have spoken what I have believed in the presence of my former Attorney-General and now the Premier, and I have been blunt, honest and to the point. Certainly, I have displayed a concern for democracy, but I cannot forbear but to point out that an event such as the one yesterday afternoon must unavoidably lead to the situation that arose last evening.

Mr. Mathwin: If the Minister thought that I was going to speak for five minutes on the cigarette labelling legislation he was wrong, because I had more to say than would take me only five minutes. It was a crook Bill; what did he expect of me?

Mr. McRAE: I said that the Minister was led to believe that the Bill would take about an hour. He knew that there would be three principle speakers from the Opposition and two from the Government and, based on that, there would have been plenty of time for a grievance debate to be held last evening. The fact of the matter is that, in summary, if this is merely a scheme or a dodge to catch the Government out in circumstances where an honourable member is sick or injured or has a reasonable excuse not to be present, it is hopeless. However, if it is an attack on something that could be self-defeating within Standing Orders, I accept that it has the validity and credence I have given it. I also point to the conventions, and I do not believe that the Government or Opposition would be likely to break the conventions, because it would be disgraceful if they did. That may happen in some other States or Parliaments (I will not get into that argument), but I do not believe that it would occur here.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you think you have as many crooks on your side as they have in Canberra?

Mr. McRAE: I think that that comment was most uncalled for in the light of the way in which I have been addressing my remarks to the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRAE: I have been purely dispassionate. That was the second point I wanted to make. The third point I make is that obviously in any Parliamentary system there will be friction between the Government and the Opposition. In any Parliamentary system there is a need to have a set of Standing Orders that will balance the respective duty of the Government to get on with the job and the duty and right of the Opposition to probe the Government at all times and bring its actions under scrutiny. That difficulty will always remain with us but, in the light of what is happening

in the country now, my final proposition is that, if members are not impressed by my earlier points, let us not give up trying, sinking down to the same garbage that any Parliament, Government or Party happens to be in at the moment, or may be in in future. Let us get to work again on the Standing Orders Committee and come up with a system that works. I believe in Parliamentary democracy and that, unless the conventions are maintained, this State and nation face the gravest of dangers. I, for one, am willing to continue ongoing work on the Standing Orders Committee in the light of my comments.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the motion because a fundamental right that has existed in this Parliament for a long time is that a private member has the right to move for the adjournment of the House. Although the member for Playford gave examples and said that he had a democratic approach on the Standing Orders Committee, unfortunately he has served on only one side of the House. One gains a different picture, when one has served on that committee, when one's Party has been both in Government and in Opposition. Let us look for a moment at the British House of Commons, which has over 600 members and in which there are no time limits on speeches. It was interesting that, when the British delegation was in Adelaide last week, its members were amazed to see the restrictions that applied in this House of so few members (such as the time limit on speeches), and the general oppression that exists in the House. They were amazed at the Standing Orders under which we are forced to operate in the House and the limited rights that private members have.

The picture can change dramatically regarding what is a democratic approach to members' rights, especially when a member has served on both sides of the House. Unfortunately, although I believe that the member for Playford has been genuine in what he has said, he has not had the experience of having been on both sides of the House and, therefore, cannot give a balanced view of the situation. He presented statistics on the grievance debates, which he said was a package deal in connection with the time table of the House.

Mr. Evans: And short replies by Ministers.

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes, but they have gone by the board. At times, we have few questions and replies because of the obvious filibustering of certain Ministers when replying to questions. This was not in the spirit of the package deal by any means. It is one thing to have a programme and effective management of the House, but such a scheme cuts both ways. The Opposition has obviously paid the price, because it has not had a fair deal. The member for Playford presented statistics (and I accept his figures) on the number of grievance debates so far this session. A grievance debate commencing at 10 p.m. is of little value to the Opposition but, if it were held between 5.30 p.m. and 6 p.m. each sitting day, it would be of far more value to the Opposition.

Mr. Keneally: How?

Mr. ARNOLD: The member for Stuart would be well aware that Opposition members do not have a vast number of press secretaries to assist them.

Mr. Keneally: Neither do back-benchers.

Mr. ARNOLD: The press is interested mainly in what goes on in the House between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. and during the time immediately following the dinner adjournment. The honourable member has said that Government back-benchers do not have press secretaries, but the Ministers certainly have them, and they are available and accessible to back-benchers. Government back-benchers would also have the advantage of being able to grieve between 5.30 p.m. and 6 p.m., and that would be a far more reasonable and effective time for Government back-benchers and particularly Opposition members. This was part of the package deal in providing a programme of management of the House whereby the business of the House could be proceeded with, so that we would know how far we would get by a given time. Unfortunately, that deal has broken down. The exercise has been one-sided, and once again the rights of the Opposition have been whittled away. Until the rights of private members are restored, any resemblance to a democratic approach such as has been outlined by the member for Playford will not exist in this Parliament, especially in this House. This is one of the most oppressive Houses so far as Standing Orders are concerned. I think the attitude of the United Kingdom Commonwealth Parliamentary Association delegation that was in Australia recently towards our Standing Orders is well worth noting.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the member and agree with the sentiments expressed by the member for Chaffey. My experience in this House has been limited to that of an Opposition member. The experience of the member for Playford has been limited to that of a Government member, and it would be difficult for him to understand our position when we have a Government that has been so keen and ruthless in limiting the freedoms of members on this side.

Mr. Keneally: What rights has the member for Playford that you haven't got?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the member for Stuart sees the role of a back-bencher in the Government as being precisely the same as that of an Opposition member, he had better read publications in the Parliamentary Library about the role of an Opposition. A major function of an Opposition is to question what the Government is doing. The whole Parliamentary system is based on the premise that the Government introduces legislation with the support of its back-benchers, and one of the most important roles of the Opposition is to question the Government by debate, questions at Question Time, grievance debate, and so on. Obviously, that is not a function of Government and, if the member for Stuart cannot realise that, he has not the perspicacity that I think he has.

Mr. Keneally: You completely misrepresented my interjection, and you know very well what I said.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition has been impaired and impeded in its attempts to question the Government's activities. One feature of the term of office of the former Attorney-General, now Mr. Justice King, was that, when he decided to implement something, come hell or high water, and logical argument notwithstanding, he would see that it was implemented. These changes in Standing Orders came about as a result of a proposal by the member for Davenport that we have grievance debates. The Government seized on this: it gave an inch and took a mile. The Opposition believes that, if there was the same position as in some other Houses of Parliament where there was opportunity for grievance debates, the good government of this State would be enhanced.

We can imagine the mental processes through which Mr. Justice King went in conceiving these changes, introducing them, and bulldozing them through. Since I have been a member, Question Time has been reduced by half, or more. There has been a progressive reduction in the speaking time allowed to members, and now we have the latest sweeping changes. The price paid for this grievance

debate was high. It was supposed to provide for the more orderly conduct of business and I will refer to part of what the then Hon. L. J. King said when he introduced the changes in this House on February 19, 1975. That is recorded at page 2455 of 1975 *Hansard*, as follows:

The question of the allocation of time between various items of business is a matter on which the views of the Opposition should be primarily concerned. It is not the only factor, but it should be the primary factor, because the Opposition is able to judge better than others what aspects of intended Government legislation are likely to be controversial and what are likely to require extensive debate.

In that way it is hoped that at a weekly conference a time table can be prepared that will be satisfactory to both Parties, will enable business to be completed with adequate time allocated for proper debate, and will also enable the House to rise by 10 o'clock on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings and by 5.30 on Thursday afternoons, with the grievance debate consequently taking place. This is a situation in which the good sense and co-operation of both sides can enable the business of the House to be completed in the time available and the case for and against legislation to be presented in the best and most concise way. It certainly involves the assumption of a greater degree of responsibility on the part of the Government and Opposition in nominating speakers to represent the various Parties' points of view in relation to matters before the House, and that fact alone will give members the chance to consider what they propose to say and, hopefully, say it in a somewhat more concise and lucid way than we have experienced in the past.

I do not accept even that argument. The points made in the former part of that statement have been completely broken down. I do not accept that that is a statement of the way in which this House should function. Those constraints should not be imposed on members. If members want to say something on behalf of their electors, they should have the right to say it, regardless of whether other members of the Government or of the Opposition or members of the public find it boring. Therefore, I do not agree with the latter part of the then Attorney's statement.

The former part deals with discussions that were supposed to take place about the programme of the House. I do not intend to refer to this with heat, because when I raised this matter in the House previously I incurred the displeasure of the Deputy Premier. I have referred to how it was to operate, but it is not operating in that way. Yesterday, the debate on the Cigarettes (Labelling) Act Amendment Bill extended for longer than had been expected and the grievance debate was not held, but to my knowledge there was really no discussion about how the programme would proceed yesterday.

I remind the House (again without heat, because, if I get declamatory about things, I am accused of getting personal) that there has been no rational discussion about the programme for this week in the way that the matter to which I have referred in the then Attorney's speech was used to justify the changes that he introduced. These changes have worked all in favour of the Government and entirely against the best and proper interests of the Opposition Parties and the people they represent.

Mr. Keneally: Will you give an undertaking that, if you are elected to Government, you will completely reverse the position?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think it would only be fair if we gave the present Government time to realise that we were not speaking unfairly. There is an old saying that a wise man learns from another's experience and a fool from his own. In these circumstances, the only way the Government could learn would be for it to serve under these Standing Orders for a period. This would be a salutary lesson for people who tend to be as verbose as the Minister of Mines and Energy. As I have said, I will keep the tenor of this argument at a low key, because I want the Government to realise that we believe that these changes have been most detrimental to the proper functioning of the Opposition.

This House does not have many members, and the Government seems loath to increase the number, which has been static for some years now. Therefore, there does not seem to be any reason for this constraint to continue. If one looks at Standing Order 57, one sees how restrictive it is. Talk about rule by the Executive! The Minister is the only one who can decide to adjourn or extend the sittings of the House, and this can be done without debate. One can see how restrictive this Standing Order is on all members, except members of the Executive, who are in complete control. Talk about the rights of back-benchers! Obviously, the Government is not interested in the matter, but the Executive has absolute discretion. It decides whether we will have an adjournment debate, whether we will sit late, and whether debates will be guillotined. The Government front bench decides what happens in this place, and this is not conducive to good government.

All the points have already been made by Opposition members. I certainly support the motion. It was a tragic day when the changes to Standing Orders were bulldozed (and that is the only word for it) through the House. I do not believe they are working even as the Hon. L. J. King contemplated they would work. Certainly, they are working against the interests of the Opposition. I believe every fair-minded member of this House will support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The weakness in the argument put by the member for Kavel is that members of his Party have abused the rights that all members of this House have, and there is no doubt whatever that members of the Liberal Party have on occasions gone on and on, ploughing the same furrow *ad nauseam*. We had an example of that last week in the debate on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill. The Liberal Movement has had to go through all those speeches carefully to try to work out just where the Liberal Party stands. So, in the last few days we have had an experience of this. We have all noticed how member after member got up and said exactly the same thing again and again. This greatly weakens the otherwise legitimate case put by the member for Chaffey and whoever else spoke. If one abuses one's rights, one runs the risk of losing those rights, and that is what has given the Government the excuse to do what it has done.

Having said that, I will even the record by saying that it is notorious in Australian Parliaments for a Labor Party, when it assumes office, to put the squeeze on the Opposition. This has happened not only in South Australia but also in other State Parliaments. I can well remember, some time not long after 1957, talking to a former member of the Queensland Parliament. He had been a Labor Party man who had gone to the Democratic Labor Party. I should say that in fairness, although it does not affect one iota what I am going to say. He lost his seat in 1957 in the split in Queensland, along with most of his colleagues. He saw how a Country Party and Liberal Party Government, when it came to office in Queensland, treated the Opposition, which was by then the Labor Party, so much more generously than the Labor Party had treated the other Parties when the positions had been reversed. I have never forgotten his remarks: that the Country Party and Liberal Government in Queensland had been so much more generous to the Labor Party when it was in Opposition than the Labor Party had been to it in the reverse situation.

It is universally true, in my knowledge of other Parliaments and of this one. There is no doubt that since 1970 we on this side of the House have had the squeeze put on us. It is because of that that I have protested and aimed my protest at this specific matter, because this is one of the weakest of the weak points that have been made.

The member for Stuart, by interjection, asked the member for Chaffey what rights the member for Chaffey lacked that the member for Playford had. Of course, that was not the way to put the question. The appropriate and significant way would have been to ask whether the member for Chaffey was satisfied with the rights that he and the member for Playford enjoyed in common. The answer is that members on this side of the House are not satisfied. However, Government members are satisfied to let the Government get on with its job and not worry too much about their position in the House, because they know that they can go much more easily to Ministers and get what they want privately than can Opposition members.

It is only right that I should say that the member for Playford is perhaps the least compliant of Government back-benchers. He shows (if I may say so with respect to other back-benchers) far more individuality than any other back-bencher on the Government benches, and I venture to say that he has paid the penalty for it. I respect him for that. So, to that extent, I think the member for Playford probably chafes more than anyone else on the Government side at the restrictions that are placed on private members. However, the proper way to put the question that the member for Stuart asked by interjection would have been to ask whether members on either or each side were satisfied with the rights that they have.

Let me now refer to the member for Playford, because he was the only opponent of the motion. Unfortunately (and I apologise to him), I did not hear all of his speech. However, he has been kind enough to do what I knew he would do if I asked him: he has told me of the three points he put. I understand that the first point he made was that he agreed with the motion from a technical point of view. He tells me he then went on to say that there was no reason to expect that Parties in this Parliament would not stick to the conventions of Parliament and do the right thing if they got to the deadlock position that I outlined could happen under this Standing Order. I think that is really a debating argument, rather than anything else, because we do not know what will happen in future in this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy resume his seat. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The time will come when members who are now in the House will no longer be here, and we cannot speak for our successors. In fact, we cannot always speak for ourselves, because in the heat of the moment we sometimes do things that are unexpected. The point, therefore, is really only a debating point. The member for Playford's third point is that, if the moving of the adjournment of the House were merely a trick or scheme to defeat the Government when a member was absent or because he did not hear the bells, as I understand happened to a member this afternoon, it would be odious.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You didn't hear them, either.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: True. The irony is that I might not have voted in a manner in which I was expected to vote.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: However, that is by the way. Maybe it would be odious, but I remind the member for Playford that this device was used properly on one occasion to bring down a Government: it was a perfectly proper and convenient way to do it. That device cannot now be used. That is the complete answer to the third point raised by the honourable member. Having answered the points made by the member for Playford (the only points made against the motion) I am satisfied that, although we are likely to lose the vote on this matter, the merits of the motion are undoubted and cannot be challenged. I will not cease trying to get a change in this practice, and I will go further than the member for Kavel is willing to go. Whichever side of the House I am on (and I am one of the few members who has moved from side to side, and I expect that to continue for some time), I respect the rights of the Party in Opposition, and I will do my best, however hard the temptation once in Government not to give an inch to the other crowd, to have the practice reversed, because I think it is wrong. It is wrong when I am in Opposition, it is wrong when I am in Government. I hope the member for Stuart, if he survives the redistribution, will be at liberty to remind me of my statement.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae (teller), Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.*]

CIGARETTES (LABELLING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment): I move:

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

I do not think there is any need for me to canvass again the reasons for my attitude.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Boundy, Broomhill, Goldsworthy, Keneally, and Simmons.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room on October 16, at 9.30 a.m.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference on the Bill to be held during the adjournment of the House and that the managers report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTIONS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 926.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the Bill for the following four main reasons: first, it will destroy the independence of the Upper House; secondly, it will very much tend to make the Upper House a rubber stamp of the Lower House; thirdly, the Opposition has a mandate generally from the people of South Australia through a referendum taken some months ago to oppose this Bill; and, fourthly, there is no precedent in Australia for any Upper House to have to adhere to a provision similar to that proposed in this Bill. It virtually provides that an Upper House shall be taken in and out of office at the whim of the Government in the Lower House. So, if the Government wishes to have an election annually, it will take out half of the members of the Upper House with it annually. This is totally opposed to the whole principle of having a House of Review.

If this Bill is passed, the traditional independent powers and voice of the Upper House will be lost, and the checks and balances provided by the Upper House will be destroyed. Without an independent Upper House, democracy will be the sufferer. There is no doubt that an Upper House and a bicameral system are absolutely essential for the true working of democracy. When we bear in mind the tragic set of circumstances occurring in Australia at present, we see that an Upper House has a very real role to perform. Difficult though it may be to reconcile its duties and the good of the people, there are times when circumstances are such that an Upper House must fulfil its duty; that is exactly what is going on now. Upper Houses are essential for democracy.

We might consider introducing a system like that operating in the Senate and in Victoria and Western Australia, where there is a fixed term of office, unlike the minimum term that we have in South Australia today. In other words, once the Upper House members in those places have served for their term of office, there must be an election, regardless of whether or not there is a Lower House election at the same time. The provision in South Australia is that members must serve for a minimum of six years, and they will come to an election at the next possible House of Assembly election. Normally, this provision works well, and there is not very much discrepancy, but, because the Premier saw fit from Canberra (I believe in a fit of pique) to call an election over the railway issue —

Mr. Becker: Did he consult his colleagues back here?

Dr. TONKIN: I am sure he did not. Because he called an early election, half of the number of members of the Upper House may be in office for a good deal longer than six years. This presents a barrier to the Premier's aspiration to take control of the Upper House, a control that I strongly doubt he could take even if an election were held for the Upper House after the normal time of six years. This Government is becoming (as I have said many times before in the House) a tired, lazy, arrogant Government devoid of initiative, a Government which the Premier himself says has come to the end of its legislative programme.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He has never said any such thing.

Dr. TONKIN: I am tremendously impressed by the loyalty of the junior Minister, and that is what I would expect from him.

Mr. Langley: It was eight months off and four months on with Sir Thomas Playford.

Dr. TONKIN: Then all I can say is that the Premier is doing his best, as in other matters and in his whole legislative programme, to emulate the Playford Government. The proposal we are considering now is totally and absolutely unsatisfactory. It will not do; therefore, we oppose it. It is possible for Upper Houses in the Senate and in the Victorian and Western Australian Parliaments to have a day separate from the corresponding Lower House election day. In the Senate, there are 60 members now, but we understand that, as a result of a decision made in the High Court with the help of the former Senator Murphy resulting in four votes to three, there will be 64 members in the Senate, and they have a fixed term of six years, with half the Senate contesting an election every three years in normal circumstances. Although that election may be called at any time, those members do not take their seats until the due date, which is July 1. I am sure that I am not telling the Premier or his Deputy anything they do not know in saying that an early Senate election would result in the election of new members for the territories who would take their seats immediately. I am sure that they are well aware of that fact, and I am convinced that that is the reason for their rather shabby political ploy of using the High Court writ issued, I understand, on October 9 and not announced until today. Victoria has 44 members in the Upper House, elected from 22 electoral provinces. That contrasts sharply with our own situation in which the electorate comprises the entire State, and we use a system of proportional representation.

I believe that our system is far superior and much better. The term of office for the Victorian Upper House member is again six years, with half of the number of members of the Upper House coming up for election every three years. The other three States are not strictly comparable with the South Australian situation. New South Wales has an Upper House of 60 members that is elected by the members of both Houses, and their term of office is 12 years. I think that that system is probably (at the risk of being critical of my interstate friends) not entirely satisfactory. Fifteen members are elected every three years. Tasmania does not have general elections for the Upper House, but has 19 single districts, with each member having a term of office of six years. Elections are held every year once a year for three members, and every sixth year for four members. That is an interesting system, because it provides for a by-election atmosphere every year when three members are to be elected to the Upper House. I think that it has something to commend it, and perhaps the Premier ought to investigate that system, which would certainly be preferable to the one we are being asked to consider this evening. Queensland, to its shame and, I understand, its regret now, does not have an Upper House.

Mr. Millhouse: To its regret! It hasn't done anything to replace it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: That shows how much out of touch the member for Mitcham is.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, no, it doesn't. I've discussed it with Ministers of the Queensland Government, and they said that they find it hard enough to get their legislation through one House, let alone try to get it through another one.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is interjecting unnecessarily.

Dr. TONKIN: There are members in the Queensland Parliament now who are seriously looking into the whole situation of reviving the Upper House.

Mr. Millhouse: They've had 18 years in which to do it.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Mitcham shows a surprising lack of courtesy, charity and thought, as I pointed out earlier today. I suggest, with every respect, that he should get up and make his own speech.

Mr. Millhouse: As soon as you sit down and I can get the call, I will.

Dr. TONKIN: Out of his own mouth, it came. One becomes used to almost anything in this place.

Mr. Olson: We'll never get used to you, mate.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased that the member for Semaphore was referring to the member for Mitcham and not to me. The system to which I referred earlier, the Tasmanian system, with a yearly election of three members, could possibly get over the Government's stated objections to the present system we have here. Perhaps that system ought to be examined, but I cannot see any real advantage in the Government's legislation at present which would mean that the Upper House would come out every year, if it were the Premier's desire to pull out the Lower Honse with it. I do not believe that that is exactly what the Upper House is for. I turn again to my specific objections to the Bill. We must look first at what is the function of an Upper House, and I refer, as I have done before, to J. R. Odgers *Australian Senate Practice,* fourth edition, which provides the answer in simple terms. On page 13, he says:

The accepted theory of Upper Houses is that they exist to apply the brakes to hasty legislation, to introduce a period of pause for second thought, and to improve proposed legislation if the need be shown. That two sieves must be better than one is an indisputable truth.

We have only to cast our minds back to a period, of which I am sure the Government is not proud, when legislation to control road transport in this State was introduced in the House at a late hour and pushed through in a short time and given short shrift, and to look at the role the Upper House played then in providing that necessary check. There are many reasons why we should have a two-House system. Most people in South Australia will admit that what Odgers says is true of the South Australian Upper House, and I can give many more examples. I recall the Emergency Powers Bill and the Privacy Bill, although the Premier may not necessarily agree in relation to the latter. On page 15 of the book, Odgers says:

The constitutional provision for fixed six-year terms of Senators is of much importance.

Here we have a minimum of a six-year term. The book continues:

Members of the House of Representatives have three-year terms, which may be shortened by an early dissolution of the House brought about by a Government's defeat on the floor of the House or by other political circumstance. The Senate, however, can only be dissolved in the event of a double dissolution following a legislative deadlock between the two Houses and, even then, only in strict accord with section 57 of the Constitution. Thus fixed six-year terms give the Senate a special quality of continuity which is the great strength underlying its independence.

Odgers again on page 44 discusses virtually the exact situation we are considering now, and says:

It has been suggested that, while retaining the system of rotation of Senators, the Constitution should be amended so as to tie Senate elections, and the date of commencement of terms of service of Senators to the date of House of Representatives elections.

The provision for six-year terms for Senators would be omitted and instead provision made that senators hold their places until the expiry or dissolution of the second House of Representatives, after their election. In relation to this proposal, it must be remembered that six-year terms for senators were designed to give them greater independence in dealing with proposed legislation, so assisting the Senate as a House of Review. That quality of independence would disappear if senators, through no fault of their own, could have their terms shortened by any penal dissolution of the House of Representatives, such as occurred in 1929, seven months after the first meeting of that House. Lacking independence, the Senate would live in the shadow of the House of Representatives and fast lose its character as an independent House of Review.

That is the situation that would apply if this legislation went through now. The Upper House must partly reflect the will of the people as expressed at the most recent general election, but it must not reflect only that will: it must have some continuity so that it does not become a mirror image of the Lower House, and it must retain an independence and ability to deal with and review legislation devoid of the pressures that might otherwise arise. If it is to be a true House of Review, that is the only situation in which it can flourish.

I am sure it will be argued that it has lost its role as a House of Review and has become more patently a political House. If it has, I do not believe that that is any reason for changing the present system. Professor Sawer, who is, I understand, one of Australia's foremost constitutional lawyers, made the same point in 1950, when he made a submission to a Senate Select Committee.

Mr. Millhouse: He signed that letter the other day, too.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, indeed. In 1950, Professor Sawer made a submission to the Commonwealth Parliament Senate Select Committee on the double deadlocks Bill. He told the committee:

There is no point in having a House of Review unless you have some degree of difference between the points of view of the Houses, and you get that more with the staggered system of election.

The Select Committee completely agreed with him. The report of the committee states:

With the staggered system of elections, there is reflected in the Senate a different electoral flavour, which not only assists the Senate as a House of Review but also provides a necessary balance against a temporary landslide in the House of Representatives.

I suppose that is one way to look at it. I have not foreseen a total landslide at the next House of Assembly election here. The result will be close, but perhaps the Premier ought to look at the safeguard that the Legislative Council may provide for him in the event of that landslide occurring towards us. It is important that the Parliament consider also that only 17 months ago the people of South Australia voted overwhelmingly to defeat a similar proposal as is outlined in this Bill, namely, a proposal for the Commonwealth Parliament, dealt with at a referendum.

I do not believe that this State Government can claim in any way to have a mandate for bringing about the result that will be achieved if we pass this legislation. The Commonwealth legislation, dealt with in May, 1974,

was a Bill for an Act to alter the Constitution so as to ensure that Senate elections were held at the same time as House of Representatives elections, and the "Yes" case was based on three main premises. The first was to avoid having so many elections (that is the obvious one); the second was to save money by not having unnecessary elections; and the third was that Parliament should reflect the will of the people as expressed at the most recent general election. I am sure that the Premier will put all those arguments again, but the people of South Australia resoundingly defeated those proposals. The vote in favour was about 332 000 and the vote against was nearly 373 000.

Mr. Jennings: They knew nothing about it. If you're in doubt you say "No".

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear the member for Ross Smith put forth that hypothesis and belief. It is a statement of belief worthy of him, and I invite him to say so now, because he obviously knows nothing about the Bill, so I look forward to his crossing the floor and voting against it. The people of South Australia at that referendum quite rightly rejected the "Yes" case and accepted the "No" case. That referendum referred to the Senate. In this case we are dealing with the Upper House, but the idea is still entirely transmissible to the Upper House in this State, ensuring that it retain its independence and not become a rubber stamp of the Lower House. To put it quite simply, the people of South Australia do not want this proposal. They are satisfied with the situation as it is, and I would say that where the Labor Party had total control of the Upper House, the Liberal Party had total control, or, as is the case at present, the Liberal Movement had total control of it.

Mr. Millhouse: You sound as though you want my support for something.

Dr. TONKIN: I would have to think about that, but I am grateful to the honourable member for his offer.

Mr. Millhouse: I am not sure that I gave an offer.

Dr. TONKIN: One thing that has been said about the Premier is that he has been a fine Premier, the businessman's friend. I think I have referred to the businessman's friend previously in this House. The Premier topped the poll in the W. D. Scott survey. What a wonderful fellow! However, the reputation that this Government has built up over the years in which it has been in office has been built up very much because of the activities of the Legislative Council.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: It ill behoves the Premier to laugh at such a suggestion. One thing that has happened is that, wherever anything very radical has been introduced in legislation and has been passed by this House, if mistakes have been made in it that would adversely affect the community and they have been pushed through this House, they have been tidied up in another place. Amendments have been made that have sometimes taken the socialist sting out of some aspects of the legislation.

The Legislative Council has corrected errors that would have disadvantaged the people of South Australia, and, by the time the legislation comes back here and is approved, goes on the Statute Book and gets out to the community, it is not bad legislation, and everyone says what a wonderful fellow the Premier is and what a wonderful Government this is, because the legislation is not nearly as bad as the people thought it would be. The Premier has much for which to thank the Legislative Council. In another place, his legislation is whipped into shape so that it appeals to many people in South Australia, and he should be well aware of that and should look carefully before tampering with what has been for him a tremendous advantage.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The honourable member's comic image never ceases to delight me.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased that I delight the Premier.

Mr. Mathwin: When the Premier gets up, we will have to dance.

Dr. TONKIN: Verbally only. I repeat that I do not care for this legislation. I know perfectly well what the Premier intends, and he knows that I know that. I do not think he makes any secret of his intention. He wants to have an election as soon as he can on the new boundaries—as soon as the electoral commission presents its report and the redistribution is effected. He does not like the uncomfortable situation that he is in. He will have an election as soon as he can, and it will suit him to take the Upper House out with him, even though the Upper House election is held before the time provided in the Constitution for the election. In so doing, I think he has some idea that he may win the Upper House. Then, he will not have any time for the Liberal Movement or the Liberal Party, because he will have total control.

I suggest (and I think that the member for Mitcham could well, in his heart, agree with me) that the Premier may be in for a bit of a surprise. I am sure he is. I urge him not to persist with this Bill. It will not be in the best interests of South Australia, and it will not help its future. It will certainly not help the future of the Labor Party in South Australia. I cannot accept that we can do without a Legislative Council, without a bicameral system. That system, throughout all the Westminster systems of Parliamentary democracy, is a vital and most important part of the whole system. This is an attempt to by-pass or subvert that bicameral system, and I will have no part of it. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Liberal Movement opposes this Bill, and probably there is no need for me to say more than that, because, whether the Premier wants to persist with this legislation (to use the Leader's expression) or not, it will not matter, as it will be defeated. I can tell the Premier that now; that is, if the Liberals stay firm in the Upper House, which is always a conundrum. However, I suppose the Premier is entitled to wonder whether that will happen after our recent experiences with that Party.

Mr. Mathwin: You're accustomed to jumping from one side to the other yourself, aren't you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Am I?

Mr. Mathwin: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg had better not offend me now, or I may do just that now, and the Bill will go through. Having stated, as I gravely do, the attitude of my Party to this Bill, I must say that I think, with all charity to him and despite his references to me in about the last half hour, that the Leader has rather overstated the case in opposition to the Bill.

Dr. Tonkin: I have learned a great deal from you, of course, over the years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the Leader did not show much of that in the speech he has just made. I oppose the Bill, because in my view there should be as much difference between the way in which the two Houses are elected as is possible within the bounds of Parliamentary democracy.

There is no question of either the present system or that which the Government proposes being more democratic than the other. They are both equally so. A good case could be made out for the present system, now that we have managed to make the Upper House satisfactorily democratic; at least it is becoming so. A good case could be made out for fixed terms of office of members of Upper Houses. It is traditional, and it means that they are not necessarily a mirror of the Lower House. On the other hand, a good case could be made out for saving the expense of an odd additional election sometimes and doing what this Bill suggests. So, there is no question, in my view, of a democratic principle being involved in this Bill. However, in my Party's view, there should be as much difference as there possibly can be between the two Houses.

This is in my view a trivial matter. The amendment proposed by the Government is not a great one. I can remember only one occasion in recent times on which the House of Assembly has come out for election and the Legislative Council has remained. That occurred in 1970, and I must admit that it went against my grain to see half (I think it was) the members of another place having eight years in office and being given, on a plate, an extra two years in office, simply because of what occurred in this place. However, that is in my view not much of a price to pay for maintaining this distinction between the two Houses, and it is on that ground that I oppose the Bill and that my colleagues, I expect, will oppose it, too.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I want to make clear that I believe firmly in the bicameral system of Parliament. Some members have heard me express that opinion before. Having said that, I must also say I believe that the Government is firmly opposed to the bicameral system. The Premier and others in this State have expressed that view vehemently in this Chamber. Indeed, I have even heard the Premier say it from both sides of the House, when his Party has been in Government and in Opposition.

Let us be frank about it: the Government wants eventually to abolish the Legislative Council. Indeed, that is a basic A.L.P. policy that we fully realise and understand: the abolition of all Upper Houses, either in the State or Commonwealth sphere. So, let us be under no illusion whatsoever regarding the Government's ultimate purpose. Of course, this is only one step along the way. This Bill, in its small way, will weaken the independence of the Legislative Council in this State. I say that irrespective of the composition of that Council.

We must realise, talking now, in October, 1975, that the Legislative Council is different from what it was only a few years ago, for instance, in 1970. We have had a change in the method of electing Legislative Council members. The make-up and composition of its individual members and Parties are different from those that obtained only five years ago, in 1970. The individual members of that place are different from those who were members of the Council in 1970. No-one can argue with that.

Mr. Max Brown: They know it up there, too.

Mr. COUMBE: So far, we seem to be on common ground. Of course, a common roll is now in operation, and the qualification for electors to vote for the Legislative Council is markedly different from what it was only a few years ago.

Mr. Jennings: In your day.

Mr. COUMBE: I am referring to the position that obtained in 1970 and comparing it with the present situation. The member for Ross Smith is famous for speaking in the past. I would like him to get out of that habit, because I am speaking of the present situation. The electorate system for the Council is now different from what it was previously: instead of five Districts (Southern, Midland, Northern, Central No. 1, and Central No. 2) each returning four members, all members now represent the whole State and operate somewhat like Senators in the Commonwealth sphere.

Also, the size of the Council has changed from 20 members (as it was almost from time immemorial) to 21 members now, and at the next normal election it will increase to 22 members. Those are some of the radical and drastic changes that have occurred in the Legislative Council since, say, 1970, and particularly since 1973. So, significant changes have occurred in that place in a short time. It is important that members take cognisance of this when they examine the Bill, which I believe is another step along the way to reducing the difference between the two Houses that exists now. I have said I am a firm believer in the bicameral system of Parliament. The Government is committeed to a course entirely opposite to that, because it wants to abolish the Legislative Council. In fact, the Labor Party wants to abolish all Upper Houses in Australia. To the student of political history, it is interesting to note that the bicameral system relies not only on the make-up of the membership of each House but also on the two Houses of Parliament being different in various aspects. If the Houses are a mirror image of each other, one becomes a rubber stamp of the other.

The effect of this Bill is to reduce drastically the difference to which I have referred. One of the features of the bicameral system is that each House must be different from the other, and such a difference should be provided in the term of office of the members in each House. What I am saying relates entirely to the normal terms of office of each House and does not take into account the effects of a double dissolution, as provided for in the Constitution Act. This measure will contribute towards each House of Parliament in South Australia becoming a mirror image of the other. In 1968 or 1969 a provision was inserted in the Constitution Act that required a referendum to be held before the Legislative Council could be abolished. Having seen both Houses in operation (and I am sure the member for Gouger, who has been a member of both Houses of this State Parliament, would readily echo my comments), I believe it is unusual for a member of the Legislative Council to leave that House and become a member of the House of Assembly. Usually it is the other way around. From time to time members have left the House of Assembly to attain greater heights or greater distinction in the Legislative Council, but the member for Gouger has added lustre to his career by coming to this House and joining us common folk. He is all the better for that and we welcome him here. If this measure is passed, one House will become a complete rubber stamp for the other and there will be little justification for the form of Westminster government that we have now.

Mr. Jennings: The powers in South Australia are different from what they are in Westminster.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member amazes me because, at Westminster (as you, Sir, know and will know even better next year), the Upper House is not elected.

Mr. Jennings: But the power of the Upper House is different from what it is here.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, but the House of Lords has many different features and has enormous powers.

Mr. Jennings: But there are things it can't do anything about.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member can do very little about anything anyway.

Mr. Max Brown: Tell us why the Upper House wasn't a rubber stamp in the Playford era!

Mr. COUMBE: To enlighten the member for Whyalla, I would point out that some of the biggest fights in this State occurred when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier and had to fight an Upper House that was composed principally of his own members. A good example was when Sir Thomas was trying to set up the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the Council opposed his legislation. In those days members of the Upper House regarded themselves as being independent of the Government. The majority Party that formed the opposition to that Bill was composed of members of what was then the Liberal and Country League. That is my reply to the honourable member, who came in on cue. That is not the only instance of Sir Thomas's being thwarted. I believe it occurred in the years 1960-70, too, but was not of the same magnitude; however, it did occur.

I have cited those examples to show the independence of the Upper House and how critically important it is to maintain two Houses in South Australia so that one House should not be a mirror image of the other. To preserve the bicameral system, we must preserve a substantial difference between the two Houses, not only in the method of election, the term of office, and the composition of the members of the House but also in its outlook. One of the most important features in that regard is the term of office of members. An example with which I do not personally agree of an Upper House being less democratic than the Legislative Council would be in Canada where it seems that some members are elected for life. One would not have to go as far afield as Canada to find examples of a kind of democracy that is different from what exists in the Legislative Council in this State.

I began my speech by saying that one premise that is important to preserve a bicameral system of Parliament and to make it work is that there must be a marked difference in outlook between the two Houses. One difference is a different term of office for members of the Legislative Council. If the House of Assembly runs its normal term of three years, half the members of the Legislative Council face the electors. This Bill provides that, if that does not occur, half the members of the Legislative Council will still face the electors whenever there is an election for the House of Assembly. The section in the Constitution Act that deals with double dissolutions makes no difference at all. If there was to be an election in the House of Assembly every 18 months or so, it would make a farce of the working of the Legislative Council.

The substance of this Bill is to bring the two Houses together by altering the term of office of the members of the Legislative Council. I have already dilated on the changes that have occurred in recent years, with the Legislative Council now being markedly different from what it was in 1973. If we are going to maintain the marked difference between the two Houses that is essential for the preservation of the bicameral system, we must vote against the Bill. When introducing this measure, the Premier indicated that its purpose was to ensure that half the members of the Legislative Council faced an election when the House of Assembly did not run its normal term. He makes the plea that separate elections for the Legislative Council are expensive, and that some Legislative Council members could go well over their normal six years, if an election for the House of Assembly was held before the normal time. In the interests of democracy, I think that that is a small price to pay, and I make that plain. Members of the Legislative Council eventually have to face the electors and meet their masters. Without going over everything I have already said, I reiterate that Opposition members believe in the bicameral system of Parliament and vehemently believe that the Bill will dilute that principle by eroding some of the principles of that bicameral system by cutting out one of the differences between the two Houses, namely, the fixed term of members of the Upper House. Having said that, I express my complete opposition to the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I join my colleagues on this side in opposing the Bill, which cuts out the principle of review, which is an essential ingredient of the Upper House. It does not have to hurry its decisions, but can take time to review legislation. We have only to recall the end of session legislation we see here that is rushed through and sent on to the other place. There have been marked alterations to legislation that would have been overlooked but for the Upper House. I believe that a member of the Legislative Council should be able to do his job without continually looking over his shoulder, and that would be the result of this Bill.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What about the nine years?

Mr. RODDA: I do not care about that. If Parliament is functioning correctly, they will not be there for nine years but, if members in the Lower House play up and we go to the country more often than we should, it might be a good thing if members of the Legislative Council are still members, because they are of substance and are experienced. This Bill cuts that out, and that is a bad feature of the Bill. Policy is made in the Lower House and Governments stand or fall by the policy made in this House, and to tack half of the Upper House on to—

Mr. Simmons: What about Canberra?

Mr. RODDA: That is a different argument from the one we have here. It is all very well for the Minister elect to make statements such as that. If the Government were behaving as is its counterpart in Canberra, the Minister elect would be man enough to say, "Let's have our medicine in one big gulp." We have seen many examples of considered opinion coming from the Upper House, and its record, despite what has been said over the years about its restricted franchise, is not something to be ashamed of. When a Minister, Mr. Justice King made headway with legislation, much of which was social legislation. By agreement in conference between the Houses, that legislation was finally accepted by both Houses, and this procedure has not hurt the State. I hope that, as a result of the different composition in the Upper House, as time progresses and the members become seasoned in their job we will see a review of legislation that will be good for the State.

It was apparent at the recent election that the people voted differently from the way they had voted before. I made that point the other evening when talking about the Liberal Movement, whose Legislative Council candidates secured more votes in the country areas than did the Assembly candidates, and this point was made by the member for Torrens earlier. For the benefit of the member for Goyder, in the seat of Victoria his Liberal Movement Assembly candidate had a good jingle and said, "For 10 long years you have had a lazy and void

representation, and you can alter that by doing certain things on July 12 and voting for someone called Hall and the Liberal Movement." I think that that candidate secured 796 votes while Mr. Martin Cameron had about 1 100 votes. There were people who were willing to vote differently for the Assembly than for the Upper House, so there is not necessarily a mirror vote. The point was made by the member for Torrens that we should not agree to the Bill, which is designed to provide that, each time a general election for the House of Assembly is held, an election for half of the members of the Legislative Council is held. I do not see why someone in the Upper House should not have an extended term, because for one or more reasons there has been an election in the Lower House. I cannot say that I like elections out of focus in the Lower House, either, because in the 10 years I have been here we have had five elections. Obviously, the biggest Party in the House is the "no-election" Party. It is noticeable that the new members of the Upper House (Mr. Foster, Mr. Dunford, Miss Levy, Mr. Blevins, Mr. Sumner, and Mr. Cornwall) are settling down to their job of reviewing legislation.

Mr. Keneally: What about Mr. Laidlaw?

Mr. RODDA: Yes. I am indebted to the honourable member, because I would not want to leave anyone out or to suggest that Mr. Laidlaw, because he comes from my side of politics, should be any different. We gain something from these members if they are doing their jobs correctly. There is no reason why we should take half the Legislative Council members to the country if for some reason we find ourselves going to the country.

Mr. Keneally: What if it's by their own hand?

Mr. RODDA: If it is, it is usually for a good reason.

Mr. Keneally: We go and they don't, yet it's by their own hand that the election is fought.

Mr. RODDA: That inherent fear seems to be in the Labor Party. If the honourable member and his Party are bringing down policies that are good for the people, that is something about which he need not be afraid. That is his philosophy and my philosophy.

Mr. Keneally: That's merely the Opposition's view.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: We could debate this point all night and not get an answer. We have had a stable Government from the bicameral system. I have discussed the matter with people from Queensland and I believe they regret very much that they have only a Lower House, and the same applies to New Zealand. They are both inherently rich areas in natural resources, and they have had many problems of development because of the quicker hammer of the Lower House and the lack of review by an Upper House. I hope that the day when South Australia has no Legislative Council never comes, but the big fear that the people on this side have is that this Bill may be a first step in that direction. It is the unanimous feeling of the Opposition that the Legislative Council should continue to live long and do good things similar to those that it has done in the past, and even do more illustrious things.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I oppose the Bill and support the comments made by the Leader, the member for Torrens, and other members on my side. I believe in the bicameral system of Parliament. Although I may not have had a prolonged experience in the Legislative Council, I have had experience in both Houses and can speak from that experience. Many of the things that I hear in this place about the Legislative Council amuse me. I had much respect for most of the members of the Government in that Legislative Council. Some of them are not there now, but some do remain. I had the greatest respect for them.

Mr. Keneally: Which ones?

Mr. RUSSACK: I will not mention names, because the other evening I did not mention a name but mentioned a man's office, and the member for Ross Smith reprimanded me, in the same way as he did when he claimed that I had been ignominiously defeated in my own town at an election. That was a challenge to me, and one main reason why I am in this House is that the member for Ross Smith challenged me. I have been elected to this House twice, and I speak as a person who has been elected to both Houses.

I raise my voice, because I am definite about my opinion of the bicameral system, and I go further to refer to the respect I have for those gentlemen in the Government in the Legislative Council. I am sure that, if members opposite examined deep down in the hearts of those members of the Legislative Council, they would find that those members had a different opinion of the Legislative Council from that which members of this House have. I am sure that those members of the Legislative Council, through their experience, have a different opinion about and outlook towards the Legislative Council from that of most members of this House. Statistics show that, in the Legislative Council in the past five years, more amendments made by that House have been accepted than have been rejected. Regarding Bills, I remember that in one year, which was about 1972, the Legislative Council dealt with about 137 Bills, and about 130 of them were passed, two were laid aside, and about five were rejected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is drifting from the matter under discussion. I think we are discussing something that is getting far removed from the Bill before the House.

Mr. RUSSACK: I will ultimately link my remarks to why we oppose this Bill. The type of amendment that was inserted by the Legislative Council was the type of amendment that the Leader of the Opposition spoke about when he said that most of the legislation was improved and was more palatable to the people when it came out of this Parliament. The Government talks about democracy, and a second Chamber gives the general public a democratic chance to know what is being discussed here and it gives those concerned and affected a chance to state their views before the legislation ultimately passes through the second House. If there were no second Chamber or no exercise of responsibility and a second look at legislation, Standing Orders of this House could be suspended and, overnight, a Bill could become an Act, ready for proclamation.

We also often hear from the Government that it has a mandate for everything in its policy speech, but I suggest that that is not so. It may be right theoretically, but it is not in practice. Because we have a bicameral system, the mandate and those points not acceptable to the people can be deciphered and the people can approach the Legislative Council. Those unacceptable parts of the policy can be either rejected or amended. Regarding the election as provided for in this Bill for members of the Legislative Council, I strongly believe that there should be a longer term of office for members of a House of Review than for members of what we call the popular House.

Mr. Keneally: This Bill won't affect that.

Mr. RUSSACK: Of course it will, and it could do so on many occasions. Even in the recent Parliament that lasted for two years, the terms could have been affected.

Mr. Keneally: The Legislative Council will still have a longer term than House of Assembly members.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must bring to the attention of all honourable members of this House that we are drifting away from the Bill, which deals with the coincidence of election. It has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of another House.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am speaking to the point of the Bill and the effect it would have on members of the Legislative Council and their tenure of office. With due respect, I believe that this point is what the Bill is all about. If members of the Legislative Council are elected as frequently as are members of this House, or more frequently than the six-year term, they would be involved in the political atmosphere. By having a longer term they are removed from the political emotion to which a member in the popular House is subject. I believe that that is necessary, because then they can carry out their function of reviewing legislation correctly. A longer term obviates the involvement with the political situation and allows a councillor to review matters in a considered way. Because of the points I have made, because I believe in the bicameral system, which I believe could be endangered if this Bill passes, because I believe it is democratic for the people to be able to approach members of Parliament before Bills finally become law, because I believe that members in another place should be removed from political emotionalism, and because this Bill would tend to create shorter terms of office for members in another place, I must oppose it.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I, too, oppose the Bill, because it merely makes the Legislative Council a rubber stamp of this place. Under the bicameral system of Government, it is desirable that elections for the Legislative Council and House of Assembly be as divorced from one another as possible. After all, if the Legislative Council is to be maintained as a House of Review, we should not have a system of elections parallel to that of this place. In other words, it should not be a rubber stamp of the House of Assembly. It has become obvious that a House of Review is absolutely necessary for the Parliamentary system as we know it.

The Government has demonstrated more than once that it is not capable initially of introducing legislation that is absolutely correct. This has happened many times. Repeatedly, amendments that the Government accepted have come from another place, the Government thereby acknowledging that it has passed through this House legislation that has not been as good as it could have been. Having accepted some Legislative Council amendments, the Government has acknowledged that it has erred in its presentation of Bills. By its actions, the Government has demonstrated the necessity for a means of review, be it by a House of Review, by public review, or by means of a time lapse in which the South Australian public can review the Government's actions. This has all been part of the role.

As has been stated, it is Labor Party policy to abolish the Legislative Council. I fear the consequences of this and believe, for the reasons to which I have just referred, that it would not be in the best interests of the people of South Australia if this was to happen. More pertinent, I believe it is necessary that the South Australian public should have an opportunity to accept and respond to legislation presented by the Government. It is feasible in a single-House system that legislation could be introduced one morning and, if necessary, put though that same evening. The public would not know a thing about it, and would ultimately ascertain, too late, that the Bill had become law, at which stage little could be done about it.

Mr. Keneally: I know of legislation that's passed both Houses in South Australia in one day.

Mr. BLACKER: That could be so, and that would prove more than anything else the necessity for having a House of Review. If legislation can get past both Houses—

Mr. Keneally: You were complaining about a one-House system.

Mr. BLACKER: This has happened many more times under a single-House system, and we must avoid this. The legislation that this Parliament presents to the public and under which the public must operate should be, as nearly as practicable, foolproof and acceptable to the community. However, one knows that under a single-House system this will not always be the case. Not once in the Premier's second reading explanation, which lasted for only three or four minutes, did he give a reason for introducing the Bill. He merely said that it would correct a couple of matters. He did not even say that it was intended to correct an anomaly. The Premier gave no reason to the House, in relation either to administration or to cost, why the Government had introduced the Bill.

Therefore, the whole exercise must be viewed with extreme suspicion, because, if the Government can give no reasons for the legislation, we must surely treat the whole matter as though there were ulterior motives behind its introduction as, indeed, I believe there have been. Who really asked for this legislation? I do not know, and the Premier has not told us. What are the Government's motives behind it? They are the real questions that we must ask.

Mr. Keneally: I think a Mr. Petch started it. The name doesn't mean much to me, but it may to you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BLACKER: The more one looks at this Bill, the more the Government's policy in relation to the abolition of the Upper House shows through the Bill. In order to discredit the principle of a House of Review, it is the Government's objective to parallel, as much as possible, the election of Legislative Council members with that of House of Assembly members. In other words, if we can have an election at the same time, we will be conditioning people to accept that one House is merely a rubber stamp of the other. This is yet another progression in the steps being taken to condition the public into accepting that, although it is claimed that each House has its legislative procedures, one House just follows the other.

It is said that it is really a matter of convenience to have elections for both Houses together and to ensure, as much as possible, a more orderly system of voting, and that this will result in a more concerted and better organised vote being presented by political Parties. It is much better to spend more money promoting a dual role election than it is to have two separate and independent elections. Consequently, if the same sum of money that would be spent on two elections was spent on one concerted effort, it could result in a better election from a Party-political point of view. Because the optional preference system has been proposed, additional pressure will be exerted on the Government to introduce the voluntary system of voting. That system will be resisted by the Government, because it cannot afford to hold elections for each House on separate days with voluntary voting. No doubt, this is an attempt by the Government to close its ranks in expectation of a possible change in the future.

I believe that the Bill has been introduced for three Party-political reasons, none of which has been outlined to the people or to this House. The Government has not said what are its intentions. We have merely had a Bill presented to us, of which a second reading explanation lasting only two or three minutes was given. We are now left in the dark, and no-one really knows what the position is. I will now state the three reasons. First, it is to enable the Government to call out the Legislative Council as soon as an election can be arranged: in other words, it is a procedural matter to bring out the Legislative Council as soon as it is possible to call a House of Assembly election, and would be to the Government's advantage. Secondly, House of Assembly elections would be paralleled to a Legislative Council election and would undermine the public's understanding of electoral procedures. In other words, it would make a rubber stamp of the Legislative Council and would lead to the abolition of that House. Thirdly, it has been introduced to cover the situation should a voluntary voting system be introduced. Under this system, the Labor Party could not afford a Legislative Council election to be held separately from an election for the House of Assembly. This is a move by the Government to cover its options in the distant future should voluntary voting ever be adopted in this State. I oppose the Bill because I believe it is a Party-political manoeuvre.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): This Bill sets out to amend sections 14 and 15 of the Constitution Act. From examining the measure, it is obvious that the Labor Party sees that political advantage can be gained from it. Another obvious reason for its introduction is that the Government has an inherent dislike for Upper Houses.

Mr. Chapman: It may suit them as being a place for retirement.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, or a place where it can get rid of members it would otherwise have to put up with in the House of Assembly. As one who believes in the bicameral system of Parliament, I cannot support this measure, because I believe the term of office for members of the Legislative Council should be as nearly as possible fixed so that members do not have to run the gauntlet of the whims of an arrogant Government. If one examines the operations of Upper Houses in other States in Australia, it is interesting to note that the South Australian Upper House does not have the inbuilt protection that certain other Upper Houses in Australia have got. The Constitution Act in Western Australia does not contain a double dissolution provision; the Upper House in Western Australia can reject a Supply Bill introduced by the Government. The Tasmania Upper House has a similar provision in its Constitution, but if the Government of the day is not satisfied with the operations of the Upper House it can create a situation whereby members of the Upper House can be forced to an election. I do not believe that this measure deserves support. The Government cannot justify this measure on sound or fair grounds, so I strongly oppose it.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I oppose the Bill. The reasons for its introduction are obvious, because the Australian Labor Party platform, under the heading "Constitutional and Electoral" in clause 1 (*b*), states:

. . . that a second Parliamentary Chamber in South Australia is unnecessary and wasteful of public funds.

The immediate aim should be:

The Legislative Council should be abolished after a favourable vote of citizens at an election at which abolition is an issue. Meanwhile, the Council should be reformed by (i) altering its powers to conform with those of the United Kingdom's House of Lords—that is quite different from the powers in this Bill—(ii) providing adult franchise in the voting for this House; and (iii) boundaries for the Legislative Council allocated on a basis of one vote one value subject to a reasonable tolerance.

As I have said, the main aim of the Bill is to abolish the Legislative Council. When one reads the Premier's second reading explanation one sees that that aim is obvious. All members of the Labor Party in this House will support the measure because, according to section 67 of their platform, they have signed a Parliamentary pledge and they must, whether they like it or not, support the measure. They will do that regardless of their personal feelings and the merits of the measure. They will vote as they were directed at a Party meeting that was held this morning. I, like other members on this side, believe that a bicameral system is the only proper system of Government. It gives people the right of appeal in another place and allows the Legislative Council to consider legislation introduced in this House: it acts as a House of Review. It has done a good job for this State and has helped the Premier on numerous occasions when he has been forced (as he was recently by a lurch to the far left)—

Mr. Keneally: Which members are you talking about?

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member knows which members I am referring to. Without the Legislative Council we could expect bad legislation to be introduced that would be to the Government's advantage. This Bill is a waste and is bad. Its final aim is to abolish the Upper House. I oppose the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As this is a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, and as it provides for an alteration to the constitution of Parliament, its second reading requires to be carried by an absolute majority. In accordance with Standing Orders, ring the bells.

The bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 296, I count the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I now put the question: "That this Bill be now read a second time." For the question say "Aye", against say "No". There being a dissentient voice, it will be necessary to divide the House. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with the powers conferred upon me by the Constitution Act, I concur in the second reading of this Bill. There being a majority of two for the Ayes, the Bill passes its second reading.

Second reading thus carried.

The SPEAKER: I declare the second reading to have been passed by the requisite absolute majority, and it may now be proceeded with.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

This Bill requires an absolute majority, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Ring the bells.

The bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 298, I count the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question: "That this Bill be now read a third time." For the question say "Aye", against "No". There being a dissentient voice, it will be necessary to divide the House.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

The SPEAKER. There are 23 Ayes and 23 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes.

Bill read a third time.

The SPEAKER: I declare the third reading to have been passed by the requisite absolute majority.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 16. Page 375.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): This Bill has more in it than appears from the outside cover: in fact, the use of the term "health" is somewhat confusing in the sense that many of the things referred to, although health matters, relate more specifically to certain matters of rural importance, such as the keeping of pigs, which is dealt with in clause 8, and also the new Part IXD, which deals with pest control and which introduces a totally new concept of pest control and the licensing of pest control from that which has existed previously. In dealing briefly with the Bill, I can say that the first seven clauses are machinery provisions relating to the appointment of persons to the Central Board of Health and to making alterations to the board's auditing provisions so that there is only one auditor and the audit is carried out only once every year. In the Minister's second reading explanation, he said that the Bill brought the Health Act into line with the Local Government Act. I presume that refers to having only one auditor, because, under the Health Act, the board carries out its audit in January, whereas the Local Government Act requires that auditing for local government be carried out in July.

Clauses 9 to 12 inclusive are only minor amendments introduced as a result of the change to metrication on the one hand and on the other hand to the change in the fee prescribed for a doctor from a fixed fee to a prescribed fee consequent on the passing of the Medibank legislation. Clause 13 provides an additional safeguard in the regulations relating to radioactive substances and irradiating apparatus. It is now made imperative that these materials be also covered under the regulations, whereas previously the regulation did not provide for the transport or importation of these materials.

Clause 8 repeals the existing section 88, relating to the keeping of pigs, and I think that that section provides that a person may not keep pigs within 15 metres of a dwelling, and provides little else. To establish a new concept on the keeping of pigs, power is given to local boards, by regulation, to provide for the inspection of piggeries, for the maximum number of pigs that may be kept in a building, for the siting of buildings, the storage of materials, the prevention and control of rats, mice, flies and other vermin, the sanitary disposal of liquid and solid wastes, the siting of effluent treatment lagoons, the destruction and disposal of dead pigs, and so on, including the preservation of public health and the prevention and suppression of offensive conditions caused by piggeries.

One wonders why, when this is related to piggeries, the offensive smells and other things arising from treatment works such as Bolivar are not included. However, we are dealing with piggeries only, not the disposal of human waste. My concern about the new section being inserted by clause 8 is that a Bill identical to this one was introduced on March 26. It lapsed as a result of the termination of the previous Parliament, and the matter has been brought forward again. The Bill before us is a regulatory one but, when one asks what may be the regulations relating to the keeping of pigs, one finds that there is no model regulation. In fact, no regulations have been prepared on this matter, so the Bill asks Parliament to accept a principle but it does not define what the practice will be.

I consider that there has been adequate time to prepare a regulation. The Bill has been canvassed amongst the people concerned since about November or December last year, yet we still have no regulations. My concern is that the new principles laid down under which local boards of health may regulate can have considerable impact on people who are keeping pigs and have a substantial investment in this business. We are giving power to lay down regulations which we will not see and which will be drawn up and possibly implemented while Parliament is in recess. Unless Parliament meets within a reasonable time, the regulations could be operating for up to five or six months before we have a chance to look at them or move for disallowance. However, I have an understanding, from discussions I have had with principal officers in the Central Board of Health, that any regulations the board desires to bring forward will be referred to the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, which will refer them to its pig section for report and comment. I should like the Minister's assurance that this will be done.

One objection that this group had was that the Bill provided that local boards might regulate. Local boards are precisely what the term means, and the pig section feared that independent local boards could draw up their local regulations. However, I have been given an undertaking and an assurance that, just as the Central Board of Health has said that regulations will be referred to the United Farmers and Graziers for comment, the board will be drawing up model regulations and it will be up to local boards whether they implement them in whole or in part. I repeat my objection to this sort of legislation. It is regulatory legislation that we are asked to accept in principle without being given any detail relating to the matters set down for which local boards of health may regulate. A code of practice for pig keeping has been drawn up.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I think there is a specification on which the regulations could be drawn up. Do you agree?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, there are seven points to which the regulations must relate, but it is like building a framework without saying what is inside it or like building a house without telling the people who must live in it what

the furniture will be. I am indebted to the United Farmers and Graziers for making available to me an interesting document on the code of practice for pig keeping. I have been told that this matter has been discussed by a committee, the two United Farmers and Graziers representatives on the committee being Mr. J. F. McAuliffe and Mrs. S. L. Dawkins. The document is comprehensive.

However, I am not sure whether the United Farmers and Graziers, whilst it had representatives on the committee, accepts the document as being a perfect model for the regulations. We are getting too much of this regulatory legislation that does not enable us to comment, other than in broad terms, and all the comments that I have been able to make on this matter are in broad terms. As a representative of the people who will be affected, I consider that some regulations could have been drawn up in the period of seven months since the earlier Bill was introduced, and those regulations could have shown how the department intended to carry out its regulatory powers.

Clause 14 introduces Part IXD on pest control, and I make the same comment that this is a comprehensive provision, introducing a new concept. Wide and sweeping powers are associated with the definitions provided, and I believe that much information could have been given to members to clarify matters that will be regulated for. The new regulations will prescribe the manner and form in which an application for a pest controller's licence is to be made, the fee to be paid for such a licence, and the conditions on which such a licence may be granted. Similar provisions are made regarding the application for a pest controller's certificate.

Although the Bill tells us what the penalties will be for infringements of the regulations, it does not say what it will cost pest controllers to obtain a licence or what it will cost their employees to obtain a pest control certificate. However, we know that any pest controller or his employee who uses, for fee or reward, any pesticide will, unless he is the holder of a pest controller's certificate granted to him under this section, be liable to a penalty of up to $100. What will such a man have to pay for his certificate? This is important. What are the terms and conditions that have been laid down? These matters are also important to those people who will find themselves affected by this clause.

The definitions of "pest controller" and "pesticide" are indeed wide and sweeping. "Pest controller" is defined as meaning any person who carries on the business of controlling or preventing (and I am paraphrasing the definition the growth or development of any living thing. If one is controlling or preventing the growth of any living thing, one will come within the terms of this sweeping definition. Also, if one is using a pesticide, in relation to which there is a wide and sweeping definition, one will come within the same dragnet provision. This embraces two new Acts, the Vertebrate Pests Act and legislation that will possibly become law after it has been dealt with, the Plant Pests Act. This means that anyone engaged in the control of plant pests or vertebrate pests will be obliged to conform to the provisions of this Act. That means, in turn, that it will embrace all councils, which are compelled under these Acts to carry out certain functions on behalf of the authority for fee or reward. It also affects seriously those landholders who may have to carry out work, particularly for a neighbour. If I was to carry out pest control work on my neighbour's property, and there was any thought of monetary reward, I would be infringing the Act, unless I held a pest controller's licence.

If there were rabbits on my neighbour's property that were causing me problems, as a result of which I went on to his property to poison them, I would be committing an offence, although I do not say that I would be prosecuted for it. If I were spraying my crops and my neighbour asked me to do his as well, I could not do so unless I had a pest controller's licence, because there could well be some consideration of reward. My neighbour would want to reward me in some way, so I could not possibly do the work for him.

I see a serious area of concern in the case of farmers who work in a syndicate. If one farmer is given the responsibility of doing this type of work on behalf of other syndicate members, he would undoubtedly have a credit shown against his name in the joint accounts and, if that happened, he would be deemed to have done the work for fee or reward. Consequently, unless some consideration is given to this form of operation, which is becoming increasingly common and which is being encouraged by the Government, people carrying out what is a perfectly normal function, with the responsibility that they have to their partners under such an arrangement, would be committing an offence if they sprayed on one of the other syndicate properties.

On the other hand, I have been able to establish (and I should like the Minister to confirm this) that, if Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is carrying out pest control work only as a part of its contractual function as a receiver of grain for the Wheat and Barley Boards, and not doing so for fee or reward, so long as its employees were concerned only with spraying weeds around silos and controlling weevils and pests in the grain, that firm would be exempt from the provisions of the Bill.

I have also discussed with the Minister of Health the question of Alf Hannaford and Company Limited, the contract seed graders and picklers. Its business is confined not solely to the State and this firm is, of course, caught up in this dragnet provision. It is a pest controller under this definition, and is using pesticides, even though it is accepted that those which are being used are not as harmful as would have been the mercuric compounds used previously. Also, this firm is using accepted standard products and not its own mixtures. In these circumstances, it has a case, particularly as it is a seasonal operation and it performs a vital function for the industry.

This firm has much difficulty getting operators at certain times, and it certainly would not be able to have a pool of certificated operators on hand. I think the Minister of Health has given a verbal assurance to the firm that it could be considered for exemption under new section 146x, pursuant to which the Governor may, by proclamation, exempt a person or a class of persons from compliance with the provisions of this Part of the Act.

The other area at which I have looked in this regard relates to a matter which was raised with me by Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. I refer to new section 146w, which relates to the possession, control, or use of any pesticide other than a prescribed pesticide. Under new subsection (2), no person shall use a prescribed pesticide otherwise than in the manner prescribed in relation to that pesticide. I am given to understand by the officers of the Central Board of Health that the prescribed pesticides will be those registered under the Agricultural Chemicals Act. So, there will be no conflict between the prescribed pesticides referred to in this section of the Health Act and those that are already prescribed under the Agricultural Chemicals Act. However, certain additional chemicals

that are used for fumigation will be added. I refer to chloropicrin and methyl bromide, which are pure chemicals that are added to the list.

There should, therefore, be no confusion regarding what are prescribed pesticides. Being commercial preparations, they will have a prescribed method of use. Much common sense applies in relation to this matter. I can understand that this Bill has probably been introduced as a result of the representations that have been made by firms such as Lawlors or Bonneys, which are becoming worried by fly-by-night operators who are undercutting their prices and who have used their own mixtures without prescribing what was in them and saying that they would kill white ants, or something else. It has thereafter been ascertained that water or some other innocuous compound has been used and that, as a result of their not being compelled to use prescribed pesticides, certain people have mixed up their own brew and taken the public for a ride.

I therefore believe there is probably good reason for introducing this sort of legislation to control this type of operator. I believe I have covered all the other types of activity that could be caught up in this dragnet, and those matters should be looked at in the other applications of this Bill. I support the Bill.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjounrment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I am especially concerned about the Emergency Fire Services, because of the tremendous dangers that I foresee confronting my district and surrounding districts in the coming summer months. It has been reported in many ways that we are facing extreme bush fire danger in many areas of the hills because of the growth of weeds and so on following heavy rainfalls. It is tragic that the plans for the proposed new headquarters for the South Australian Country Fire Services should have been brought to a halt by the Dunstan Government. The E.F.S. is a voluntary organisation and, as such, it is extremely important that we maintain and improve the high efficiency of that organisation. We are justly proud of that organisation, but its existing control centre, although it is modern, is small and accommodation is extremely cramped.

The organisation extends from the perimeter of the metropolitan area through all country districts, and is responsible for the prevention and control of fires in all areas outside the scheduled districts covered by the South Australian Fire Brigade. Since the inception of the Bush Fire Equipment Subsidy Fund, total expenditure on E.F.S. fire-fighting equipment using subsidised funds by councils and the E.F.S. has exceeded $2 304 800. People in my district and in other districts throughout South Australia are aware of the magnificent job that the dedicated volunteers of this organisation do. The headquarters of this organisation in its co-ordinating role in recent years has alerted and despatched two-thirds of the fire units under its control to calls for assistance to major fires in the Adelaide Hills.

The E.F.S. cannot possibly function effectively without professionally staffed headquarters, establishment and facilities. An inquiry that was set up to investigate the construction of a new headquarters was the result of concern expressed by interested bodies that were vitally concerned about protecting South Australian country areas. The purpose and function of a new headquarters would enable the integration of functions of the E.F.S., the Bush Fire Research Committee, and field staff, and provide accommodation and facilities for permanent staff officers, together with necessary administrative and maintenance staff and proposed additional staff and board members.

The headquarters of many other organisations in this State are well equipped and up to date. I refer, for example, to the Red Cross Society and the St. Johns Ambulance Brigade. The South Australian Cabinet accepted a recommendation in principle to establish a headquarters for the E.F.S. The Government had set up a working party to inquire into and report on all aspects of the proposed reorganisation of country fire services in South Australia. The strong recommendation of that working party was that the erection of a new headquarters should be proceeded with immediately. The working party was set up by the Government in 1971 and presented its report in 1972. That report is still comprehensive and would stand the test of time.

Existing staff strength at E.F.S. headquarters is certainly inadequately accommodated. Senior E.F.S. officers are concerned about the limited facilities available at headquarters for carrying out the vital role of the organisation. Public safety should be the major responsibility of any Government, and there is desperate need for a new centre, a new hub for our emergency fire services, to provide the adequate level of fire protection in country areas. The main weaknesses of the service are its lack of equipment and training, and its limited headquarters, office space, and inadequate facilities and staff to co-ordinate forces to suppress major fires. If the new headquarters were constructed some of these problems would be solved, and the proposed radio network to co-ordinate activities during major fires in one of the most vulnerable fire areas in the world would also improve.

Initially, it was intended to call tenders for this project in about August of this year. However, because of lack of Government funds the Government has supposedly abandoned that plan. In the first year of the building project sufficient funds would be required only for the preparation of documents, calling of tenders and, where possible, for work to commence on siteworks. At least that would be a start. Major expenditure would follow later. It is estimated that it would take about 32 weeks to prepare documents after funds were approved. By doing this, at least we would be progressing and would know that something would be moving as far as the new headquarters was concerned. There are now 9 000 volunteers and 438 registered brigades in South Australia, but they have only four instructors on the staff. South Australia's population is increasing, equipment is becoming more complex and the standard of efficiency that is required is of a high degree. To maintain the level of efficiency, a minimum of four additional staff would be needed but, at this point of time, to employ them would be ridiculous because they could not be accommodated in the existing facilities in the present E.F.S. headquarters.

Although E.F.S. officers are efficient, they are inadequately trained. Since 1955, equipment and plant of a value exceeding $2 000 000 has been purchased by the organisation and is being used throughout the State. Although maintenance work of an adequate standard is carried out by councils and the E.F.S. brigade members, insufficient full-time staff are employed to ensure that the maintenance work done is of the highest possible standard, or that it is carried out as soon as possible or, indeed, as soon as is

necessary. Much of the equipment now needed is sophisticated and requires a high level of training for personnel operating it. The E.F.S. conducts each year many instruction courses, visits various organisations, lectures at schools, etc., but the demands on it and the need for it has far exceeded the instructional resources now available. That is a pity because it is important that we educate young people in the hazards of fire. Many requests for training and lectures have to be declined, so that the problem of additional training and more effective supervision of equipment management could be overcome with additional trained staff.

In conclusion, South Australia now has in country areas E.F.S. equipment, as I have already said, to a value of over $2 000 000, and much of this plant is modern sophisticated equipment that requires skilful handling and maintenance. The E.F.S. headquarters is insufficiently equipped, staffed and accommodated to provide the essential training of volunteer personnel and inspections of equipment needed to ensure the efficient use of this plant and equipment. The E.F.S. staff would be under considerable difficulties in trying to cope with a prolonged major fire situation as things are now.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I am prompted to speak this evening by a statement by the member for Mount Gambier last week, when he said that he was ignorant of the fact that certain people in his district were affected by industrial deafness and required some hearing assistance. He said that he did not know anything about the matter, but that he had good hearing. He does not realise that in Mount Gambier considerable saw-milling activity is taking place, and the employees in that industry are greatly affected by industrial deafness. I have been employed for many years in an industry that has affected my hearing to some extent. I was a boilermaker for many years. This work has caused me some disability in this respect. I was concerned that the member for Mount Gambier did not understand the problem, but I am sure that later he will realise that certain people in his district, particularly those working in the sawmilling industry, require some assistance.

What I am really concerned about is the industrial deafness maintained in industry and the lack of assistance and appreciation by employers of their employees. In early 1968, a symposium was held in Adelaide (which I attended), sponsored by the Health Department and the Department of Labour and Industry. Dr. Aram Glorig came from America to address the symposium, and one of the things that has stuck in my mind was that he said that the most damage to a person's ears happened during the first seven years of exposure to noise.

Mr. Rodda: Do you think we should ban hi-fi bands?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: If the honourable member had spoken a little more loudly, I might have been able to hear what he said. The member for Whyalla was today affected by industrial deafness; there is an old saying. "Speak up, mate because I can't hear you for those bloody bells." That happened to him today. The workers most affected are those in the sawmills in the South-East, boiler-shop workers, and operators on presses such as those at General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth and Woodville. What concerns me most is that, during the past seven years, only little has been done to reduce the noise at the source. That is essential, because there is no good having a Workmen's Compensation Act to compensate employees for their loss of hearing if the employers are not willing to face up to their responsibility to reduce noise at the source. I had a look at what happened in my own organisation, the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union. In the year ended December, 1973, the A.M.W.U., on behalf of its members, processed 17 claims, and what did it get? Over $30 000 was paid out in workmen's compensation. In 1974, the total sum paid out by insurance companies to that union's members (and most of them were boilermakers) was $63 035, paid to 25 claimants.

Mr. Max Brown: Does that include Medibank?

Mr. WHITTEN: Medibank was not operating then, but insurance companies are now getting more on the cheap as a result of their rip-off. One employee was almost totally deaf, and the claim paid to him (and I do not think that the insurance company was generous) amounted to $8 490. During the first nine months to September, 1975, a total of $45 000 was paid to 23 members. Whereas most of the claims during the first two years of operation were made against Government departments, most claims are now coming from private industry. This proves to me that the Government now has a scheme that attempts to reduce noise at the source, instead of letting the noise continue. In the *News* of October 8 appears a report that recognises that insufficient has been done. Under the heading "Noise now a modern hazard", the following appears:

> Hearing loss from noise pollution was a far greater hazard to society than respiratory problems caused by air pollution, an Adelaide noise consultant said today.

I wish that the member for Hanson were present, because he was greatly concerned recently about noise from the Concorde at Adelaide Airport but, if he had had any experience in industry, he would realise that the noise level in industry is often much greater. He quoted the Concorde's noise level of 114 decibels, but in the boilermaking industry a reading of 130 decibels is common.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't you wear ear-muffs?

Mr. WHITTEN: What the employer said to the worker years ago was, "We are not very concerned about you. Put wadding in your ears." What was said by Dr. Glorig and the people who understand acoustics and the impairment of hearing was that wadding was useless and often caused an infection of the ear. The employers then said, "We will give you ear defenders", which used to be used by artillerymen in the Army. Ear defenders are not much better than wadding, preventing only about 15 per cent of the noise. In an industry where the decibel rating is about 125, such as in the sawmilling industry, which the member for Mount Gambier did not understand, and in the boilermaking industry it is about 130-135 decibels, so taking 15 per cent from that rating gives a rating of 120 decibels, and that is all that these ear muffs will do.

The only solution to this problem is that employers must wake up to and honour their responsibilities, reducing the noise at its source. One thing that I am pleased about is that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, under the instruction of the Labor Government, now has a programme for reducing noise. Another great problem is in the case of people who work on farms and who operate tractors. They do not realise that the decibel rating for most tractors is between 120 and 125 decibels, but what does the cockie say? He says, "Get out on that tractor." He does not provide any ear muffs, because they do not come under the Workmen's Compensation Act. The member for Eyre would not be concerned about that. He is not coming under the compensation Act regarding deafness. Any employees on his property on these high-power tractors suffer much industrial deafness, and one

of these days they will catch up with the cockies and get them where it hurts, namely, in the pocket. These people have exploited workers for a long time in connection with hearing. The Australian Labor Government has instructed the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation to examine means of dampening sound, and, in terms of a report to the *News* of Monday last, lawns are to get the silent treatment. The report states:

Noisy lawnmowers, the curse of the summer weekend in suburban Australia, may soon be a nuisance of the past. The C.S.I.R.O. is working to perfect a rotary lawnmower.

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have been misrepresented by the member for Price, and I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member wishes to make a personal explanation, not to take a point of order, he should ask for leave to make a personal explanation.

Mr. GUNN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. GUNN: During his remarks, the member for Price accused me of forcing people to drive tractors without these people having ear-muffs, and I want to make clear that in no circumstances would I engage in such a practice. To my knowledge, many employees who drive tractors have ear-muffs available to them. I suggest to the member that, before he makes that type of personal attack, he check his facts.

Mr. ALLISON (Mt. Gambier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. ALLISON: I feel that I have been misrepresented, too, by the member for Price. As a member of the Mount Gambier City Council and Deputy Chairman of the health committee, I am constantly checking on both Government-owned and privately-owned enterprises, making inspections for excess noise. That can be checked from council records, and in a question that I asked on October 7 I stated that I was asking for an improved National Acoustics Laboratory service at Mount Gambier. I was conscious of the problem.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I thought the member for Price made a good contribution, but he spoilt it by his scathing attack on the salt of the earth. He referred to them as the cockies. I rise on a matter of grief occasioned by a bureaucratic action by some people in my district. To put Government members at ease, I say that I will not blame the Government for being the bureaucrat in this case. The matter arises from a peremptory ruling that the South Australian Trotting Control Board has handed to the Naracoorte Trotting Club. It was conveyed to the club that it would conduct its race meetings at Mount Gambier. I do not have to tell many members that Naracoorte is about 90 kilometres from Mount Gambier and that the nearest trotting club to the one at Mount Gambier is at Strathalbyn, about 320 km away.

The Naracoorte club was founded in 1954, and Naracoorte has a population of about 4 500, including the surrounding areas, but not including the nearby towns in Victoria, which have a population of about 6 000. The town of Naracoorte is thriving. It has had its ups and downs, as the member for Mitcham said this afternoon he had had. The new arrangements seem to have come about from the recommendations of the Hancock report, but I cannot find anything in that report that states that Naracoorte Trotting Club would be disbanded or centralised at Mount Gambier.

Several owners of trotters in the district have centred their activities on the Naracoorte trotting track but, unfortunately, because of this decision, they have now left. Some have gone to Ballarat. One horse prominent in Australian trotting circles that is involved is Reichman. The club has approached the Minister and the board, and I understand that the decision rests with the board. The decision seems to me to have been based perhaps on a clash of personalities. The club has set up its own fine track, and electric light is provided.

An active band of workers, through cattle schemes and other fund-raising activities, has kept the sport alive. In the club's last season of operations, it conducted two race meetings at Gawler, which provided it with finance. I notice from the balance sheets and reports that there has been criticism that the club had not paid out debenture holders, but that matter has been dealt with and now the club has a credit balance of about $5 000.

Dr. Eastick: Did it make that information available previously?

Mr. RODDA: I understand that the board has been fully aware of it, and the balance sheets are available to the board. On August 8 the club was told that one trotting meeting was to be held at Mount Gambier, and it was not allotted any further meetings for this year. The club is now faced with not having any meetings, and I understand that the Mount Gambier club does not want the meetings there, either. It seems at present that the club has little prospect other than to disband. The board has been approached, but apparently the approach has fallen on deaf ears. A letter signed by Mr. K. W. Porter and addressed to the Secretary of the Naracoorte Trotting Club states:

With regard to the year ending December 31, 1976, the board has decided that no meetings will be allocated to your club. The board feels that it is unnecessary to receive any further representation or delegation from your club in this matter and has lodged a written report with the Director of Tourism, Recreation and Sport notifying its decision.

I have been asked to raise this matter. The Mayor of Naracoorte, like other people, has protested about it, and I bring it before Parliament as a matter of grievance. The facilities are available. The club is not broke: it has a cash credit. I was interested in the interjection by the member for Light about whether the matters had been brought to the attention of the board. I understand that they have, but I also understand that there are clashes of personality that should be ironed out. I raise this matter on behalf of a prosperous part of the South-East. The Naracoorte Trotting Club is very much a part of our community, and I hope that it will be possible for the club to make a contribution again to the community.

Motion carried.

At 10.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 16, at 2 p.m.