HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 13, 1975

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment (Moratorium),
Prices Act Amendment,
Public Finance Act Amendment,
Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act Amendment.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTIONS)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have to report that the managers have been to the conference but that no agreement was reached.

QUESTIONS

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

SHEEP TREATMENT

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (October 7).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture informs me that when potter sheep are received at the Port Lincoln abattoirs appropriate records are established and maintained throughout the processing operations. Deaths during transit or in the holding yards are classified as total losses and when payment is forwarded to the owner it is accompanied by a numbered advice note showing lot number, total receivals both dead and alive, and total losses. Details are also given on the number of carcasses passed for human consumption and the disposal of skins. There is no mystery concerning the disposal of total losses at Port Lincoln. They are collected from the trucks or from the yards and rendered down *in toto* through the by-products plant including the skin, if it is a pelt only, as are the great majority of "potter" skins. If the skin is long-woolled, it would be salvaged from the carcass beforehand, providing there was no advanced putrefaction.

However, as stated in my colleague's original announcement in the *Port Lincoln Times* of July 31, payment is made only on those sheep delivered and slaughtered and no payment is made for total losses. The reason is that the rendering down of dead sheep *in toto* complete with stomach and intestinal contents raises the colour level of the tallow, and increases the free fatty acid level, thus reducing the value of any batch of tallow which included such carcasses. Also, by leaving even a short-woolled skin on the carcass the crude fibre level of the meatmeal produced is likewise increased, adding to processing costs and reducing the quality of the meal. While no payment is made for total loss sheep, similarly no charge is made for disposal, as it is considered that the value of the carcass may just cover the cost of treatment; and my colleague refutes any allegations of mismanagement at the Port Lincoln abattoirs and considers that the staff of the works have performed admirably in the circumstances.

ROCK LOBSTER

In reply to Mr. VANDEPEER (October 15).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Fisheries confirms that this committee is a purely advisory body, and that since he has held the fisheries portfolio, he has not referred any questions to it for report or recommendation. From January 1 last, legislation under the Australian Fisheries Act provides for limited entry fisheries and the Australian Government will have to approve of any changes in policy or legislation which will affect the management of the rock lobster fishery which extends into both State and proclaimed waters outside the jurisdiction of the State. In such circumstances, it appears desirable, and necessary, that the committee should be reconstituted to include an Australian Government representative from the Fisheries Division of the Australian Department of Agriculture, and that the present terms of reference under which the committee functions should be amended. The Policy Division of the Premier's Department has been asked to examine this matter in consultation with Professor Parzival Copes who has recently been investigating fisheries resource management in this State; and in due course further consideration will be given to the constitution and functions of the Rock Lobster Industry Advisory Committee.

FERTILISERS

In reply to Mr. KENEALLY (October 29).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture informs me that phasing out of the nitrogen fertiliser bounty will be of no great impact in South Australia as only small quantities of this fertiliser are used by local farmers. Most of this State's cropping regime depends on nitrogen supplied by legumes and the use of nitrogen fertilisers occurs mostly in Queensland, where it is applied to the sugar crop. My colleague feels that the recommendation by the Industries Assistance Commission to phase out the nitrogen fertiliser bounty over three years is sensible; it gives producers an opportunity to consider whether the returns from the crop they are cultivating with nitrogen fertilisers, are great enough to cover increased costs. It would appear that, if the recommendations are adopted, the price of sulphate of ammonia, which contains 21 per cent nitrogen, will be increased by $16·50 a tonne to $106 and that of urea, which contains 46 per cent nitrogen, would be increased by $36·20 to about $171 a tonne.

In reply to Mr. WOTTON (October 2).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, informs me that his department is seriously concerned about the operations of people who are promoting the sale of unregistered preparations as fertilisers in contravention of the provisions of the Agricultural Chemicals Act, particularly as some of these materials have been demonstrated on analysis to be worthless for the purposes for which they were being sold. The methods employed by some companies and firms which have come under notice in this regard, make it difficult to obtain convictions in legal proceedings, and unfortunately farmers who have been duped by them are most reluctant to furnish evidence of sale.

The Minister, at this stage, considers that it would be unwise for me to make public the names of persons, companies and firms who are known to the department to be dealing in these materials. However, he has advised that in 1973 a firm trading under the name of A. G. Nutri Products was successfully prosecuted for three breaches of the Agricultural Chemicals Act involving the offer of materials as fertiliser in packages not bearing a registered label and the sale of a preparation whose contents fell far below the guaranteed analysis. At present there are at least two other organisations which are believed by the department to be selling unregistered materials as fertilisers, and their operations are being closely watched. My colleague has supplied me with a

comprehensive report on this problem which I shall be happy to make available for the perusal of the honourable member if he so desires. I take this opportunity to appeal to farmers who have been misled by spurious operators in the fertiliser trade to assist the Agriculture Department by coming forward and laying complaints.

EMERGENCY INFORMATION

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (November 5).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The flood openings in the embankment approach to the Kingston bridge are designed together with the river waterway at the bridge to give a maximum build up with a flood of the magnitude of the 1956 flood of 0·15 metres (6in.). The effect of this build-up only extends eight kilometres upstream from the bridge. The actual differential head was measured at the peak of the 1974 flood at 0·173 m (6·8in.) As regards information services, flood level details can be obtained by either a personal visit to the Irrigation and Drainage Branch of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, fifth floor, State Administration Centre or by telephone to:

Adelaide, 228 2482 . . . . . Mr. W. Gamlin
Waikerie, 170 . . . . . Mr. G. Jeffree
Berri, 82 1211 (after hours) . . . . Mr. R. Bristow

Technical or engineering advice may be obtained from the Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage, telephone Adelaide 2228 2430 or the Resident Engineer, Berri, telephone Berri 82 1211.

INTERSTATE COMPETITIONS

In reply to Mr. BECKER (November 5).

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government does not intend to amend the Trading Stamp Act to allow South Australian residents to enter give-away or lucky number competitions sponsored by interstate companies. The Government is firmly of the opinion that the provisions of the Trading Stamp Act are of great benefit to the people of South Australia by protecting them from offers which appear to be offering them something for nothing when as everybody knows the cost of so-called free offers have to be borne by somebody, and that somebody is not the person making the free offer. I am examining the provisions of the Trading Stamp Act to see if it needs amendment to prevent companies such as *Reader's Digest* sending material such as the Lucky Number Giveaway promotion to residents of South Australia.

CIGARETTE PERMIT

In reply to Mr. VENNING (November 5).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, 1974-1975, provides that any person who carries on tobacco retailing on or after October 1, 1975, shall be the holder of a retail tobacconist's licence. The annual licence fee payable is $10, provided the retailer purchases tobacco only from a licensed wholesale tobacco merchant. Section 12 of the Act enables the Minister to reduce the licence fee when he is satisfied that payment of the fee assessed by the Commissioner "would cause substantial hardship to the applicant". This provision was inserted in the Act because tobacco wholesalers whose licence fee is based on 10 per cent of their sales for an antecedent period (as well as a fixed fee of $100) could be seriously affected by sudden changes in demand for a particular product or by a large retailer changing from one wholesaler to another. I do not consider the $10 fee would cause financial hardship and if it were possible to dispense with this fee for a bowling club, it could be unfair to a retailer required to pay an identical fee in order to sell tobacco products for a livelihood.

KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (September 18 and November 4).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have now received a reply from the Australian Minister for Transport with regard to the district council's submission that the main runway of the Kingscote Airport be sealed. It is the intention of the Australian Government that with the exception of a few aerodromes required for national and defence purposes, all aerodromes now owned by the Australian Government should be transferred to the local authorities concerned, by mutual agreement. There are currently some 190 aerodromes throughout Australia operating efficiently under the local ownership plan. It is considered that aerodromes which serve a local, rather than a national need, should be owned and operated by the community they serve with assistance from the Australian Government for both development and maintenance works. If the district council agreed to accept local ownership, the proposal would contain a specific offer that the Australian Government would bear the full costs of sealing the runway as part of the transfer arrangements and would utilise the resources of the council in carrying out the works. However, the subsequent costs to the council of maintaining the aerodrome, including provision for periodic reseals would be of the order of $14 000 a year. Council expenditure would be matched by Australian Government grants.

The Australian Government has suggested that council could recover their costs by charging a fee of about 25c for each passenger arriving or departing by air. Such surcharges are quite common throughout Australia and range from 20c to $1 a person. The Australian Minister does not accept that such a charge would be a disadvantage to island residents as compared to their mainland counterparts. Improvements to the aerodrome should attract to the Island large and increasing numbers of tourists which are a source of income to the island community and could provide, in effect, most of the council's share of the costs associated with maintaining the aerodrome. Whilst the Australian Minister for Transport accepts that the Kingscote Aerodrome is important in reducing the islanders' isolation, he finds it difficult to agree that it should receive special treatment. He is firmly of the opinion that it serves a local need rather than a national need and as such should be locally owned with costs being met by levying a small passenger tax. In the circumstances, it appears unlikely that further concessions can be gained.

LAND ACQUISITION

In reply to Mr. GUNN (November 11).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Government has not acquired either of the properties mentioned by the honourable member. Therefore, it is not possible for immediate payment to be made as requested. Following negotiation with the landholder, a price for the purchase of sections 74-117, 410-417, 419-422, 234 and 235, was agreed, but further action was halted when Australian Government funding of this land and other areas intended for national parks was curtailed. The State Government agreed to make up at least part of the deficiency and this would have enabled the property to be purchased when an Australian Government contribution had been received. Earlier this week, when it became apparent that funding from Canberra could be further delayed, officers of my department discussed interim financing of this and certain other properties with the State Treasury and I expect a

satisfactory answer on this within a few days. We shall then be able to proceed to negotiate on the above property to establish a revised price as the landowner has recently withdrawn sections 234 and 235 from his previous offer. Nevertheless, settlement may be effected within the time stipulated by the landholder. The situation regarding Koonalda station is quite different. It is held under two pastoral leases expiring in 1983 and 1993 respectively and, although preliminary negotiations have been undertaken, no finality has been reached and no decision on the resumption of these pastoral leases has yet been taken.

BELAIR RECREATION PARK

In reply to Mr. EVANS (November 11).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Belair Recreation Park has, for a number of years, been extensively used for horse riding, principally in the northern portion of the park adjacent to the roadway known as Sir Edwins Avenue leading from the Belair entrance. However, to a lesser extent, the various walking trails and fire access tracks throughout the park have also been used. The northern portion of the park is primarily used by riders from the nearby Sheoak Hill Riding School, which is located about 1·6 kilometres to the east of the Belair entrance on Sheoak Road. The greater majority of people who use this area are inexperienced riders who either enter the park unaccompanied or in group riding classes sponsored by the Sheoak Hill Riding School. Most people hiring horses from the Sheoak Hill Riding School do so on an hourly or two-hourly basis (fees charged are $3 for 1 hour or $5 for 2 hours). Allowing for the distance of about 3·2 km from the riding school to the park entrance and return, and the general inexperience of the riders, the average time spent in the park is of the order of one hour. For many years concern has been expressed at the erosion and general vegetation degradation which have occurred in the areas most heavily used by horse riders. In an endeavour to combat the spread of this degradation, an area of 35 hectares immediately to the south of the Belair Railway Station, principally planted with exotic pines, is being developed as a horse riding area. Access to this area will be possible from both the Belair and western entrances. Initially it is not proposed to construct specific trails within this area, but depending upon the extent of usage and attrition which occurs, this may ultimately be required.

It is recognised that more experienced riders than those who generally use the facilities of the Sheoak Hill Riding School also wish to use the park, particularly for extended periods on long distance trails. Horse riding *per se* is certainly not considered to be an undesirable activity within reserves, particularly recreation parks, and, properly controlled, can be very much a means for the appreciation of nature. However, horse riding presents certain management problems, for, like any other form of traffic, deterioration to the track surface can rapidly occur unless steps are taken to prevent it. Ultimately it is proposed to create a system of longer distance horse riding trails within the Belair and Para Wirra Recreation Parks for use by experienced riders. The location of these trails will of course cater for the requirements of these riders but, nevertheless will take into account normal management principles. It is anticipated that work could begin on this system later this financial year. In the meantime, horse riding will be restricted to the area previously mentioned, in the northern portion of the park.

FILM CORPORATION

In reply to Mr. EVANS (November 5).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During 1974-75 the South Australian Film Advisory Board met six times at intervals of approximately two months. Of the seven appointed members, five attended at five of these meetings and six attended the other two meetings. There have been two meetings held during the current financial year, one attended by six of the members and the other by five members. The members serve in an honorary capacity and are paid no honorarium. Although entitled to expenses involved in their attendance there has been no claim for any such expenses.

LAND PRICES

Dr. TONKIN: What reasons can the Premier give for the exorbitant increase in the average cost of a block of land in the metropolitan area during the 12 months to the end of September, compared to other cities? Figures released yesterday show that the average cost of a block of land in Adelaide rose by 21·2 per cent during the 12-month period. That is a significantly greater increase than the increase in the cost of blocks in Sydney, which increased by 12·8 per cent, and in Melbourne where prices actually dropped by 5·5 per cent. A spokesman for the Premier is quoted as saying that State Valuation Department figures for the five developing areas around Adelaide showed an increase of only 6·1 per cent in land prices, but this is not a true average figure. Since South Australia is the only State to have a Land Commission in operation, it is obvious that the commission has not been successful in its aims of containing land prices and stopping price increases. This is yet another result of the State Government's unquestioning agreement to a Whitlam Government proposal with disastrous effects on the economy and the community as a whole.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader obviously wants to play funny with the figures. He knows well that the position in South Australia is that by means of land price control, and by means of the operation of the Land Commission, in the developing areas of Adelaide land prices in Adelaide have been held low, and are markedly below those of the States he quotes.

Th Hon. G. T. Virgo: They always have been.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: And they continue to be, and if no action had been taken they would not be, simply because in South Australia the demand for land in the metropolitan area remains high, and economically high, and in consequence, if we had not taken the action we had, there would have been a very marked escalation in the price of building blocks in Adelaide. But the fact is that the Government has placed on the market land at a figure below $6 000 for a block. Land remains available in the developing areas of Adelaide at that figure, and no other city in Australia can claim that. So much has there been success on the part of the Land Commission that it is regarded with awe in other States. The Premier of Victoria has tried to proceed along similar lines to copy what we have done in successfully containing the price of land here, and other cities in South Australia have asked for the Land Commission to go there. It has been very much welcomed by the city of Mount Gambier, where now the Land Commission is putting blocks on the market.

CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. WELLS: Has the Premier seen a report emanating from Mr. Gorton M.H.R., that was published in today's *Advertiser*? Mr. Speaker, I seek your leave and the concurrence of the House to explain the question. Following the recent sequence of vicious events in Canberra which

brought about the undemocratic dismissal of the Labor Party Government in Australia—

Members interjecting:

Mr. Mathwin: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I see no way in which this question is related to the affairs of South Australia. The question was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I, as Speaker, will decide whether this question is relevant or not. I must hear the question. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order—

Mr. Wells: You don't like this?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: —the question has been asked, and the question was: Has the Premier seen an article in the newspapers? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a question which is suitable for consideration by this House.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You don't like it, do you?

The SPEAKER: As I said earlier, as Speaker, I shall decide. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order—

Members interjecting:

Mr. Wells: You pommy bastard.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: —with due respect, I called Question three times, when the honourable member was rambling on. He did not even ask for the permission of the House when he was commenting on the situation, and I called "Question" three times.

The SPEAKER: The "Question" has been called and I rule the question out of order in the manner in which it was asked. The honourable the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

WATER CHARGES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Deputy Premier explain to the House and to the public of South Australia why it is considered necessary (and, indeed, whether the Government has made a firm decision) to double the price of water soon? With other members of Parliament I attended a film last week at which the Minister said that it would be necessary to double the charges, I think he said in the next few years. I think the Minister realises the tremendous hardship that was caused by revaluations and the effect they had on water rates in several metropolitan suburbs last year, and early this year. He well realises that people will, literally, be rated off of their properties if what is proposed happens. Will the Minister give the reasons for these increased water rates and, indeed, say whether such an increase will apply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At the end of his explanation, the honourable member mentioned the fact that revaluations had last year hit certain areas of the State very severely, and that is true. As a result of that, he would know also that the Government took steps to equalise the rating system so that that would not occur again. In other words, instead of one-fifth of the State (which it has been customary to value in any one year) being hit with a tremendous slug every five years, the rate equalisation scheme would mean an increase over the whole State each year if valuations increase. In the statement I made last Thursday I forecast that it was likely the Government would be required to double the cost of water to consumers over the next five years. The reason for that is that people living in the metropolitan area, in particular, have demanded not only an adequate supply of water (which they have got) but also a supply of water that is much better than the current supply that they receive. They have demanded clean water. The Government intends to give them clean water, and the honourable member can hardly disagree with that intention because, in fact, a Liberal Government in, I think, 1969 announced that it would do this. At that time, in Opposition, we said that we would want to examine the situation more closely before we committed ourselves, as we believed that several other courses were open at that time. Subsequently, we decided that we would filter the Adelaide water supply, and that is likely to cost, over the time of the programme arranged, in excess of or up to $100 000 000. Of that sum, 30 per cent will be by way of a direct grant from the Australian Government, but the remainder will have to be met by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in repayments of not only the interest but also the principal of that loan over a period. That is one factor. The other factor is escalation, about which the honourable member knows without my explaining it to him. The forecast I made did not take account at all of the desirability of reducing the current deficit of the department, which is running at $13 000 000. I made the statement because on that occasion we were telling the people of Adelaide that they would get clean water some time in the future; the first of it will be on stream in 1977, the second in 1978, and so on. I thought it was proper at that time to warn the people that they would have to pay for this clean water. I do not see anything unreasonable about that. If I had not done that, I believe the honourable member would have been justified in questioning me, saying I was trying to deceive people or hide facts from them. I tell the people the truth and the honourable member wants to know why I have told them! I have explained that, as well as the additional cost, escalation will be involved. I reiterate that the figure I gave does not allow for anything to relieve the deficit currently being carried, which has increased from $4 700 000 last year to $13 000 000 this year. I expect even the honourable member would grant that there will be wage and salary increases in the next five years that will lead to the sort of escalation that we have taken into account.

CARETAKER GOVERNMENT

Mr. KENEALLY: Does the Premier believe that the construction of the undemocratic caretaker Government in Canberra is a clear indication that a Liberal Government will again ignore Labor-governed States? In the caretaker Ministry are eight Victorians, four New South Welshmen, two Western Australians and one Queenslander. There are no Tasmanians or South Australians. Of course, these States are governed by Labor Party Governments. Is this a clear indication that the Liberal policy of ignoring Labor States will continue?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage I do not know whether the caretaker Prime Minister intends to make any alterations in his Cabinet. I can only say that it seems strange at this stage that there are no Ministers from those States that are governed by Labor Governments. It was drawn to my attention by public servants yesterday that somehow or other the normal addresses in the telex had been altered. Obviously they must have been altered by a specific direction, and the two Labor States are not in their normal order but at the bottom. Something is obviously going on in the minds of the present caretaker Government so far as Labor-governed States are concerned.

COUNTRY HOUSING

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether provisions can be made to expedite the building, for purchase and rental, of Housing Trust dwellings in country areas, when the provision of such houses will assist the expansion of industry? I have a specific case regarding Maitland Engineering, a small business making silos, bins, field bins and other machinery that currently employs 15 tradesmen who, to find a house, live anywhere between Curramulka and Moonta. They must travel considerable distances each day to and from Maitland to work. This firm has moved to new and larger premises, and now has orders for its products that will keep it going for well over 12 months, with no further orders. Having just entered the interstate market, it finds the demand good, and could immediately use five more tradesmen if housing were available. This is the specific problem. Mr. Thomas, the proprietor of that business, considers that, if special consideration can be given to the green triangle, the iron triangle, and the proposed city of Monarto to attract industry, assistance could also be given in cases like his throughout the State by the provision of both rental and purchase housing through the the Housing Trust.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be happy to take up the matter with the Housing Trust. I should be grateful if the honourable member would tell Mr. Thomas that the priority that is given, in the provision of housing, to country areas of this State is probably significantly greater than that given to the metropolitan area, particularly through the South Australian Housing Trust. He has no cause whatsoever for making the kind of remark that he made to the honourable member, nor has the honourable member any cause for repeating it. In almost every case the waiting time for a house from the Housing Trust is much greater in the metropolitan area than it is in any country area of the State. I hope that the honourable member will repeat to Mr. Thomas what I have said. I point out that the trust in its operations, especially in country areas of the State, is keenly aware of the problems that arise in getting people to build houses. The trust's normal procedure has been to employ contractors and to keep them employed on a regular basis on the grounds that, if a contractor has regular work in a certain district, he will retain his employees and the trust will not have to bear the additional costs associated with contractors moving in and out of country areas as each house is built. This is the traditional method used by the trust and, over the years, it has meant that the average time taken to build a house in the country is somewhat greater than it is in the metropolitan area. Because a contractor is given a contract for several houses, he spaces out those houses in order to secure continuous employment in country areas for his employees and the subcontractors. I hope that the honourable member will understand that explanation and will also pass that on to Mr. Thomas. If I can get additional information from the trust, I shall be pleased to do so.

CATTLE STEALING

Mr. CHAPMAN: Is the Attorney-General aware of the circumstances surrounding the conviction of Douglas Kenneth Smith on charges which related to cattle stealing and which were heard in the Central District Criminal Court, and of the two sentences, each of nine months imprisonment with hard labour, which were imposed but which were suspended in lieu of a three-year good behaviour bond of $50? Because of the nature of the offences and the man's previous record, will the Attorney undertake to examine the case with a view to the Crown's initiating an appeal against the suspended sentence? A sketchy report of the case appeared on page 18 of this morning's *Advertiser*. However, a copy of the evidence, witnesses' statements and His Honour Mr. Justice Mohr's reasons for judgment supplied today by the court clearly reveal that, on August 2, 1975, at Bonnie Brae station, via Yunta, Douglas Kenneth Smith of 45 Gladstone Avenue, Magill, builder's labourer, stole cattle, namely, a heifer, the property of Peter Robert Sandland, and wilfully killed a heifer, the property of Peter Robert Sandland, with intent to steal the carcass thereof. On his own admission, he was found guilty under sections 136 and 137 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935, as amended. He was relieved of what might have seemed to be an appropriate penalty of serving concurrently the two sentences of nine months imprisonment with hard labour. I have contacted the station owner involved, and it seems that, with the extreme co-operation of these people, staff, and local police officers, the offender was apprehended. People in the area are disturbed that the case has been heard and determined in what seems to be a rather frivolous way. I seriously bring the matter to the attention of the House, because there is much concern that in this place day after day, evening after evening—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he is now commenting and not explaining his question.

Mr. CHAPMAN: All right, Mr. Speaker, I will come back precisely to the explanation, because the complaint I have received several times is, "What point is there in spending day after day in this place making laws if, when an offender is apprehended, he is dealt with in this way?" I conclude by saying that, in these outer areas, if a man is hungry he will get a feed. There is no doubt about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting again. I ask him to put the question.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have put the question. I will conclude briefly, with every respect, by saying generally, and more especially in this instance, there is no need in outer areas traditionally to steal, because those country people will give a man a feed or a bed if required. He need only ask.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member's question, as I understood it, is about whether I am aware of the circumstances of this matter. The reply is, "No", in general terms. However, I have read the "sketchy" report, as the honourable member put it, in the *Advertiser* this morning on this matter, and I think there were sufficient details there for me to be able to give a reply. The way members opposite, when it suits their purpose, feel quite free to denigrate the Judiciary of this State never ceases to amaze me. Judge Mohr, the judge involved in this matter in the Central District Criminal Court, is well known to members of the legal profession in this State as a man and a judge of very high repute and great abilities in the law. It is interesting that this judge, who, as I have said, is held in very high regard, was severely denigrated by people not long ago because of the heaviness of the sentence of four years imprisonment that he imposed on some drug pushers, and that sentence was subsequently overruled by the Supreme Court. Now, the same judge is being criticised for the lightness of his penalties. There

seems to be a fundamental contradiction in these sorts of criticism. For the honourable member, on the information before him, to describe the way that this matter was handled in the Central District Criminal Court as frivolous is completely and utterly without foundation. I have no doubt that this matter was handled with much care and skill by the honourable judge concerned and that all the matters were taken into account, and doubtless many of the matters that would have been before the court certainly are not before the honourable member for him to make his judgment on them. Obviously, the court weighed the matters before it and considered them carefully. It decided, in its wisdom, that the appropriate penalty in this case was the penalty applied. I do not know the criminal record of the offender involved but if the honourable member considers that the offender has a long history of crime and that it is likely that he may well offend again, I put it to the honourable member that it is likely that a suspended sentence of nine months imprisonment probably will be implemented if this person again offends within the three-year bond period that has been set. The effect of this penalty is that this offender who has been found guilty and convicted, if he commits any criminal offence within the next three years, will receive nine months imprisonment. It seems to me that it is better policy for courts to apply that sort of penalty, which is more likely to protect the rights and privileges of the community from any further offences by this person, than to apply the Draconian heavy hand that the honourable member has suggested.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Education say whether the South Australian Private Schools Association or any independent South Australian schools have been told by the Minister or any member of his staff or other Education Department staff that the South Australian State Government per capita grants for 1976 for private schools will be stopped, deferred, or reduced? If such information has been given, will the Minister say what was the detail of it?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Tell us where you dreamt up that question. Who made that one up for you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: I have received telephone calls from two persons who are concerned, and another member of my Party has received similar contact but from different people, that advice has been passed on to the South Australian Private Schools Association that the grants for 1976 will be stopped and that the Government will not have the money available. One must consider the announcement about a $10 000 000 surplus expected by the Treasurer for this financial year. In one staff room at a private school of which the Minister has personal knowledge and in which he has had experience in teaching, it has been said that, if an Australian Labor Party Commonwealth Government is elected, the grants could be reintroduced.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The simple answer is "No". However, I may be able to assist both the honourable member and the House to have some understanding how such a rumour may have arisen. It is possible that it is purely vicious and political, but I am always prepared to give people the benefit of the doubt, and therefore I will explain how it is possible that such a story could have got around. Some time ago people involved in the private schools area approached me about the future of the Cook committee, and these people put before me certain submissions about the future of that committee. No undertaking was given at that time; certainly, no Government decision of any type was conveyed to them. Within the past 24 hours, certain people in the private schools system have been told indirectly, not by me, that the Cook committee will continue in existence. I believe I had told this House as much some time ago, and therefore anyone who followed *Hansard* would have been aware of that. Whether somehow or other the fact that the Cook committee will continue in existence and money from the State Government will continue to have an element of needs funding in it has been extended in the mind of certain people so that they assume that the per capita component of State Government funding will be eliminated, I do not know. However, I suppose it is possible that people, having heard indirectly that the Cook committee will continue in existence and that needs funding from the State Government will continue, have made some sort of extension in their minds and believe that this involves the elimination of per capita funding. That is simply not the case. The information that these people have been given, albeit indirectly, could be only to the effect that the *status quo* will be maintained. That is the situation. Regarding the specific school to which the honourable member has referred, I believe that I will be on campus, as it were, twice between now and the end of the year in an official capacity, and I am sure I will be able to lay at rest all fears that may exist in that quarter.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the around-the-clock security patrols, which a report in the *Advertiser* of November 11 stated would be used at McNally Training Centre, have been implemented? If they have been implemented, will the Minister say under what conditions?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: A report, I think by Bernard Boucher, appeared in the *Advertiser*, and there was also a report by Rex Jory in the *News* of the same day. In contrast to other reports (and leaders) appearing in the press at that time about McNally, those reports were, in the main, fair and accurate, but that was not the case both before and, on one occasion, after that date regarding some incidents, anyway, at McNally. The question of outside security is interesting, and I am pleased to be able to give the House some information on this matter. Outside security patrols have been operating at Vaughan House for 24 months, and they have been of valuable assistance, as they check the buildings regularly for intruders and make systematic checks of the security of the outside of the buildings. That aspect cannot be stressed too strongly, because, on occasion over several years, there have been problems with intruders, strangely enough, from outside the various institutions and training centres. The security service provided at Vaughan House has functioned well in handling that problem. At McNally, the male staff on night duty had been operating a similar function but, because of the recent problems at night, it is unwise for the staff to move away from the units to carry out such checks. However, security patrols are being instituted. The honourable member asked how the patrols would be implemented, and I am sure that he would agree that the disclosure of the method of operating would be unwise and would be the complete antithesis of the name "security service". The checks will be more intensive while certain repairs are being made at McNally and, generally, it is not intended to have the patrols operating during the day.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the estimated cost of repairing the damage

caused by the recent riot at the McNally Training Centre is $60 000? I understand that structural damage was caused: one wall was severely damaged, and another wall was considered a hazard and condemned. I understand that this will involve some rebuilding, and this, coupled with other damage to the centre, must be a costly business, so I ask the Minister whether the estimate of $60 000 was an accurate estimate of the damage caused?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member is correct when he says that there was some structural damage in that a certain amount of rebuilding will be needed, at least in the case of one wall. I do not have any detailed figures on the costs. Apparently the honourable member's messenger service is better than mine on these matters. I shall be pleased to check the accuracy of the information he has supplied, and we can compare notes to see who has the better service.

COINS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I ask the Premier whether the Government will immediately hold an inquiry to determine the following:

1. The reason why historic gold coins were sold from the collection at the Art Gallery of South Australia.
2. The reason why the gallery received less than one-third of the market value for these coins.
3. The reason why such historic coins were sold overseas.
4. The future policy of the Art Gallery Board on the sale of coins from the collection.

Will he also say whether the report of this inquiry will be tabled in Parliament? Following a series of recent articles in the *Sunday Mail* concerning the sale of coins from the coin collection at the Art Gallery of South Australia, I asked a series of Questions on Notice to obtain information about the coins sold. During 1973-74, 194 gold coins were sold through Spink & Son Limited, London, for a total value of £11 733 sterling. A valuation has been made of these coins by Mr. Dion Skinner, a recognised authority on coins, who has acted as consultant for the Australian Police Force.

His valuation of these coins indicates that they had a market value at the time of sale of at least £35 525 sterling. Mr. Skinner has also established beyond any doubt that many of the coins sold were of Australian historic importance. I will make available to the Premier a copy of the report by Mr. Skinner, which shows the discrepancies between the market value and the sale value for each coin. One example is the $50 United States of America 1852 "slug" California Moffat-Augustus Humbert. In the Spinks circular, reference 8539 (October, 1974), a sale is recorded for £7 500. The gallery received £560 for its specimen, which corresponded to the one offered by Spinks. It seems that someone is guilty of gross incompetence and negligence in allowing these historic gold coins (*a*) to have been sold; (*b*) to have been sold overseas, and so lost to Australia; (c) to have been sold on consignment at such a low value. Finally, I point out that these coins were taken out of Australia during April-May, 1973. On June 6, 1973 (within a month, or even less), the Australian Government introduced a new regulation prohibiting the export of such coins minted before 1901. One even wonders whether the coins were deliberately taken out of Australia on that occasion because of the introduction of new regulations under the Customs (Prohibited Export) Regulation No. 5A.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not at this stage intend to order any inquiry. However, if the honourable member provides me with the information I will have it checked, but the information he has provided me with previously did not prove, on checking, to be correct. If he will supply me with the information, I will have it checked.

BIRDS

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment tell the House what steps are being taken to overcome the serious damage caused to a large variety of crops by native birds? I have received reports from various grower organisations concerned about this problem. The latest of these reports came from the cherry section of the South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association. The report states that 60 growers have expressed their concern, and makes the point that the loss to one grower last year alone with one patch of cherries was over $3 000. This problem affects not only the cherry crops but also apples, pears, apricots and all deciduous fruits, and many cereal crops. I am aware of the provisions in the Act in relation to obtaining permits to destroy birds, and this is happening.

I am also aware of the concern of conservationists, who are aware of the effects of such killings. I have been told that a suggestion has been put forward that a programme of sensible harvesting would help to eliminate the illicit bird trade, thus providing a considerable benefit to the community as a whole. The programme, I have been told, could be self sustaining and would cost the Government nothing. It has been estimated that between 60 and 100 birds could be harvested each day, the Rosella bringing $17·50 a bird. I have also been told that, in February, in a trial programme 36 birds were brought in for harvesting in the Ashbourne area. I know that steps are being taken by departmental officers who have already visited certain affected areas, and I invite the Minister to do likewise. Indeed, I shall be pleased to assist in such a visit.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The problem raised by the honourable member is a real one. Members of the cherry section of the South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association have already contacted my department, and some of my officers have had discussions with them. The fruitgrowers point out (and my department concurs) that a large percentage of fruit crops grown in the Adelaide Hills is lost each year because of the activities of these and other birds. My department and I share their concern, but I have been told that a solution to the problem is difficult to determine and would be complex to implement. However, I have asked my officers, in conjunction with the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, to carry out an intensive research programme into this matter during the coming fruit season. They have already had discussions with fruitgrowers and National Parks and Wildlife Service inspectors. Agriculture Department officers from the Lenswood Research Centre have already been making investigations, and some limited information is now available. Further investigations will be carried out in the Ashbourne area next week, but it will possibly be two or three weeks before sufficient information is available and any possible plan can be devised. It is also true, as the honourable member says, that there is a possibility of making money out of the trapping of these birds, but I am not sure what the elasticity of demand for Rosella parrots would be. The present price is $17·50 a head, but I understand that making any appreciable dent in the problem might require the trapping of several thousand of these birds.

I am not quite sure how the market would stand up in those circumstances. True, trapping was carried out at Ashbourne on a couple of days in the early part of this year. I think 36 birds were trapped in one day by the use of about 61 metres of net. In the whole morning nine birds were caught, and the trappers moved to another area where the birds happened to be and caught another 27. It is a fairly labour-intensive occupation if we are to protect large areas of the orchards. It is not a simple matter, and it is a serious one. I can assure the honourable member that I take the matter seriously, and I shall be pleased to have a look at the damage caused and at the efforts being made to solve the problem.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether some of the A.E.C. Swift and/or Volvo bus chassis on order will be fitted with bodies specifically designed for country and interstate passenger services and, if they will, how many will be used for such services, and what are the proposed routes?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: From memory, I think 88 of the Volvo buses will be fitted with 8ft. 2½in. width bodies so that they can be used on the highways as distinct from the 8ft. 6in. buses that we currently use in the metropolitan area. The reason for this is that we will have express buses operating to places such as Elizabeth, up through the Hills, and so on, and on roads in these areas it is not desirable to breach the provisions of the Road Traffic Act regarding width. The actual location of the whole cannot be given at this stage, but I am pretty sure 88 buses are being so equipped.

COURT HEARINGS

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Attorney-General examine, and consider amending, the procedure of summoning persons who are to appear before local courts? In no way am I criticising the treatment of persons appearing before the court. What I am referring to is that defendants and witnesses are summoned to appear at 10 a.m., and often it is 2 p.m. or 3 p.m. before they are actually called before the court. Will the Attorney-General examine the procedure of summoning persons, as I believe it should be possible for a clerk of the court, with his experience, when sending out the appropriate notices to be able to orchestrate to some degree the time of calling? The time of the people appearing before the court is extremely valuable, the same as is the time of the magistrate or whoever is holding the court, and in many instances, for a 10-minute appearance, a person must give up a whole day. The Attorney-General will recognise that their time is extremely valuable.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I sympathise with the sentiments that the honourable member has expressed, because it is a difficult problem, and often great inconvenience is caused to persons who are summoned to appear before a court. They have to be at the court at 10 a.m. or thereabouts, and often they are not required to give their evidence until the afternoon. However, although I undertake to examine this matter for the honourable member, there are considerable problems in implementing any sort of scheme to endeavour to improve the situation, because, although the clerks, magistrates and judges are aware that this difficulty often arises, there is no easy solution, because often one finds that a case listed for 10 a.m. in the morning collapses because the prosecution or the plaintiff decides not to proceed with the matter. Because of this factor, the courts are in the habit of listing several cases to be heard on a certain day and of summoning several witnesses to be in attendance at 10 a.m. or 10.30 a.m. The difficulty that the courts face is that they do not know when the witnesses will be required. Because this problem causes inconvenience to the community, I think it should be looked at, and I will certainly do so for the honourable member. However, I am not hopeful of being able to find any satisfactory solution to the problems of all the parties concerned.

TRADE UNION COTTAGES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether it is the policy of the State Government to encourage trade unions to build cottages for retired members and, if it is, whether the Government intends that the South Australian Housing Trust, Government instrumentalities and Government departments shall sell to unions land at book value? The South Australian Housing Trust has sold to the Electrical Trades Union for $2 667 a parcel of land at Taperoo that is equivalent to four or five building blocks. I understand that this piece of land was sold to a church on March 23, 1965, for $2 000, and in the transfer the Housing Trust acknowledged the value of the land as being $5 400. The church was unable to proceed with the development of that property and sold the land back to the Housing Trust for $2 667 in July, 1973. I believe an arrangement exists with the Housing Trust under which, if land is made available to churches or other organisations and if they are unable to develop it, that land must go back to the trust, which buys it back and makes an allowance for rates and taxes. The Electrical Trades Union purchased the property on February 11, 1975, for $2 667. I understand that the union intends to build cottage homes for retired members. My attention has been drawn to the transaction by a property developer constituent who places a value of $25 000 on the property. He is willing to pay that sum to acquire the land. However, I understand that, if the union goes ahead with the project, the current market value of the land can be used as a basis for the Commonwealth Government's four-to-one subsidy for this purpose. Therefore, in theory, the union could put a $125 000 project on the property for $25 000, the $25 000 being used as its contribution. The land cost only $2 667, and in theory it could be considered to be a generous gift to the union. The principle behind the matter is whether it is the Government's intention to encourage unions and similar organisations to provide cottage homes for their retired members and whether the Government will continue to make available, through the Housing Trust and other Government instrumentalities, land at book value.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know the details of this matter, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

Mr. VANDEPEER: Can the Premier give a clear statement of the Government's policy on new building programmes for the hospitals at Millicent and Kingston? The boards of those hospitals have had building programmes prepared and were almost ready to call tenders when promises of finance were withdrawn, leaving the hospital boards completely in the air. The Millicent hospital has been working on a building programme for about four years. In Kingston, a building programme has been considered for some two years. This year the Kingston Hospital was given a mention in the Loan Estimates, but the hospital board has now been informed that no funds are available.

The hospital will now not be able to upgrade toilet and bathroom facilities, which are below the standard required for a hospital. The hospital boards, having seen their hospitals mentioned in the Loan Estimates, were surprised to see, within five months of those Loan Estimates being announced, that they were revised to the point where there was no money available. The condition of the hospital was noted during the Governor's recent visit. The Governor also remarked that the buildings comprising the Kingston school were some of the worst and oldest prefabricated buildings he had seen. I ask the question to enable my constituents to have some idea of whether this Government intends to make some attempt to catch up on essential public facilities in the Millicent District.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from my colleague about these matters.

FILM REPRODUCTION

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Education consider the possibility of educational and other films produced in South Australia by Government agencies and, possibility, other commercially produced films, being reproduced on video tape in addition to the usual 16 mm acetate film? The cost of producing normal acetate film is about $500 for an hour-long film. The cost of video tape, including reproduction, is less than $30 an hour. Several Government education centres are capable of doing this simple work.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Although I prefer to be regarded as no longer an expert on the subject of reproduction, I will take up the matter with my department and see what can be done.

BRIDGE REPAIR

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport say why it will take more than 12 months to have the bridge south of Wirrabara replaced? Yesterday, in reply to a Question on Notice, the Minister gave me a comprehensive reply in which he said it would take more than 12 months to have this bridge repaired. I point out that this bridge is on an important northern highway, and whilst a detour is provided it takes travellers out of their way on to an unsealed road. I therefore ask why it will take more than 12 months to repair this bridge. Is it a matter of finance, a lack of trained personnel, or just what is the reason? People are concerned that this main highway will be out of commission for more than 12 months.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, we wasted our time giving the honourable member the details that we gave, because if he had read the reply I gave him yesterday he would have seen that the answers to the questions he has raised today were dealt with fully. In that reply I said that investigations were in hand now to determine the details, the new alignment and the capacity requirements, to determine what caused the bridge to collapse, and to determine whether some steps are necessary and, if they are, to see that they will be taken in relation to the new bridge. The survey, design, and construction will then proceed as a matter of urgency. I do not know whether the honourable member wants 12 months work done in three weeks, but the Highways Commissioner has said that he is proceeding as a matter of urgency, but more than 12 months work is involved. The honourable member might be able to build a bridge much more quickly; I know he is more qualified than are the Commissioner of Highways and his staff. Nevertheless, I think South Australia would be far better served by the Commissioner and his staff building the bridge than by the member for Rocky River building it. If the honourable member built it, I would not like to go over it.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier say whether his attention has been drawn to anomalies that have crept into the Workmen's Compensation Act since it was introduced in 1972 and whether it is proposed in the February session of this Parliament to introduce amendments to this Act? If it is, will the Premier indicate, as a matter of policy, the areas in which these are likely to occur as far as remedial action is concerned?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have a feeling this question was asked on notice. I ask the member for Goyder—did he ask that same question on notice?

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes, Sir.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Dr. EASTICK: Is the Deputy Premier, having regard to the newly published facts, prepared to withdraw his attack on His Excellency the Governor-General in respect of his (the Deputy Premier's) remarks in relation to the withdrawal of Mr. Whitlam's commission? In this morning's *Advertiser* the release of the Governor-General's letter clearly indicates that the then Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, had received advice from the Governor-General on the course of action that was expected of him. It is quite obvious that he had been warned, and I will read, if the Minister likes—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the House that yesterday we discussed this matter under a suspension of Standing Orders. There is no such suspension of Standing Orders today.

Dr. EASTICK: It is a matter of new facts, Sir.

The SPEAKER: It is not.

Dr. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Sir. This is Question Time; it is a question on new facts that were not available yesterday. It refers to a remark that the Hon. the Deputy Premier made in this place yesterday, and I seek his retraction of the attack he made when insufficient information was available to him.

The SPEAKER: It is also a question relating to the actions of the Governor-General, and yesterday I ruled that under suspension of Standing Orders we discuss certain matters. There is no such situation existing now. I do not intend to allow this question.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The matter to which we referred yesterday and the question today are two totally different things. The question today is directed towards the Deputy Premier and his attack. I believe that that is the predominant factor in this question, and therefore Standing Order 150, which was suspended yesterday, does not apply in this case.

The SPEAKER: It applies in all cases. I say once again that, no matter how we approach this, the Governor-General's name or the name of the Queen's representative will come into the matter, and I do not intend to allow discussions on this unless we suspend Standing Orders as we did yesterday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: TELEVISION STATEMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has been reported to me by several people who saw the programme that last night during *This Day Tonight* on Channel 2 the Leader of the Opposition, in discussing the events in Canberra on

Tuesday, when asked by the interviewer (Mr. Noel Norton) about my attitude and that of the Liberal Movement, twice asserted that I did not understand the constitutional situation. He also said that probably what has governed my actions is a sense of loyalty to Senator Hall. Certainly I do have a sense of loyalty to my Federal colleague and to all my Parliamentary colleagues. We work as a team, are proud of our increasing numbers, and are confident that there will be more of us after December 13. However, on this and on all matters we each come to our own conclusion. In this case it was not a hard task: the situation is quite clear.

The first allegation, twice made by the Leader, is as inaccurate and lame as it is insulting to me and my Party. I believe I understand very well the constitutional position. Indeed, some weeks ago I prepared a paper on it and will let the Leader have a copy: it may help him. That the Leader had no better reply to the questions asked of him than this one disparaging of me shows the paucity of his arguments and the weakness of the position that he and his colleagues have had to adopt in an effort to try to defend the quite indefensible actions of the Liberal and Country Parties in the Federal Parliament.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industries Development Act 1941-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a short Bill simply changing the name of the Industries Assistance Corporation to the State Industries Assistance Corporation in order to distinguish it from the Industries Assistance Commission which has a similar name and the same initials, if we do not change the name.

Mr. Coumbe: It is a little different in size.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A little different in size and it has a different function. I think ours is much better.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1967-1975. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is prepared under the consolidations. I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The object of this Bill is to amend section 25 of the Public Service Act in order that cases similar to those dealt with (but have not been dealt with) by that section could be dealt with in a similar fashion. There are a number of Acts which contain specific references to departments or parts of departments and to offices in the Public Service which have been discontinued or abolished by proclamation under section 25 of the Public Service Act. Some of those departments and offices could also possibly have lost their identity by virtue of legislative enactment.

Subsection (3) of section 25 of the Public Service Act confers power on the Governor, from time to time, upon the recommendation of the Public Service Board, to do a number of things including the bringing of a department into existence, creating, and assigning a title to, an office of permanent head of a department, discontinuing a department or part of a department, amalgamating two or more departments or parts of departments, etc. Subsection (6) of that section enables the Governor in a proclamation made under subsection (3) or in a subsequent proclamation to provide for the reading of a reference in any Act to a department affected by a proclamation under subsection (3) as a reference to a different department or the reading of a reference in an Act to an office of permanent head affected by a proclamation under subsection (3) as a reference to a different office, etc., but, unfortunately, some of the earlier proclamations did not contain provisions for the reading of a reference in any Act to a department as a reference to some other department and some Acts which established departments and offices of permanent head of those departments were not amended so as to bring them into line with proclamations made under the Public Service Act. Moreover, subsection (3) as originally enacted was far more limited in scope than subsection (3) as now in force and, in exercising the statutory powers conferred by that section, it is not unreasonable to assume that some unforeseen situation could well have been, or could well be, overlooked.

For instance, subsection (1) of section 15 of the Museum Act, 1939, provided that there shall be a department in the public service called "The Museum Department" and subsection (2) of that section provided that "the director shall be the permanent head of the department". However, by proclamation under the Public Service Act published in the *Gazette* on December 23, 1971, the office of Director, Museum Department, was abolished and the Museum Department, as it then was, became absorbed into the Environment and Conservation Department, and consequently went out of existence, but section 15 of the Museum Act has never been amended and the Act was not brought into line with the proclamation.

There are references in other Acts to departments and offices which have been affected by proclamations under section 25 of the Public Service Act but in a significant number of cases recourse to subsection (6) of that section is available only in relation to proclamations under subsection (3) and any changes that take place by Act of Parliament or by any process other than a proclamation under subsection (3) cannot be dealt with by making the kind of provision contemplated by subsection (6) as it now stands. This situation does not assist the consolidation and interpretation of the Acts which contain provisions that are inconsistent with proclamations under the Public Service Act, and, as paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) of subsection (6) of section 25 do not apply to departments and offices other than those dealt with by proclamation under subsection (3), there is need to confer power on the Governor to bring references to those departments and offices also into line with changes in the law howsoever they might occur, and this Bill is designed to cover such cases.

The Bill amends subsection (6) of section 25 by inserting after paragraph (*c*) a new paragraph (*ca*) which in effect would enable the Governor, in a proclamation referred to in that subsection, to provide for the reading of a provision, word or passage in any Act as some other provision, word or passage where that first mentioned provision, word or passage refers to any department, office, officer or permanent head and had previously been in operation but because of a change in the law, has become inoperative or incapable of interpretation or has become inconsistent with the Public

Service Act or any proclamation made and in force under that Act. The object of the amendment is to bring the Act in which the first mentioned provision, word or passage occurs into line with the change in the law. If this Bill is approved by Parliament before Parliament rises this year the necessary or desirable corrective action could be taken by proclamation and reference to each proclamation could then be made by footnote annotation on the appropriate pages of the new edition of consolidated public general Acts from 1837 to 1975.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I support this short Bill. I have had expert legal advice on it that is favourable, so I am certain I can do no more than add my consent to the Bill. It will enable the Governor by proclamation to make an annotation regarding certain descriptions of departments and offices and officers. Therefore, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

Later:

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is intended to deal with a situation that may arise in the foreseeable future following the amalgamation of the three metropolitan racing clubs. Members may be aware that from July 1, 1975, the South Australian Jockey Club Incorporated, the Adelaide Racing Club Incorporated and the Port Adelaide Racing Club Incorporated amalgamated to form a new club under the name of the South Australian Jockey Club Incorporated.

However, section 31b of the principal Act, the Lottery and Gaming Act, provides for each of these bodies to nominate a member of the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board. Since from July 1, of this year the three named bodies ceased to exist and a new body with, coincidently, the same name as one of the three bodies came into existence, it is clear that some difficulty may arise in the event of an unexpected vacancy occurring on the Totalizator Agency Board. This Bill then provides for a general re-organisation of the board by reducing its members from nine members to five members. It remains for me to add, that the form of the board proposed is the form of the board proposed in a Racing Bill that will in due course be placed before you.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the amendment of the definition of the controlling authority for horse racing by making it clear that it is the South Australian Jockey Club Incorporated as constituted on and after July 1, 1975. Clause 3 provides for the amendment of section 31a of the principal Act by providing a definition of "the declared day" and for the fixing of that day by proclamation. Clause 4 provides for the amendment of section 31b of the principal Act by providing for the reconstruction of the board on the declared day and for the vacation by members of the board of their offices on that day.

Clause 5 provides for the amendment of section 31c of the principal Act by providing for a term of office, not exceeding four years, for members of the board. Clause 6 is a consequential amendment. It provides for the amendment of section 31d of the principal Act by providing for a quorum of three for meetings of the board as reconstituted.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): This Bill amends the Act in relation to the Totalizator Agency Board. The amendments are necessary because of the amalgamation of the three metropolitan racing clubs: the South Australian Jockey Club Incorporated, the Adelaide Racing Club Incorporated, and the Port Adelaide Racing Club Incorporated. Since I first called for an inquiry into the racing industry (a call that was accepted by the Government), the Hancock committee carried out an in-depth study into racing in South Australia, and must be complimented for the work it did, because it proved the necessity for such an inquiry and the need for the three metropolitan racing clubs to amalgamate. It was most important to the horse-racing industry that certain economies be made. Although it was unpleasant certain action had to be taken. The three metropolitan racing clubs, especially the committee members and the Chairmen of the respective clubs, have served the sport well in South Australia.

Today, horse-racing is controlled by the South Australian Jockey Club, and it is to the credit of the horse-racing industry that all clubs have amalgamated on a voluntary basis. Since that action was taken the sport has never looked back. That amalgamation made it necessary for the constitution of the T.A.B. to be amended. Under the provisions of this Bill, the Government is reducing the number of members of the T.A.B from nine to five; two will be appointed on the recommendation of the Minister, one will come from the horse-racing industry, one from trotting, and one from dog-racing. Country horse-racing and trotting clubs will no longer need to be represented, nor will representatives be required from the Port Adelaide Racing Club or the Adelaide Racing Club. The person to represent the S.A.J.C. will represent the whole horse-racing industry in South Australia. The same applies to trotting and dog-racing.

A representative's term of office will be four years, to which I do not object. In addition, I do not object to a quorum of members being reduced from five to three members. The Governor will appoint the Chairman of the board, and will also appoint his deputy. On a board with five members representing three sections of the racing industry, it is only fair and reasonable that the Chairman and his deputy should be impartial. I see no difficulties about the legislation.

The Totalizator Agency Board, in conjunction with the racing industry, has overcome its teething problems. Cost will be the biggest problem in future, and one wonders whether automation can solve the problems in an organisation that is highly labour intensive. It has been said that, with a fully automatic totalizator system similar to that in Western Australia, the board could be involved in an expenditure of about $7 000 000 or $8 000 000. However, that is a matter for the future.

The board as constituted has served racing well. There have been fine gentlemen and various astute businessmen on that board, even though there was a set-back through the operations of data-bet. The board has a responsibility to do what Parliament desires, namely, to control and provide a legal betting service. The returning of profits to the industry has proved worth while, and there have been many benefits to racing in its various forms, as well as financial benefits to the State. The people involved in all the racing sports can be proud of what they have achieved.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the Bill. Unfortunately, it goes only part of the way towards achieving the many changes required in the Act. In October, I sought an indication from the former Minister on whether the Government would proceed with the general racing Bill before the end of this session, and I referred more particularly to allowing for a restructuring of the dog-racing industry. The Minister told me that, before the adjournment, we would be giving first aid treatment regarding the T.A.B. and that the more extensive matters regarding the Bill on racing, particularly dog-racing, would command our attention in, I think, the 1976-77 session. There was no indication that that would be introduced in February.

The Bill makes a desirable alteration, and the Minister contemplates an even more desirable alteration regarding the total racing legislation. Figures given earlier this week show that the returns to the Government from racing have increased markedly in the past 12 months. The figures for several country trotting meetings are equal to or in excess of the returns from the Saturday evening trotting at Globe Derby Park. That shows the amount of money that is around, even in these difficult times.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Those in the country aren't broke, after all?

Dr. EASTICK: The country clubs to which I am referring draw the bulk of their patronage from the city. People go to the premier trotting club in the State, namely, the Gawler Trotting Club, or to the premier country South Australian greyhound dog-racing club at Gawler. Both venues provide useful recreation. I look forward to the more complete Bill on racing, and I support this truncated measure.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. This legislation has been brought here on the last day of this part of the session.

Mr. Evans: It's a bit of a gamble!

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. It must be debated here and then sent to the other Chamber for discussion, and one would presume that it had to be made law today.

Mr. Evans: It came from there.

Mr. MATHWIN: Well, I apologise, but we have been given little time to peruse the Bill and find anything that is wrong with it. The measure will reduce the number of members of the board from nine to five, and this is supported by the organisations concerned and is a step in the right direction. Clause 4 amends section 31b of the principal Act and deals with the constitution of the board. New subsection (5) provides that the persons holding office as members immediately before the declared day shall, on the declared day, vacate their respective offices. I ask how much of their term will members have served. We are reducing the number of members of the board by four, and some members could well have gone on the board for four, five or six years. New subsection (6) (*a*) provides:

Two shall be appointed on the recommendation of the Minister, one of whom shall be appointed to be the Chairman.

Here again, we see that it will be left to the Minister to appoint the Chairman. Does that mean that the Minister does not trust the board to appoint its own Chairman?

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what odds are there on the clock starting again so that we will have an idea of how long the honourable member has to go?

The SPEAKER: That matter will be rectified. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: I hope that you will give me long odds, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Although the machine has broken down, I can tell the honourable member that he has spoken for seven minutes thus far.

Mr. MATHWIN: I hope that my machine does not break down, because that could cause me difficulty. New section 31b (7) provides that the Governor may appoint a person on the recommendation of the Minister to be a deputy of a member other than the Chairman. Here again, there is a distinction, because this member must be other than the Chairman. New section 31b (8) provides that the Governor may appoint a person, who may be a member, on the recommendation of the Minister to be the deputy of the Chairman. So, not only will the Minister appoint the Chairman, but he will also appoint the deputy Chairman. Why does the Minister think that he is the only person who could appoint a reputable person to take over the responsibility of the Chairman and the deputy Chairman?

Mr. Max Brown: Perhaps some people involved in racing are biased.

Mr. MATHWIN: I see the point. New section 31c (1) provides that a member shall be appointed for a term of office not exceeding four years and on conditions determined by the Governor. Does that mean that the term of office of present board members will be more or less than four years? I should like the Minister to clarify that point.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I am prompted to rise by what the member for Light has said, namely, that there will be an increase in revenue to the Government. Revenue is being driven out of this State as a result of the closing of the Naracoorte Trotting Club in a preremptory fashion by the South Australian Trotting Club board. Action is being taken to move trotting to Apsley, Victoria. Surely the Government does not wish to drive people out of the State, but that is what it is doing. The Naracoorte Trotting Club was to be forced to go to Mount Gambier to hold meetings, but Mount Gambier did not want them. Many people in my district do not regard the South Australian Trotting Club's decision very highly, and I would be failing in my duty as the member for the area if I did not protest.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 11 (clause 2)—After "52." insert "(1)".

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 2)—After line 4 insert—

"(2) The power conferred by subsection (1) of this section on the Governor to make regulations shall expire on the thirty-first day of December, 1977."

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

These are minor amendments. Amendment No. 1 is only a correction of a drafting error. The Legislative Council

evidently saw fit to include amendment No. 2. I think some of the members may have been bordering on paranoia in seeing some threat on this matter, but the Government is willing to accept this amendment.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I must disagree with the Attorney's diagnosis, because I believe members in another place acted most responsibly in this matter. The amendment adds the expiry date of December 31, 1977, to bring the legislation effectively to a conclusion. I think that is desirable, because it is undesirable for Acts to continue *ad infinitum* after they have served their useful purpose. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL (GENERAL)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 9 (Second Schedule)—Leave out Wills Act, 1936-1975—Section 7—Section 7 is repealed—Wills Act, 1936-1975.

No. 2. Page 10, second column, lines 2 to 6 (Second Schedule)—Leave out all words in these lines of the second column and insert—

Section 3—

At the end thereof insert "Part III—General Provisions." commencing on a separate line.

No. 3. Page 10, second column (Second Schedule)—Leave out proposed new 26a and insert section as follows:

"26a. Applications of this Part to proceedings under the Motor Vehicles Act—Where proceedings lie against an insurer or nominal defendant under Part IV of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959, as amended, this Part applies to the insurer or nominal defendant as if he were the tort-feasor for whose wrongful act he is liable."

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

They are drafting amendments designed to clarify the intention of the Bill; they do not change its substance.

Motion carried.

SEX DISCRIMINATION BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 6 (clause 16)—After line 39 insert new subclause (2*a*) as follows:

(2*a*) A person discriminates against another on the ground of his sex or marital status if he discriminates against him by reason of the fact that he does not comply, or is not able to comply, with a requirement and—

(*a*) the nature of the requirement is such that a substantially higher proportion of persons of a sex or marital status, other than that of the person discriminated against, complies or is able to comply with the requirement than of those whose sex or marital status is the same as the sex or marital status of that person; and

(*b*) the requirement is not reasonable in the circumstances of the case.

No. 2. Page 16, line 33 (clause 49)—Leave out "he considers" and insert "are".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Amendment No. 1 is a minor amendment.

Dr. Tonkin: It was omitted in error.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Amendment No. 2 raises a question that is rather more connected with legislative policy than with drafting style. It turns on the question whether the regulation-making provision in a Bill should be expressed as "The Governor may make such regulations as he considers necessary" or "The Governor may make such regulations as are necessary". I am not of any great mind one way or the other on this matter. It does not seem to me to make any substantial difference.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I am pleased that the Premier accepts these amendments. The first amendment does not need debate. The second amendment gives effect to a fundamental principle that must be kept in mind at all times. It relates to the difference between the words "he considers" and "are". It is an important matter because, in the original wording of the Bill, the Government had an opportunity to produce regulations that did not conform entirely to the provisions of the legislation. I realise it is unlikely that such a situation would occur, but it could occur. It is important that our legislation be tidied up. In the amended form, regulations must be necessary. It should not have to be spelt out, but I believe it should be spelt out. This amendment puts the matter beyond doubt and means that regulations must conform to the spirit and letter of the legislation. I therefore welcome the Premier's support. I am tempted to comment that I wish the Government would be as amenable in all other matters relating to the preciseness of the law as it has been on this occasion.

Motion carried.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CITY PLAN)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 1—After clause 1 insert new clauses as follows:

1a. Amendment of principal Act, s. 2—Arrangement of this Act—Section 2 of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by striking out from Part V the passage "ss. 40-42j" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "ss. 40-42k";

and

(*b*) by striking out from Part IX the passage "ss. 75-81" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "ss. 75-82".

1b. Amendment of principal Act, s. 42h—Approval for building work—Section 42h of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (12) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:

"(12) A person who carries out building work that has not been approved as required by this section shall be guilty of an offence and, subject to subsection (12a) of this section, liable to a penalty not exceeding two thousand dollars.

(12a) Where a Court, before which a person has been convicted of an offence that is in contravention of subsection (12) of this section, is satisfied that the cost of the building work in relation to which the person was so convicted exceeded two thousand dollars that subsection shall apply and have effect to and in relation to that person as if in that subsection there were substituted for a penalty not exceeding two thousand dollars a penalty not exceeding a sum determined by the court as being the cost of that building work.

(12b) For the purposes of subsection (12a) of this section a certificate under the hand of the Chairman of the Committee specifying a sum as representing the cost of the building work referred to in that subsection shall be *prima facie* evidence that the sum so specified was the cost of that building work.

(12c) For the purpose of this section, building work approved under this section that is carried out in breach or contravention of any modification or condition imposed under this section shall be deemed—

(*a*) to be building work that has not been approved as required by this section;

and

(*b*) to have been carried out at the time at which that breach or contravention occurred."

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to. New clause 1a is merely a drafting amendment made at the request of the Commissioner of Statute Revision. New clause 1b amends section 42h of the principal Act by striking out subsection (12) of that section and inserting several subsections in its place. They could best be explained *seriatim*. New subsection (12) provides for a fine of $2 000 for a person who carries out building work that has not been approved. New subsection (12a) provides that the maximum (and I emphasise the term maximum) penalty may be increased if the cost of the building work exceeds $2 000, in which case the cost of the building work will represent the maximum penalty that can be imposed.

New subsection (12b) is an evidentiary provision. New subsection (12c) provides where building work is carried out in contravention of a modification or condition imposed under section 42h of the principal Act that building work will be deemed not to have been authorised and also to have been carried out at the time the contravention occurred. These amendments are made at the request of the City of Adelaide Development Committee, which has the administration of the relevant part of the Planning and Development Act and have been concurred in by the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, who is Chairman of the committee.

Mr. COUMBE: I am pleased that the Government accepts the amendments. I believe it was overlooked when considering the powers of the committee. Previously, I supported the committee's time being extended, but sooner or later its work must come to an end. If the committee is to do its work properly it must have the right sort of powers, which does not mean that those powers should be excessive. Certainly, it must have regulatory powers under the Building Act and the Local Government Act. The amendment will be of benefit to the committee.

Motion carried.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION (ADDITIONAL POWERS) BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 17 (clause 3)—Leave out "In addition" and insert "(1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section, in addition".

No. 2. Page 1, line 20 (clause 3)—Leave out "a person or body" and insert "the Government of the Commonwealth or an instrumentality of the Commonwealth or the Government of a State or Territory of the Commonwealth or an instrumentality of such a Government or any person or body outside Australia".

No. 3. Page 1 (clause 3)—After line 20 insert new paragraph (2) as follows:

(2) The Minister shall not give his consent under subsection (1) of this section unless he is satisfied—

(*a*) that the carrying out and giving effect to the agreement will not directly or indirectly require the employment by the Commission of any additional officers or employees;

(*b*) that the carrying out and giving effect to the agreement will not prejudice any activity authorised under the Act or otherwise by the Commission in the State;

and

(*c*) that in the carrying out and giving effect to the agreement the Commission will make greatest possible use of outside consultants established in the State.

No. 4. Page 2—After clause 4 insert new clause 5 as follows:

5. Expiry of Act—This Act shall expire on the 31st day of December, 1978.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. They limit to some extent the ambit of the Bill, but in the Government's opinion they are not contrary to the general purpose and would not prevent the object of the Bill from being achieved. The first amendment is formal and really consequential on the remaining ones. The second limits the kinds of agreement into which the commission may enter. Under the original clause 3, the commission could enter into an agreement with any person or body. Under the amendment, it can reach agreement to do work only for the Government of the Commonwealth or any instrumentality of the Commonwealth or the Government of a State or Territory of the Commonwealth or any instrumentality of such a Government or any person or body outside Australia.

Any work that the commission may do in Australia must be in relation to an agreement with another Government or instrumentality. This is of considerable advantage to the commission regarding work in South Australia, because several councils already have approached the commission, and it is appropriate that those approaches should go to the State Planning Authority. If, in the wisdom of the authority, additional assistance is required, it would be the authority to approach the commission. The Government has no objection to that amendment.

Amendment No. 3 limits the circumstances in which the Minister can consent to an agreement reached by the commission to do planning work for any outside authority. The Minister must be satisfied that the reaching of such agreement will not require any increase in employment in the commission. The only impact on the commission would be to use up any excess capacity. Secondly, the Minister must be satisfied that the agreement in question would not prejudice any work that the commission did within this State, which work is to be given priority over work for anyone else.

I do not necessarily agree with the view taken by the Legislative Council, but I will not dispute it. That view was that the commission was a State authority and that there ought to be a priority, if it did any outside work, for Government instrumentalities within the State; for example, the State Planning Authority. This view was put strongly. I do not feel strongly one way or the other, so I agree with it. I do not think it is of great moment.

The third point is that, in carrying out an agreement, the commission will make the greatest possible use of outside consultants in South Australia. That is entirely consistent with the commission's policy. The wage bill of the commission this year is about $900 000, and planned expenditure on consultants established in South Australia is, I think, about $600 000, so the normal work of the commission regarding Monarto will generate substantial work for consultants. There is no reason why any ability that the commission may have to attract jobs from outside South Australia or even within the State should not also benefit consultants. This is the normal way in which the Government would expect the commission to operate.

The third amendment is also acceptable to the Government. The fourth amendment inserts a provision that the Act shall expire at the end of 1978 and ensures that the Act will come up for review in a little more than three years. I would have argued that that provision was not

really necessary but, as this involves the Monarto Development Commission's possibly entering some new fields, I have no objection to it. I am pleased to have the activities of the commission in this area subject to review. It may be necessary to review this matter early in 1978 or late in 1977, because some consultation arrangements could carry on for a significant time. I think the first proposition was that the Bill should expire at the end of 1976, and that would have been a hopelessly inadequate period and unacceptable. This provision is workable, and the Government agrees to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed with these amendments, particularly No. 4. The Bill should have been chucked out. I will discuss particularly amendment No. 4. The original amendment moved in the other place was, I understand, as the Minister has said, that the Bill would expire at the end of next year, and if one of the Liberals had not suddenly collapsed on it the Bill would have been slightly less objectionable to me than it is now, but we can never tell what the Liberals here or in another place will do. I understand that suddenly, when on his feet, the Hon. Mr. Burdett said that he had been convinced by the Minister's argument, and he agreed to the provision regarding 1978.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It took about two hours.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A period of 20 hours ought not to have been enough, or seven times seven, whatever we like to use. He should not have been convinced, and I cannot understand how the Liberals could suddenly have collapsed as they did. I do not oppose the jolly amendments: it is no good doing that now. I could use a stronger word than "jolly", but I always use that adjective rather than perhaps trample on the susceptibilities of some members of this place, and the Minister of Education may be one of them. I regret that the Legislative Council has let the Bill through to all intents and purposes as it left here, because none of these amendments means anything. There is a good reason for the Minister to have a grin on his face, because he has got exactly what he has wanted, and he should not have got it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The amendments are not entirely satisfactory, but they improve the Bill as it passed this Chamber. The first point made here in the debate related to the lack of work in the State for private consultants and the fact that the commission had given more than half its consultancy work to oversea—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's a lie.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I ask that the Minister withdraw that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I ask the Minister to withdraw his statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was about to say that the statement by the member for Davenport was a lie, as usual. I will withdraw that statement and substitute what I did repeat, namely, that the honourable member's statement was a complete and utter untruth.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable Minister to make an unconditional withdrawal of his statement.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I withdraw the use of the word "lie" unconditionally.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As I was saying, the facts on the Monarto Development Commission that I presented to the Houses during the debate have not been disputed by the Minister, except by his crude interjection. These amendments guarantee that work will be handed out to private consultants in South Australia, and nowhere else. Although some work has been handed out in this State, it should be handed out in this State only, and not in other States.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member that, as we are discussing amendment No. 4, he must stick to that one.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, the motion before the Committee is that the amendments be agreed to, and I ask for your ruling on that, Mr. Chairman, because I believe that I should be able to speak to any or all of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold what the honourable member has said, namely, that he may speak to any of the amendments.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The amendments also help to guarantee some of the other points raised during the debate. I said there was little or no point in the commission's continuing in its present form indefinitely if Monarto did not proceed. The Minister said that he expected funds as to the end of 1976, but I doubt whether they will be obtained.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I have not said that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: You have; you said that in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As the honourable member knows, he must not use the word "you"; he must refer to "the Minister".

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister said he hoped that funds would come through by the end of 1976 so that Monarto could proceed. Although I would rather see the termination clause refer to the end of 1976, we still have a guarantee that the commission will not be able to continue indefinitely at its present size if Monarto is not proceeded with by that date. I am pleased to see the termination clause in the amendments. It is also interesting to see that the Government has decided to accept the amendments, because, basically, they are along the lines of Liberal Party policy. Last evening, the Minister announced that he was leasing out land in the Monarto area for farming purposes, and that is also our policy. So, it seems that at long last the Government is starting to adopt certain Liberal Party policies.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is, "That the amendments be agreed to."

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I must correct a matter raised by the member for Davenport. In the 10 years I have been a member, I have never come across a member who has a worse record of terminological inexactitudes. He has a disgraceful record and, invariably, every time he gets up to speak he deals in terminological inexactitudes.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you mean by that term?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the member for Mitcham is a most competent fellow, he knows what I mean by it. The evidence on the use of consultants by the commission is that two-thirds of the work for consultants has gone within South Australia.

Mr. Dean Brown: To private firms?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It has gone to firms in South Australia. When outside consultants have been employed, two-thirds of the work has gone to consultants

established with in South Australia. Regarding Monarto, this Bill does not affect the use of outside consultants: it affects only the work of the commission when it is entering into agreements with other bodies. Government policy is to encourage the commission to use local consultants where they have the capacity to be used. The commission is a great plus for local consultants operating in Adelaide. I say to the member for Mitcham that I regard his remarks as a carry-over from those dark prejudiced days when he was a Liberal Party member. I am sorry that, although he has seen the light on certain constitutional matters, he has not seen the light here, although I still have hopes for him. These matters are not Liberal Party policy, because these amendments were supported in general by two Liberals in another place and opposed by the remainder.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has accused me of being the worst person for twisting statements. I said that the figures I produced in the House were on record. I produced the number of firms and stated whether they were interstate or intrastate firms. I referred on this occasion and on the previous occasion to private consultants. When I interjected "private" on the Minister, he refused to reuse the word "private"; he referred to consultants, the reason no doubt being that six of the so-called consultants were employed in Government departments. The Government at least should have regard for the sad state of engineering and architectural consultants working in South Australia. There has been classic evidence to support the statement I made previously that there was a complete lack of work for these people and that some architects would be retrenched. The Premier is always accusing me of having my facts wrong whereas, if he looks at it, he will see that invariably my facts are always correct. I did not say that these amendments fulfilled Liberal Party policies; I said that they went towards them, and it is pleasing to see the Government moving its policies towards those of the Liberal Party and at least admitting that it was wrong.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I must correct what the member for Davenport has said, although it should not be necessary to do so. The term "terminological inexactitude" does not mean a twisted statement: it means that the statement has been turned completely in reverse and falsified—an untruth, that is what it means.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister.

Mr. Gunn: Yes, but you are a past master—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the member for Eyre. The honourable Minister must not make a personal attack, but must stick to the amendments.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am being greatly provoked. What I said was that the Monarto Development Commission in its employment of private consultants has spent two-thirds of the money that it has spent in that area on the employment of consultants who are established within the State of South Australia.

Mr. Dean Brown: You don't deny the statement I made previously?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The statement the honourable member made previously was the completely reverse of that. He had better check that in *Hansard*. I have given members a warning about the member for Davenport previously. He has just demonstrated the necessity for that warning again this afternoon.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wonder whether I may, with charity and deference, give a word to the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mitcham must speak to the motion. I have ruled to that effect.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, Sir, I do not think the Minister realises that the member for Davenport is only teasing him and, every time he rises to the bait by getting to his feet again to answer something the member for Davenport has said, that pleases the member for Davenport and wastes a lot of time of the Committee, I suggest that, if he wants to get his Bill through, (apparently his colleagues are not prepared to say this to him) the best thing for him to do, as the member for Torrens is saying, is to sit down and shut up.

Motion carried.

FURTHER EDUCATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 12. Page 1916.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): When I got the adjournment last night I was so angry with what had been said during the debate that I proposed to make a long speech on this, but as about 12 to 15 hours have now elapsed since then I have calmed down somewhat and I do not intend to speak at any great length on it. What irritated me last night was that the member for Mallee, who I understand is the shadow Minister of Education in his Party, made a carefully prepared speech that was sensible in the circumstances, since he knew before he began that the Bill is not to go through this session. Sometimes he makes a considered speech, and last night was one of those occasions. He said all that needed to be said about the Bill.

However, his predecessor as the shadow Minister then felt impelled to get up and to say the same things, albeit with not as much charity as the member for Mallee. To top it off, the member for Torrens (and I hope he will forgive me for referring to him) as a former Minister of Education felt impelled to get up and say the same things again. By that time I was getting a bit cross and I was going to make a full-blown speech on this. However, I know that this Bill is only to go to the first clause of the committee stage and is then to be looked at again (for heaven knows it does need to be looked at). All I want to say is that the Liberal Movement is perturbed about the form in which the Bill has been produced. It has been described to me as a monster, and that may be right. It is certainly open-ended.

Regarding the monstrous side of it, I remind myself that when I first came into this place and started to take an interest in the administration of education in South Australia, we had a Director of Education (the late Evan Mander-Jones), and a Deputy Director (the late Gilbert MacDonald), and that was that. The Minister above them (uneasily perhaps) was Sir Baden Pattinson, who is still, I am glad to say, with us. The three of them ran the system. Now we have got two Directors-General and about five Deputy Directors-General and a number of Directors, and so no. I have never known an organisation to so mushroom and grow as has the education structure, if I may use that word, in South Australia. This Bill is another great leap forward in that process. It is Parkinson's law gone mad. That is one of the objections I have to this monster. The other was put by the member for Mallee, and that is that the Bill is open ended. There is no specification of courses that will be offered. There is likely to be duplication and rivalry between the colleges of advanced education and the Further Education Department.

No-one knows what sort of rewards the department proposes for the end of its course. We already have, I think, eight colleges of advanced education in South

Australia as well as two universities, and yet there is the real chance that this department will come into the tertiary field and offer its own qualifications at that level. I have always regarded the Further Education Department as offering courses that are post-secondary—not at the tertiary level—and interest and hobby courses.

Mr. Coumbe: Vocational and subprofessional.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is a rather more pompous way of putting it. I prefer to think of them as fun courses that people do for general interest as much as anything else. That is really the role of the Further Education Department.

Mr. Coumbe: Plus apprentices.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I grant that to the member for Torrens. That is not all that is contained in this Bill. As has been pointed out before, one has only to look at the definition of "further education" to see this and I take objection to clause 9 (3). At the present time I understand that the Torrens College of Advanced Education is responsible for the training of staff for this department but, now, under clause 9 (3), it looks as though it wants to do its own training; why, I cannot possibly imagine. I adopt the various points made by the member for Mallee on this occasion. I have one other small drafting point to add, and perhaps the Minister can deal with this. Clause 6 states:

Subject to this Act, the Minister shall have the general administration of this Act, and the administration and control of the teaching service.

What possible addition to the sense of that clause is the word "general"? I cannot imagine why it has been put there. I am glad that the Bill is to be looked at again and that there are to be second thoughts about it, because in the form it is now I would be very hesitant to support it at all.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I wish to indicate to the Minister the difficulties already forming in the minds of people who have looked at the provisions contained in the Bill. This relates to a question I put to him on an earlier occasion in respect of the adult education or further education courses entering into various aspects of the wine industry. Roseworthy Agricultural College, a college of advanced education, provides a diploma course in oenology and, with the contacts it has with the industry, there is some concern expressed whether we might have parallel empires virtually in the one district with the further education centre at Gawler progressing along lines somewhat similar to but not necessarily as advanced as Roseworthy.

I appreciate that these matters are not yet resolved, but I put them to the Minister as being a very real issue that is causing some concern and some questioning in the minds of people who are vitally interested in the wine industry and who would hate to see a situation arise in which limited funds (and let us accept that for education, as for all things, for some time there will be a limitation on funding) are involved in a duplication. The other matter I raise is in respect of clause 9 (5) wherein the Minister may make available any premises and equipment for the purpose of further education. I sincerely hope that there will be a maximisation of use of education facilities and a minimisation of duplication of facilities so that all are properly used.

I appreciate there has to be a balance with regard to this matter, and that we do not have a situation arising in which we are denied the opportunity of improving further education because of the limitation on premises and other equipment that can be used out of normal time from the ordinary departmental use. There have been examples of two palaces virtually existing side by side and neither of them being properly used. That is a situation that I believe we cannot accept. The Minister has indicated (and I hope I am not quoting this undertaking out of context) that it will go to the group responsible for looking at the whole of the plan of education in South Australia.

I hope that before the Bill is considered next in the House the Minister will take the opportunity of allowing members of that organisation to discuss the results of their inquiries with members of both sides of the House, in a seminar-type situation where there can be an exchange of views, and where the responsible officers can clearly indicate what they have found, and the manner in which they have gone about their work. At the same time, they can try to answer members of both sides of the House who are interested in the future of this whole undertaking. It may be novel and breaking new ground. I am not suggesting putting officers on the spot, or in any way trying to undermine the authority of the Minister. I think sufficient members in this House have indicated their awareness and keenness to see this whole exercise come to fruition in a proper and total sense, that whatever steps can be taken along the lines that I have suggested to make sure that we do finish up with a very worthwhile and manageable Act should be taken, and I put it to the Minister with all sincerity.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I thank those members who have made a constructive contribution to this debate. The member for Mitcham rather stole my fire in his references to the offering last night by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because it is true that all that honourable member did was to repeat what the spokesman for his Party on this matter had already said, but did so in a rather nasty fashion. Certain matters have been raised to which I want to refer. This debate largely occurred last evening, and I have not yet had the advantage of being able to peruse the *Hansard* pulls and refresh my memory on everything said. I can deal with some matters raised straight away, and other matters members will have an opportunity to take up in Committee with me in February as we go through the clauses. The member for Mallee raised the matter of teacher registration. I want to make clear that this Goverment adopted teacher registration at the request of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. It has been the policy of that union for about 10 years to have registration of teachers. It has never been the policy of that organisation, as far as I am aware, that this should extend to teachers operating in the further education field, because of the special circumstances that operate in that field, particularly in relation to the enrichment courses to which the member for Mitcham, I thought in a slightly derogatory way, referred.

The member for Mallee asked why there was no reference to this matter in the Act. That is not necessary. There is another Act under which people involved in teaching are supposed to be registered, and the fact that this Bill is silent on the matter means that they will have to be registered, if that was taken in isolation. However, Cabinet has approved a regulation of the Education Act specifically exempting teachers in further education from registration for two years. I make the point that the only reason for making any mention of registration in this Act would have been to exempt teachers in the area from registration, rather than bringing them within the ambit of that other Act, since it is the other Act that does the job for us. It will be as a result of a regulation to be gazetted soon that teachers of further education will be exempted from the provisions of registration.

When discussing clause 9 (3), I think it is important to make a distinction between powers that a Government may seek under Statutes, and those things that in the short term a Government may want to do. There is no intention on the part of this Government either in the short term or in the foreseeable future to establish separate training institutions for the training of teachers in further education. As has been pointed out, Torrens College of Advanced Education is at present charged with this responsibility, and so long as the colleges of advanced education are prepared to discharge this responsibility there will be no duplication sanctioned by this Government. Colleges of advanced education, about which so much has been said in this debate (almost to the exclusion of the institution we were supposed to be discussing—the Further Education Department) are autonomous bodies.

It is not possible for me to give them directions, despite the position I occupy as Minister of Education. Furthermore, I do not have, as it were, statutory powers over these institutions, nor do I have financial powers over them, because they are almost wholly funded from Federal sources. There are those institutions such as Roseworthy Agricultural College, that have non-tertiary courses, that are funded from State sources, and we have broken new ground in the past couple of weeks by agreeing to fund for one year only courses in legal practice at the South Australian Institute of Technology and Italian Language and Culture at Adelaide College of Advanced Education. By and large, the power of the purse resides in Canberra and the colleges are autonomous.

Given the case that at some time in the future the colleges, acting within their autonomy, said that they would not train people for this area, it would be necessary for the Government of the day to have some statutory power somewhere available to it so that the slack could be taken up. This Government does not intend the Further Education Department to expand into the field envisaged in clause 9 (3), but I think it would be foolish not to have the power available should the necessity arise to use it some time in the future. I make that distinction between the general power available if we have to use it, and the immediate or, indeed, long-term intentions if things remain very much as they are.

I return, in talking of collaboration, which seems to have been the basic focus of members, to the central point that colleges of advanced education are autonomous bodies. If there are reasons why this Parliament sanctioned fairly careful drafting of sections of their Acts about collaboration it was because of that point, that from the proclamation of the Acts those institutions would be autonomous except as to the limitations enjoined on them by those Statutes. We are not talking about an autonomous body when we talk about the body that is legitimised by this Act—we are talking about a Government department, and about a Director-General who will be subject to me as Minister, and my successors, and subject to such directions as we would give him from time to time. That important distinction must be kept in mind when talking about autonomy. It is possible for the Government of the day, through its control of the Director-General of Further Education, to ensure that there is proper collaboration between this new department and those other areas with which it rubs shoulders: the universities, the higher levels of secondary education and the colleges of advanced education. That same power is not available to me as an administrative fact so far as the colleges of advanced education are concerned; it can only be gained by Statute.

Those who are criticising the fact that this legislation is silent on this matter can be saying only that they lack confidence in me as Minister or in this Government to be able to ensure that what resources are given to this area will be given in such a way as to ensure that no duplication takes place. On those grounds I have agreed that we should not proceed with this Bill. I see no reason why any amendment is required to the Bill along the lines suggested by members opposite. I am more than happy to speak to those people who have fears in this matter to see whether I can satisfy them, and to assure them that this Government is prepared to listen to representations to do with any legislation we are bringing before the House. Although I do not see the necessity, I am willing to listen to proper argument on this point. I hope that members, in looking at the general problem, will see the validity of what I am saying: the distinction between a Government department subject to a Minister, and a set of autonomous institutions.

In passing, I should pay a tribute to the contribution made in this debate by the member for Playford. I will certainly take up the matters he raised in relation to Statutes and regulations which are to do with the colleges of advanced education. The central issue here is the Further Education Department rather than the colleges of advanced education. The honourable member mentioned in passing the relative amounts of money available to the colleges of advanced education and the technical and further education area. By implication he seemed to be saying, "If you look at the Taffy report, as it has become known, there were to have been enormous amounts of money made available for the further education area, and look what could happen if this money was splashed around."

If we look at the eventual outcome of the money that has been made available for further education and advanced education to the end of 1976, we can see that technical and further education is by no means the favoured darling of those who hold the ultimate purse strings in this country. In fact, if we looked at the capital needs for further education and colleges of advanced education, we would have to say that further education was a sadly neglected area. We have only to look around the city at the sorts of facilities in which technical and further education is conducted to see that, despite some extremely good institutions from the viewpoint of capital expenditure (and we think of Panorama and O'Halloran Hill), nonetheless, the Further Education Department is still very much in the situation of operating out of cast-offs from other areas of education. That is not really good enough.

Although I am not certain that the member for Mallee with a little more thought would maintain that further education generally is some sort of favoured animal, I simply want to put the matter right that, over the years, it has tended to be a neglected area of education. The money and facilities are simply not available for duplication between the two areas. No Government has that sort of money available to enable it to contemplate undertaking or allowing the sort of duplication that seems to be feared by some members. As was said previously, it is not intended to carry this Bill beyond the purely formal stage of getting it into Commitee, and we will consider it again in February. In the meantime, I intend to allow anyone who wishes to do so to make representations to me on the contents of the Bill. I hope when representations are made they will be made against the background that I have outlined regarding the fundamental differences between the Further Education Department and the colleges.

I urge members to support this measure. No-one in the debate has referred to the central point of the legislation, which relates to the propriety or otherwise of having a Further Education Department that is separate from the Education Department. That was not the situation until a few years ago.

Dr. Eastick: No-one condemned that.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: True. That is the point I am making. I assume that members' silence implies consent and that the decision of my predecessor to set up a separate Further Education Department is one that does meet the unanimous approval of the House.

Dr. Eastick: Will you organise a discussion group?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I intend to get as wide a dissemination of the contents of this legislation as I can in the additional time available. This will include the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research, most certainly the colleges of advanced education, and any other individual who wishes to put representations before me. The member for Mitcham referred to the proliferation of Public Service positions in the administrative field in this area. I invite the honourable member to consider the vast increase in enrolments that has occurred in all areas of education since he first came into the House (I think that was the date to which he referred), and also the vast increase in the amount of resources made available to the education of each student. It would be most surprising if there had not been some increase in the administrative area to ensure that these resources were used in the proper manner.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 1687.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, which has been passed by the other Chamber. I see no real difficulties with the proposals contained in the Bill, which will upgrade the Architects Act to conform to modern practice in most aspects of the profession. In speaking of the architectural field, I believe we as Parliamentarians should be conscious that throughout the world there is a shortage of accommodation for human beings. Although in the past most accommodation units have been created outside architectural supervision, there is no doubt that architectural expertise has played a large part in the history of the world and, to a great degree, in the history of this State and Australia as a whole.

We should also realise that in the next 25 years, before the turn of the century, the world will have to produce more accommodation units than have been created since man first stood upright, and that is the task that is before us in the field of house construction. Of course, the architect's field goes wider than just that of supervision of building houses. In the main, this is a Bill to protect the buying or contracting for a new home, or buying an established house or one built for sale by speculation, or with speculation in mind. The public is protected so that it can be reasonably assured, if there is a claim by any person selling the property, that it has been built under architectural supervision by a person who is qualified as such.

All States now have an Architects Board. I believe the two Territories also have that facility. About four years ago the Architects Accreditation Council of Australia was established, with the object of looking at the qualifications of people, to a large degree those who had come from other lands, to see whether their qualifications were of a standard suitable to supervise and design work in the building field—in other words, to qualify as architects. This accreditation council had the opportunity of issuing certificates to those persons whom it believed were qualified. I am told that that council hopes that this certificate will eventually be recognised in other countries so that South Australians, or Australians, who are recognised here will also be recognised in other countries. I believe that it is very important if qualified people are to get greater experience, and then come back here and attempt to put that experience into operation, to improve our standards of building and upgrade the methods we use in construction and design within Australia.

The Bill makes it an offence for a person to use the word "architect" in plying for hire in that field of endeavour, except a naval architect, a landscape architect or a golf-course architect. They, of course, have their own qualifications. But if a person wishes to be associated with working on building design and supervision, he cannot use the word "architect". Pressure was used by the Society of Architects within the past two or three years to stop persons who claimed to be architectural designers from using the word "architectural". That is quite satisfactory but, of course, the Bill does not stop anyone from using the term "building designer". People do not have to be architects to design a building: even if this amendment is made to the Act, they can still design buildings and supervise their construction. At this stage, local government accepts that situation. I say quite strongly that I hope local government always accepts that situation, because there is no doubt that, for persons building an average house, quite often there is an advantage to have a building designer, because he can operate at a lesser rate and obtain a finished product suitable in quality and aesthetic value for the home owner. So, I believe it is wise that we have left the opportunity for the building designer still to operate but, if he claims that he is an architect and he is not, he can be dealt with under this provision.

One aspect of the Bill that I believe is good is that it stops land agents and builders from advertising homes and giving the impression that they have been built under the supervision of an architect. The Hon. Murray Hill raised this matter in another place, emphasising the importance of the Government's informing the public, and in particular the businessmen who operate in this field, of that aspect. I believe that, if the construction of houses is supervised by an architect, as long as the persons selling make the point in the advertisement that their construction was supervised by an architect and name the architect, and that person is certified, there is no problem. But if they just advertise that the work has been supervised by an architect and do not mention an architect's name, and the land agent or the business advertising the property is not an architect, they are liable. I think that we should make sure people are informed of the change in the law, as they could be acting quite innocently and be liable to a considerable fine—I think of about $500. I hope that the Minister, through his press secretary, can make that point and make sure that it is mentioned in the press.

The Bill also gives the opportunity for groups of architects, or other tertiary qualified people, to form companies. I agree with the provision in the Bill that two-thirds of the members must be qualified architects,

the balance being people with other qualifications. It was suggested by a member in another place that one could be a lawyer, but it could be a surveyor, a town planner or a person in one of many fields. Also, the qualification is that two-thirds of the voting power must stay with the qualified architects within that firm or company. I think that is an acceptable provision, and I raise no objection to it.

The Minister has made sure that the people who form these companies or are partners in limited companies, must take out a policy indemnifying themselves against any claims in case the financial assets of the directors will not cover any claim. By that I infer that the Bill also makes the individual directors fully liable for any claim that may be made against them for faulty work or supervision, and the qualification that they must indemnify themselves, with the board's approval of the amount, against any claim guarantees that any person who is aggrieved by poor quality work or lack of supervision will be fully compensated.

The Bill is acceptable to the Liberal Party. I should like the Minister to know that recently a house was built in the Hills. After a court hearing started, the matter was settled by mutual agreement. I inspected that house. Building is one field in which I believe I have a reasonable amount of knowledge. The house was built under the supervision of a quite prominent architect, a person who at the time held a reasonably high position with the Society of Architects. It is depressing to go to a constituent's house and see not just one or two faults in structure but a multitude of faults, apart from other minor faults in paint work. That person had to go to court to get justice, yet the architect involved, to my knowledge, has never been disciplined in any way by the board, although I know that complaints were lodged. One must ask, where does the average person get justice in that situation? I have always advocated, and believed in, boards being in charge of professional groups. I have said the same about lawyers and have been attacked for saying that. Here is a case where a person with knowledge of the building industry, any architect, or every member of the board, could have gone on site and seen that the building was substandard. One could claim it should have been bulldozed down and started again: that is how bad it was. The person who now has the house is prepared to show any other person who wishes to view the house just how serious the matter is. He has, in my opinion, a real complaint.

I raise this matter because I believe the Society of Architects and the board, if they wish to protect that profession and maintain the high standing it has had in the past, must have, as organisations, the courage to take action in these circumstances. If they do not, they make a laughing stock of the profession. I know there were difficulties in this case with regard to materials and a change of builder, but that does not matter: the person employed a professional man to carry out a duty, and spent a large sum of money to build that house. Any person in this Chamber could have supervised the construction of that house and ended up with a better job than that client had. I am pleased that the two parties came to an agreement on this matter. I do not know whether they are both satisfied; I suppose that would be impossible. This Bill does go some way further in dealing with that situation, so I support it with great enthusiasm because a person's house is the major purchase he makes in a lifetime. I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the honourable member for Fisher for his remarks and for the fact that he has indicated his support and that of the Liberal Party for this measure. I was pleased to hear the endorsement by the honourable member of the Government's intention to provide further protection for consumers in South Australia. The only other matter I need refer to is that the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw in the other place, in congratulating this Government for bringing this measure forward, said that there had been a four-year delay. I do not propose to contribute further to that delay.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

PUBLIC FINANCE (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 1, line 13 (clause 4)—After "ments" insert "being arrangements of a kind that have been authorised by or under any Act or law of the State or Commonwealth".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to and the following alternative amendment be made in lieu thereof:

Clause 4, page 1, lines 11 to 14—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

(*a*) That moneys in an amount specified are payable, or would, if appropriated by the Parliament of the Commonwealth, be payable, by the Commonwealth to the State for expenditure by the State in accordance with specified arrangements, being arrangements that are authorised, or of a kind that have been previously authorised, by or under any Act or law of the State or Commonwealth and that have been agreed upon between the State and the Commonwealth;

The reason for this disagreement to the original amendment and the substitution of another amendment is to express more clearly what is meant and to put it beyond doubt. I am certain that members in another place will be happy to accept it.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): So far as I can tell, the alternative amendment spells out the position in more detail. As the two provisions are not in conflict, I do not oppose the change. Now that a certain action has been taken elsewhere it is probably not very necessary, anyway. In any event, it can do no harm and I support it.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the alternative amendment expresses the intent more clearly.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment to which the House of Assembly had disagreed and had agreed to the alternative amendment made by the House of Assembly without amendment.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION JURISDICTION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 3 (clause 8)—After line 6 insert new subclause (1a) as follows:

(1a) Notwithstanding anything in the principal Act or any other Act or law contained, no employer shall enter into or give effect to a prescribed agreement, until the Commission, upon application made to it by any person in that regard, certifies that that agreement is not against the public interest.

Penalty: Two thousand dollars.

No. 2. Page 3 (clause 8)—After line 11 insert new subclause (3) as follows:

(3) In this section a "prescribed agreement" means any agreement, arrangement or understanding that directly or indirectly relates to or effects the payment of over-award wages or salary to twenty or more employees.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

The effect of these amendments, which insert new subclauses (1a) and (3) in clause 8 of the Bill, is to require employers to submit to certification to the commission a multiplicity of agreements, arrangements and understandings that may directly or indirectly affect the payment of over-award wages to 20 or more employees. The Government opposes these amendments because amendments of this nature cannot cover the field with sufficient provision to justify the creation of a criminal offence punishable by a fine of up to $2 000. I have concluded that these changes are impractical. Without any fear of contradiction, I say that an additional Police Force will have to be provided or about 300 extra inspectors will have to be employed by the Labour and Industry Department to find the people deliberately breaking this law. I think it is one of the most erroneous pieces of legislation I have seen. I was shocked by it. I am nonplussed by this amendment, because the Government believes it would be impossible to implement. The proposition we have put forward placed the onus fairly and squarely on the commission to look at agreements and, if they are within the guidelines or not outside public interest, the commission can then register them. In the amendments the onus is being placed in a different direction. It is placing the onus on the inspectors. The amendment is trying to get at employees through employers; that is the tricky part. The idea is to stop employers negotiating at all with employees for agreements, because under threat the employers could say that they might be fined $2 000 if they negotiated. The Government believes that this is outside the spirit of the legislation, and opposes the amendments.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: What the Minister has just said does not surprise me. During the Committee stage, I raised the grave limitation imposed on this Bill as it was presented to the House. That limitation was that only agreements that had to be registered would come under the provision of wage indexation. When I was talking about the limitations of that, the Premier through interjection agreed that it did impose a severe limitation on the implementation of wage indexation. The Premier said that this must apply because it was the only way such agreements could be registered. We have found a way for the Premier whereby he can still have agreements registered, and this would not necessarily impose a huge burden on the court. If all agreements had to be registered, if by any chance I decided to employ a gardener and increased his salary by $2, that would have to be registered.

There would be a most incredible list of registrations and a backlog of registrations. If the Minister opposes that type of proposal, I would support him, but we have brought in a condition that restricts the number of agreements that need to be registered. The important part is whether or not the Government wants wage indexation to work. Does the Government want to be able to control wage increases and the frightening inflation rate we are now experiencing, or is the Government willing to allow that to continue? There is a basic restriction in the effect of this Bill, and that is that wage indexation does not apply to any agreement that is not registered. The effect of the Bill is that, instead of having registered agreements, we will simply move into the field of not registering agreements, and shortly wage indexation will not apply. The amendments will allow the Government to achieve its objective, an objective which it has constantly talked about and which it has constantly tried to uphold.

I suspect that the Government does not want wage indexation and wishes to give way to the power of the unions so that wage indexation is a skeleton the Government can hide in the cupboard. Either the Government wants wage indexation to work (and the amendments will let it work) or it does not. I suspect the Government wants the latter. The Minister has put up the rather weak argument that several hundreds of people will be needed to police this provision. When other legislation is introduced it is always considered that people will slip by, but the penalty that is provided in this case is high enough to catch an employer and to stop him from entering into such an illegal agreement. The penalty imposed on an employer, should he be caught, will do all the policing that is necessary. I suggest that no additional people will be needed. The Minister's argument was weak and was a vain attempt to try to find some sort of excuse for not accepting these amendments. I support the amendments and believe at long last that we have seen the true attitude of the Government and that it does not want wage indexation to apply in practice, but wants it to apply only in theory.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): The current situation is that we have awards and registered agreements that are official and enforceable. Unregistered agreements are unenforceable at law and have been treated as being unenforceable between groups, not between individuals, for about 100 years. I expect the member for Mitcham would agree with that. The history of these amendments is that, in the circumstances that prevailed on Tuesday and Wednesday, an amendment was prepared by the Chamber of Manufactures, or one of the Opposition's advisers. Unfortunately, the second reading debate was contrary to the proposed amendment, which was a hell of a mess anyway. In desperation, the Leader threw his hands up in despair in relation to his advisers and said, "Let us have a division and get rid of it." In the meantime, I see the hand of a crafty but not very good draftsman, perhaps originating from the Pirie Street quarter, who thought these amendments were a way to embarrass the Government.

Unfortunately, the difficulty with that is that the amendment is so vague that it is impracticable. What does "prescribed agreement" mean? It means any agreement, arrangement (that is a new word in industrial terminology) or understanding. I am not sure what that means, either. Are we to have psychiatrists who will enter into a subjective analysis of what went on in the minds of the parties concerned to determine what were those understandings and arrangements?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You must register your subjective understanding of what you think the agreement means.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, but I do not know how it would be done. The amendment is so vague, it is bad. It might be cunning or devious draftsmanship, but it is bad draftsmanship and is not really up to the normal standard of the Chamber of Manufactures or the usually good lawyers the chamber retains. Having defined "prescribed agreement", one amendment proceeds "agreement, arrangement or understanding that directly or indirectly relates to or

effects (I am not sure whether that should be "effect" or "affect"), the payment of over-award wages or salary"—

Mr. Max Brown: Would that mean a production bonus?

Mr. McRAE: I am not sure what it means. What are over-award wages, anyway? We went through this matter the other evening. Anyone who says he can actually define "over-award wages" is doing well. It was attempted the other evening, but it was a dismal failure.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a common expression.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, but as we found out, it is capable of three different meanings. Members opposite got themselves into a hell of a fix trying to say what they thought were over-award payments. As this provision has a penalty annexed to it, it must therefore be interpreted strictly. I can imagin the sort of defences that would be raised. It is an agreement that directly or indirectly relates to or effects (if that is the right word) the payment of over-award wages, and they are not defined, because they cannot be defined. The term "salary" is even vaguer. I wonder how the term "arrangement or understanding" will be viewed in a criminal court because, after all, a penalty is imposed and that is where the matter will be heard. How will an arrangement or understanding which is in the minds of the Party and not in writing and which effects or affects (whatever the case may be) the payment of an undefinable sum, namely, wages or salary, (also indefinable but capable of three different meanings), be proved?

Mr. Millhouse: The longer you talk the more I suspect there is another reason for opposing the measure.

Mr. McRAE: The proposed amendments are worthy of consideration, because they are a belated attempt to regain ground lost on Tuesday and Wednesday. This is vague, impractical and unenforceable. It is totally wrong. If the Government were to introduce legislation such as this, the member for Mitcham would have a jolly good go at us for being vague and impracticable. I support what the Minister said.

Mr. COUMBE: I am not surprised at the Minister's rejection of the amendments. He is in enough trouble now, and probably he would be in more trouble if the amendments were agreed to. He is in a dilemma. He supported indexation and at the same time opposed sweetheart agreements. We have supported him in that approach, and the amendments tighten the process whereby sweetheart agreements can be slipped in surreptitiously.

Registered agreements do not always have to be renewed, and circumstances arise where a new agreement can be written in and brought to the Registrar. My fear is that some people will not enter into registered agreements. Some organisations, to avoid the process of indexation, may try to get away with it, and that will defeat the purpose of indexation. More consideration should be given to amendment No. 1 to close those loopholes. The only thing that I have doubt about is whether 20 is the correct figure in amendment No. 2.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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 CHAIRMAN: There are 23 Ayes and 23 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes. The motion therefore passes in the affirmative.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments do not cover the field with sufficient precision.

Later:

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

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

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

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have been in the Chamber while this matter has been debated through the normal stages of its passage and while the amendments from another place have been considered. I say categorically that the true motives of the Government are now clear. A clause 8 that was totally vague has been replaced in the Legislative Council by a detailed and far more satisfactory clause. It is a clause that means something, whereas the previous clause did not.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It's a clause of capitalists!

Dr. TONKIN: For goodness sake, I wish the Attorney would grow up a little. We now have a true indication of exactly what this legislation is worth. The Government is not interested in stopping sweetheart agreements: it is interested only in listening to its masters at the Trades Hall.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: Members of the Government can scream all they want.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Leader has the floor. I ask that interjections cease.

Dr. TONKIN: We heard Mr. Scott and inumerable trade union leaders condemn the Premier and the Minister when the proposal for wage indexation and for a ban on sweetheart agreements was raised in this place in a Ministerial statement made by the Premier. There was conflict not only in the daily press but also in the union press. The Minister now has the gall to introduce legislation at short notice hoping that Parliament will not notice the shortcomings of a window-dressing clause that means nothing. We were in error in this place, and I fully admit that—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I was going to tell you about that.

Dr. TONKIN: —for not picking up the full implications of clause 8.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You've been rubbishing yourself.

Dr. TONKIN: I am not ashamed to do it when we have missed something. At least that is more than the Minister is willing to do. When another place has tidied it up and made it mean what the Government said it originally meant, the Government opposes it. The Government opposes it, because it does not really want it. The legislation will not be able to be implemented, but the Government can say that it favoured any legislation that banned sweetheart agreements and that it legislated for that. What a sham and fraud! If the Government was

honest, it would agree to these soundly based and well drawn amendments. I have admitted on behalf of our Party and probably the whole Opposition that we did not see the implications of this when the Bill was before this place.

Mr. Millhouse: You speak for yourself.

Dr. TONKIN: I did not hear the member for Mitcham point it out, either.

The CHAIRMAN: I inform honourable members that interjections are out of order, including interjections by a member sitting in the seat of another member. I should like honourable members to give the Leader the opportunity to continue without interjection.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister should be honest and say that the Government really meant its statement that it wanted to control the agreements and that it agrees to these amendments. If Government members do not do that, they stand as frauds.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: I remind honourable members that towards the end of the Leader's speech I ruled that interjections were out of order and said that they must cease. I hope that this will apply from both sides.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: One problem that the Opposition has now is that it did not think of the proposition, and it has turned sour about it. You did—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The word "you" is *not* permitted. The term is "honourable member", and I must be consistent in my rulings.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Honourable members did not see fit to amend this legislation. They did not talk about this matter, because they agreed. Not one Opposition member raised any objection to it.

Mr. Becker: The member for Light did.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, he asked a question.

Mr. Becker: He opposed the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: He opposed the Bill on other grounds, one reason for that being that he has been to the Constitution Convention and thinks that he is an expert on constitutional matters. He is quite good on some things, but he did not want to understand the constitutional challenge. The amendment has come from the Chamber of Manufactures. Not one union secretary or organiser has sat in this Chamber or in the other place since the Bill was introduced.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I intend to warn any honourable member who interjects in future.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr. Bob Dunn has been sitting in either this Chamber or the other place continually since the legislation started to go through. Now we know that the Chamber of Manufactures has dictated to members on the other side.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has referred to a specific person as sitting in this Chamber, and I believe that that is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order and ask the Minister to continue without referring to people outside the Chamber.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have already said that employees of the Chamber of Manufactures who are senior industrial officers have been sitting in this Chamber since the legislation started to go through.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you have upheld a point of order that I think has been validly upheld, and the Minister has promptly offended again by referring to other people, strangers, in the precincts of this Chamber. There should be no reference to them.

The CHAIRMAN: In this case, the Minister did not name anyone. I must tell the Minister that people in the gallery must not be referred to.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If that is the case, I should like members of the Opposition not to take their orders from people in the gallery. If we are not allowed—

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday, when the Speaker was in the Chair, a point of order was taken about a member on this side having accused the Australian Labor Party of being dictated to by other groups, such as communists and left-wing unions, and the Government, through its representative, took a point of order. The Minister is doing the same thing in reverse now, and I ask you to rule on that.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot say what happened yesterday, so I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If I am on the wrong track regarding the etiquette of this place, I should like the member for Davenport to explain to me how he got the personal knowledge that he got if the Opposition is not dictated to by the Chamber of Manufactures, the Employers Federation, and the board rooms of this State. I challenge the member for Davenport to explain his Question on Notice last week in which he asked me about correspondence that had passed between me and the Secretary or President of the Chamber of Manufactures. I challenge him to say who gave him that information. The Secretary of the Chamber of Manufactures gave it to him, because Opposition members are in the pocket of the Chamber of Manufactures.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope that from now on the Minister will speak to the amendments before the Committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I should hope that the Opposition would do the same, because when the Leader of the Opposition spoke he made all sorts of accusation about this Bill and about who was controlling the Labor Party. If I cannot say who is controlling the Liberal Party, I do not think the proposition is fair, and I do not think you are being quite fair about it.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order—

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable Minister and the honourable Leader of the Opposition to resume their seats. I ask the Minister to withdraw that statement, because it is a reflection on the Chair.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will withdraw it on account of you, Sir, and for no other reason. Let us be honest about this matter. The Leader of the Opposition attacked this Government, which is genuinely trying to do something about wage indexation.

Dr. Tonkin: You could have fooled us.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Well, it fooled you and went through the House the first time, if that's your example, because you didn't pick it up.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! At all times the use of the word "you" is not allowed, despite the fact that we all get a little heated at times; "honourable member" should be used.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Legal advisers to the Government assure me that the legislation introduced on

Tuesday is sufficient to control wages, to implement wage indexation and to keep the economy buoyant. The amendment does not cover the field with sufficient precision. The Bill as drafted will control the situation. If anyone goes before the commission after the guidelines have been determined and the anomalies removed, the commission will have sufficient power to determine whether the case fits into a certain category or to reject it, if necessary. I will not go any further. The Government's stand is that it is determined to have the legislation it introduced, or no legislation whatsoever. If the Opposition is not receiving its guidelines from the employers or the employer organisations in this State—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: And the multi-nationals.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: And the multi-nationals, but not all, and I challenge the member for Davenport—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question before the Chair is that disagreement to the amendments be insisted on. The debate is becoming wide, and I hope that both sides will refer to the amendment being discussed.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Surely I am entitled to answer the accusations made by the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps I should have objected when they were made. He made all kinds of personal accusation about the Government's role in this legislation. He accused us of being dishonest, whereas this is an honest Government that is trying to overcome an anomalous situation. I talked today with people who agreed that this is the proper legislation.

Mr. Venning: Who were they?

Mr. Goldsworthy: Trade unions?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, employers. Certain accusations have been made this evening and I think I should answer them. I challenge the member for Davenport to tell me how he arrived—

Mr. CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. In a ruling you made previously you requested the Minister and the Opposition to stick to the matter before the Chair. However, the Minister ignored the Chair, and I suggest that he is doing the same thing now.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is my prerogative to decide these matters. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Seeing that I am upsetting the Opposition so much—

Mr. CHAPMAN: At no time, Sir, did I reflect on your prerogative.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order. I have already answered the honourable member's point of order. The honourable member must resume his seat. When the Chair refuses permission to speak, the honourable member must sit down, and I am applying this rule to both sides. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the Leader of the Opposition had not become so provocative in his statements about the Trades Hall and trade unions controlling the Labor Party, I had intended to stick to the legislation.

Mr. Chapman: But you aren't.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have told you why not, you goose.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, the Minister has referred to honourable members as "you".

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold that point of order. All honourable members must adhere to what I have already said.

Dr. TONKIN: My next point of order is that the Minister referred to an unidentified Opposition member as a goose, and I ask for a withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order, because I do not think that is unparliamentary. Laughter was going on when the word was used.

Dr. TONKIN: I should have thought that the correct term was gander.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Government considers that it is proper legislation in the circumstances and that it will do the job it set out to do, so I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Leader of the Opposition to speak in future only for his own Party on matters such as this and not to presume, as he did earlier, to speak for the Liberal Movement as well.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He did you a good turn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not adopt the arguments that have been put in such a manner by Liberal Party members in opposing the amendment, but it seems to me that the truth came out a little while ago from the Minister when he said "either the Bill as it stands or no Bill at all". That was the first clue we had. We had a fair amount of garbage from the member for Playford this afternoon in trying to justify the legislation, but it did not ring true to me at the time. It is now perfectly obvious that the Government believes that it has gone as far as it can go in this matter and that it is not prepared to go any further. I think if the Minister had been franker a bit earlier much of the nonsense that has been going on would have been avoided. I cannot accept his point of view on this, but, if I may suggest to the Minister, it is always better to be frank and give the true reasons rather than what are pretty obviously, and still are, specious reasons for opposing the amendments that the other place wants to make.

Dr. TONKIN: I think the honourable member for Mitcham is being rather too charitable, because I think the Minister was more than frank at one stage and gave the game away entirely, not in the respect the member for Mitcham mentioned but by way of interjection when he said, "We fooled you that time, didn't we?"

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I made no such comment.

Dr. TONKIN: I challenge the Minister to look at *Hansard* tomorrow: "You were fooled" or "We fooled you", I am not sure which.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I'll bet you $100 that I didn't.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister knows gambling is not allowed in the Chamber.

Dr. TONKIN: There we heard, out of the Minister's mouth, the Government's attitude on the Bill: "You were fooled when it went through the House on the first occasion." If the Minister thought we were fooled on that occasion, he has no chance of fooling us again now. The Upper House has caught him out in his dissemblance, and now we are supporting an amendment that will put the matter beyond doubt. The choice is quite clear; either the Government believes in what it is setting out to do and is trying sincerely to do it, or it is not trying—it does not really believe, it is only window dressing, and it is not prepared to have an amendment which is eminently fair, eminently reasonable and will do exactly what the Government says it wants to do. It cannot have it both ways. This is the moment of truth for the Minister and for the Government. Now, let us see where he stands.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister raised several points, and I will one by one well and truly bury each of those points he brought up. The first one related to the challenge that he isssued to me because I had a letter from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. I frequently receive letters that are sent to the Minister; they are sent to me as the shadow Minister. I have referred to other letters in this House that have been sent to the Minister and also to the Leader of the Opposition. It is a frequent occurrence, and if the Minister thinks it is listening to the directives of the board room, he is absolutely fooled. He knows that letters are invariably sent to the Government and the Opposition, and that was the case. It was done openly, and I raised the matter in a Question on Notice. If it was sent to me secretly I would not have raised it, of course, but it was sent openly to me as shadow Minister in this area. It related to the Albion Reid strike, because the Minister was too gutless to take any action against that—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. I want to inform the Committee that—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: He is—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable Minister.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I move—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I intend that the Committee discussion will relate to the question before the Chair. The honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I thought you were about to ask the member for Davenport to withdraw the insulting remark he made.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable Minister what the remark was.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He said the Minister was "gutless". I think the honourable member for Davenport should withdraw that remark.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point. That word has been used many times in this Chamber. In future I will be very strict: we will stick to the question before the Chair. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will stick to the amendment, because I have well and truly buried that first aspect. It was claimed that this aspect of the Bill was not raised during the debate. It was raised in the Committee stage, when I discussed it at some length. I pointed out that the Bill as it stood was quite meaningless because there would be sweetheart agreements that certainly would not be registered. It appears in *Hansard*. I will not quote it, but it was certainly raised in the debate, even though the Minister claims it was not. I think it is worth referring to one interjection the Minister made, because the whole reason why the Minister has rejected this amendment is on the grounds that it would be too difficult to register so many agreements. I refer to what I said on that occasion, as follows:

Any agreement that is not to be registered could still be a sweetheart agreement and against the pubic interest and there is no way—

I was then interjected on by the Minister, who said, "Tell us how to stop it." I said that it would be impossible to register every agreement, and the Minister said it would not. Today, because we have an amendment before us, he says it is impossible and that the whole reason for rejecting this amendment is that it is too difficult, apparently, in the Minister's mind, to register every such agreement.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You are talking rubbish.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry knows quite well he has the right of reply, and I want every member to give the honourable member for Davenport the opportunity to speak. I warn the honourable member for Davenport that when I speak from the Chair he is supposed to resume his seat.

Dr. Tonkin: He did.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition knows full well that when I spoke the honourable member for Davenport did not resume his seat. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am now taking a close look at the argument put forward on why it rejected this amendment. The first point was we could not possibly register so many agreements. Yesterday the Minister interjected in this House and said all agreements could be registered, not just the agreements registered under this amendment. The second argument put forward is that the definition is quite vague. The definition is not vague at all: it is quite clear:

Any pay increase that affects more than 20 employees must be registered.

The other part is wordy, to make sure that every payment is included and that there could be no pay increase whatsoever that is not affected under that amendment if it affects 20 employees. Again we see the reasons put forward by the Government are a complete sham. There has been much discussion during this debate about the fact that the Liberal Party in another place apparently listened to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and accepted the amendment from them. That is not true. After discussions with the Parliamentary Counsel about possible amendments to this clause, which I picked up as we went through the Committee stage and which I have already shown to the House, he said it was not possible. I went to members in the other place and suggested several amendments, this being one of them. This suggestion did not come from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry: I put it forward myself.

On this side we are not in the same position as the Government; we do not take our directions from an organisation outside this place. We do not rely on an organisation such as the trade union movement for our pre-selection to this place.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not know of any part of this Bill that relates to the pre-selection of any honourable member of this Chamber. The honourable member will stick to the question before the Chair. I hope he will not get off the rails again.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have admitted, regarding whence the suggestion came, that I went to members in another place and suggested the amendment myself. We discussed whether 20 or 50 employees should be involved, and decided finally on 20 employees. I can give an absolute undertaking that that suggestion did not come from any organisation at all. We have seen that the Government's proposal to outlaw sweetheart agreements is nothing but a complete and utter sham. The Government introduced this Bill in the hope that we would direct our attention entirely towards the wage indexation aspect of it. The Government thought it could convince the public and the Parliament that it was outlawing sweetheart agreements. We have now seen that sweetheart agreements will not

be covered in this clause. I could refer to several classic cases where sweetheart agreements have not been registered. Last week $16·50 was granted to shop assistants, and that was not a registered agreement but was an unregistered agreement. That is the sort of over-award payment and inflation we are trying to stop. It is the sort of unwarranted wage increase that we are trying to outlaw. Our amendment achieves that aim. I understand that the gun was held at the head of retailers and that they were told there would be a strike just before Christmas unless the agreement was reached. It was an unregistered agreement, because it could not be justified. That is the sort of sweetheart agreement which is damaging the economy of this country, which is causing inflation, and which we are outlawing in the amendment. I oppose the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister seems to be paying more attention to a remark from the member for Davenport about his intestinal fortitude—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will stick to the question before the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister does not seem to be directing his attention to the argument—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: There's no argument.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have warned the honourable Minister. I inform him that he is in the same position as is anyone else in the Chamber.

Mr. Coumbe: He's already been warned twice.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Torrens is also out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have listened to the debate on this motion with some interest. The Opposition now understands this legislation. Not a quarter of an hour ago the Minister said that the Opposition had been fooled by the Bill. He said we were upset because we had been fooled. That proves my point that there was something to fool us with. The Opposition now realises what the latter part of the Bill is all about. The final clause of the Bill was clouded by earlier clauses and by the haste with which the Bill was introduced; we were told it had to be considered because the House would not sit again until February. The Minister raised that matter in his second reading explanation. The Opposition now realises the full import of the Bill, and the Minister is upset about it. The Minister is admitting that he was trying to put it over the Opposition, and he thought he was going to succeed. Now that he has not succeeded he is upset.

Guidelines were laid down by the Premier. We read what the Premier had to say in his press releases, but within a day or so he realised he was in trouble. Mr. Duncan had much to say about the matter, as did Mr. Shannon. The Premier—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already ruled that no discussion will take place about what has happened outside this Chamber. I want the honourable member to stick to the matter before the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: With due respect, Sir, a proper ruling in connection with reference to people in the gallery was made, but matters outside the Chamber which are pertinent to the amendment and which come to the notice of members are not, to my knowledge, covered by Standing Orders. I am referring to public announcements that were made about this legislation. Those statements were the only insight we could properly have about the Government's intention. The Premier laid down the guidelines he was going to use to outlaw sweetheart agreements. We could see immediately that he was in trouble, so what have we got? We have an obscure Bill that gets him off the hook. However, now that the Opposition has realised the full import of the measure and the haste with which the Minister wanted it passed, the Minister does not like it and says that we are upset because we were fooled. We are not; we are delighted that the Minister's ruse has not been successful and that we have found out what the Bill is all about.

It ill behoves the Minister to chastise us by saying we were fooled. These amendments spell out exactly what the Premier wanted to do. The Premier is in trouble with his masters. If the Government is serious it will thank the Opposition for moving the amendment.

Mr. Millhouse: The Government's certainly not doing that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, but if it was fair dinkum about its original public statements about curbing leap-frogging wage rises it would grab these amendments, because they do precisely what the Government said it wanted to do. Let us not have this humbug from the Minister; he has been sidetracked by a personal reference. It is reported in yesterday's *Hansard* that the member for Davenport said:

> Any agreement that is not to be registered could still be a sweetheart agreement and against the public interest, and there is no way—

The Hon. J. D. Wright then interjected and said:

> Tell us how to stop it?

The member for Davenport said:

> It would be impossible to register every agreement.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjected again, and said:

> It would not.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has the floor. There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not upset by interjections, because the Government knows we have it cold. Let the Minister deny it. He knows the amendments fit the Bill. The Bill is a facesaver to get the Government off the hook. If the Government is serious, it will grab these amendments with open arms. I oppose the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

The CHAIRMAN: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes. The motion therefore passes in the affirmative.

Motion thus carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Abbott, Dean Brown, Coumbe, McRae, and Wright.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 9.45 p.m.

At 9.45 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned

at 12.40 a.m. on Friday, November 14. The recommendation was as follows:

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

Later:

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the recommendation of the conference be agreed to. I appreciated the asistance given by all managers for the Chamber. The Bill has been finalised as it came into the Chamber originally, and I consider that that is its proper form. The Government gave much consideration to this matter.

Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1582.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the Bill, which is somewhat similar to the one introduced in the last session of the previous Parliament, except for provisions that deal with voting and some other important provisions. The measure makes many amendments to the Act that are designed to induce better efficiency in local government administration. Some amendments moved by the Opposition during the last session have now been included in the Bill; for instance, the interpretation of urban farm land. In this connection I express appreciation to the Minister for considering these matters. The new clause relating to urban farm land is the amendment moved by the member for Kavel in the last session, and it is a reasonable amendment to the Act. The other matter deals with urban farm land that ceases to be urban farm land. Under the previous Bill, urban farm land was subject to a restriction on retrospectivity to 10 years in relation to the repayment of rate remissions. At page 3282 of *Hansard* of June 10, in considering reducing the 10 years to five years the Minister said:

I am not aware of the provision in the Land Tax Act to which the honourable member refers, so I will have it checked and, if what the honourable member says is correct, I will have my colleague in another place move the appropriate amendment. In the meantime I suggest that we adopt the Bill as it now stands, but with that understanding . . . The Parliamentary Counsel will then draft an amendment to be moved in another place.

The amendment was to bring this legislation into conformity with the Land Tax Act. The Minister did as he said he would do.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: But I always do.

Mr. RUSSACK: In this case, anyhow. I appreciate what the Minister has done and I am sure that it will be a more acceptable feature than was first intended. Probably one of the major clauses in the Bill is the one that appoints the advisory commission, to comprise three members. On reading the Bill, I believe that the commission's personnel could be the same as that of the recent local government Royal Commission. The advisory commission will be able to assist councils that have agreed to amalgamate, so that districts and areas may be brought together for the purpose of extending boundaries and to achieve greater efficiency. The Opposition accepts that it is necessary in many areas that there be amalgamations of and extensions to council areas, but it was emphatic that this be achieved by voluntary means. Provision was made earlier this year when section 45a of the Local Government Act was introduced to enable, where councils had agreed to amalgamate, a more streamlined procedure to be adopted. I understand that that procedure will still remain, but section 42 of the Act reads as follows:

(1) The Minister may appoint a special magistrate to investigate any matter connected with a petition or counter-petition, or to ascertain whether the provisions of this Act have been observed.

(2) The special magistrate shall, for the purpose of any such investigation, have every power of summoning and examining witnesses that may be exercised by a court of limited jurisdiction, and shall report to the Minister within 30 days, or within such further time as is allowed by the Minister.

I understand that that provision is being repealed, and that the new advisory commission will take over the functions previously carried out by the special magistrate. This streamlined procedure will be an added advantage to local government and to any areas that wish to amalgamate. It is evident that, since the appointment of the Royal Commission and its travelling around the State interviewing representatives of local government, there is a greater awareness of the standing of local government in the community. Local government, as we all know, is carried on by dedicated people who spend much time gratis in working for local government. However, administering local government is becoming more onerous, and I am sure that councillors are called on to spend much more time on council duties than was the case previously. Although the Royal Commission's findings were not accepted for obvious reasons by local government generally, I am sure that it has instilled a greater interest in local government and I am confident that, where it is necessary for financial, administrative and other reasons, we will find from time to time more and more councils petitioning to amalgamate, seeking the advisory commission's advice. I am certain that councils will benefit from that procedure.

Another salient matter in the Bill is that of rates. When the previous Bill was being debated, considerable concern was expressed regarding a maximum rate. Although I will not say much about the maximum rate and the exclusion, if this clause passes, of any maximum rate, I hold the belief I held during the last debate on the matter. I said then that there could be a danger from removing a maximum rate. I know that New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria and Tasmania (with the exception of the local governing body in Launceston) do not have maximum rates. The only States that have maximum cents in the dollar rates are South Australia and Western Australia. I said in that debate that outside influence would compel councils to increase their rates. In reply, the Minister said:

It would be quite improper for this Parliament to perpetuate the problem of a maximum rate. Either we have confidence in local government or we have not. I have confidence in local government and I believe local government bodies will act responsibly. With that in mind, the Government has brought forward this proposal to enable local government to raise the funds which it considers it needs and which it believes the ratepayers in its area can afford.

On page 3280 of *Hansard* I said:

Although councils and councillors generally are responsible, councils could be affected and subjected to persuasion by outside influences to increase rates. The amendment therefore is perhaps more to protect councils from what would be imposed upon them from outside by compulsory subsidies, and so on. Perhaps those councils at the maximum rate are councils which have not recently had new valuations.

I mention that because some councils are at the maximum, which is 25c in the dollar in municipalities, and 20c in the dollar in district councils. No-one would deny that there should be some increase; whether it is right to wipe

out the maximum altogether I think only time will tell. My statement continues:

I am assured that, if the valuations are adopted, they will be more than adequate to conform to the maximum rate in the dollar provided for in these amendments.

It is interesting on that point that, in the Grants Commission's second report of 1975, there is much information on financial assistance for local government. I think the fears I mentioned are well founded in some respects. On page 103 of that report the commission states:

We also believe that local government should have greater freedom to determine the distribution of the rate burden than it enjoys in some States due to restrictions as to the bases on which rates may be imposed and limitations as to type and amount of rates.

Later on that page it says:

The commission is planning to commence its hearings and inspections for 1975-76 around the beginning of October, 1975, and to conclude the programme about the end of March, 1976, with the usual break during the December-January period. It is again planned to hold hearings in each region, but the procedures may differ somewhat from those of previous years. Evidence will be taken under oath, as required by the Act, by a member or members of the commission designated by the Chairman to constitute a division of the commission for this purpose.

The commission will expect the councils of local governing bodies to support applications by the respective regional organisations with pertinent detail to assist the commission in assessing the extent of any revenue-raising and expenditure disabilities that may be claimed to exist.

I now come back to the words of the Minister when he challenged me and said, "Haven't you got confidence in the responsibility of councillors?" I wonder just what the commission means now that it is to take evidence on oath, saying that this is to show that what is being claimed truly existed. I believe they are placing some doubt on the evidence that has been given by councils and by councillors. On page 106 the report states:

The term "to function, by reasonable effort, at a standard not appreciably below the standard of other local governing bodies" is described in shortened terms as "fiscal equalisation", that is, the equalisation of the annual financial resources of local governing bodies. There are two parts to this process—the first is the equalisation of revenue resources or revenue-raising capacity, and the second the equalisation of costs of providing normal public services.

It might be helpful to elaborate a little on the term "by reasonable effort". Effectively this means that the achievement of fiscal equalisation in absolute terms is a partnership effort between the Australian Government and each local governing body. The Australian Government grants can only attempt to make up for the shortfall of revenue that is a result of a local governing body having less capacity to raise revenue than the standard and assumes that the claimant local governing body will impose rates at the standard level. Any shortfall in revenue that accrues because a local governing body chooses to impose rates at a level less than the standard will not be made up by the grants recommended by the commission. It follows that fiscal equalisation can only be realised if local government plays its part in making a "reasonable effort" to raise revenue.

The commission's formula, which is described in the following paragraphs, is regarded as being "effort neutral". This is so because it involves the use of a standard factor, the "reasonable effort" or standard rate in the dollar, rather than the claimant local governing body's own rate in the dollar. The result is therefore independent of the effort made (or level of rate struck) by a local governing body.

From that I take it that the commission will not assist a local government body if it claims that its rate is not up to the standard rate. If the commission claims that that local government body is not raising as much revenue as it should, I believe it will deprive that local government body of the grant, and this is the fear that I expressed when we debated the Bill last time. The report states on page 107:

As explained in Chapter 3 (see paragraph 3.42), and contrary to popular belief, an effort component in the formula (that is substituting the claimant local governing body's own rate in the dollar for the standard rate in the dollar) will benefit the relatively poor local governing bodies and this benefit will be the greater the wider the gap is between a poor local governing body's capacity to raise revenue and the standard capacity.

I agree that it is a good thing that the poorer areas will be assisted by the more affluent areas, but I still say that the principle is contained in that report that, if councils do not have the rate that the Grants Commission would suggest they should, they must increase the rate. That is what I mean when I talk about outside influences applying their pressure on councils and councillors who are responsible but have no control on outside pressures so that grants might be acceptable and so that they might receive more finance only if they raised a prescribed revenue in their own areas.

I think there are some very good points in the other provisions concerning rates. There is provision for four equal payments, and this will be a great help to those who find hardship. It will be a voluntary method, and it will be arranged according to the council. For non-payment of rates, there is provision for a new system. When rate notices are sent out, 60 days will be allowed for payment from the time the notices are sent out. At the expiration of that time, the rates will be due and payable. If they are not paid by that date, there will be a fine of 5 per cent for each month the rates are not paid, compounding by an additional 1 per cent a month until paid. We see one difficulty in this, and I am sure other members on this side will speak on the Bill and endeavour to make a move to rectify the situation. As I understand it, some councils send out rate notices at varying times for different wards. Therefore, it would cause a considerable amount of accounting work to determine 60 days from the time when those various rate notices went out. I feel that a simple method can be found to correct this.

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

Mr. RUSSACK: The Bill gives councils authority to make arrangements with ratepayers according to their financial position. An arrangement can be made so that rates are divided into four equal monthly payments. If that situation does not meet the economic circumstances of the ratepayer, he can negotiate with the council and come to a satisfactory arrangement. In the case of hardship, any fine imposed can be waived by the council. That provision is fairly liberal, and is an advantage to the council's rating procedure. It is my understanding of the Bill that a differential rate can apply in a ward or in relation to the use of property. It relates not to the site but to the use of the property.

A council in an area at a certain intersection on three corners could have three private houses at a rate of, say, $120, $150 and $130, and a property on the fourth corner of the intersection, which is used as a secondhand car lot where there might be no other improvements other than a small office, could be rated at the minimum rate applying in that council area. That is to the disadvantage of the private home ratepayer. Under the provisions of this Bill it will be possible for councils to adjust their rate according to the use to which a property is put. I am sure that will bring about a more equal assessment.

I will not refer to other rating matters. The Bill contains 68 clauses. Another Part of the Bill deals with

litter and other waste materials. Under the provisions of this Part, councils will have the authority to remove discarded vehicles, whether cycles, motor vehicles or farm implements, from roadways. According to amendments placed on file by the Minister, steep increases in penalties will be imposed on people who litter or allow foreign liquids to run into drains. People who leave litter in streets or cause havoc on roadways will face considerably higher penalties.

The Bill relates to many matters that would perhaps be more pertinently and effectively dealt with during the Committee stage, when I hope to have the opportunity to deal with each clause. Local government is an important tier of government. Reports of various committees on local government, especially the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, held over several years leave no doubt that local government must be supported. It is a vital and necessary tier of government. I am therefore pleased that the Bill provides that local government administration can be upgraded and assisted to become more efficient. I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. It is a similar measure to that which we considered in the past session. To a certain extent, the Minister has taken notice of the debate that occurred then. However, some matters still need to be clarified, and I shall refer to several of them. The Minister has had an opportunity to learn that local government cannot be pushed around and that it deserves all the attention the Minister can give it. People with any knowledge of local government realise that it is the third tier of government and is the closest form of government to the people. Indeed, people appreciate the work done by councils, because they know most of the people involved and it is therefore easy for them to meet and discuss with them their problems. Clause 5 sets up the Local Government Advisory Commission. The commission is to consist of a person holding or acting in the office of Secretary for Local Government, and a Chairman, who must be a person holding judicial office under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, and one would assume that they would be the people related to the recent investigation into local government areas, which was headed by Judge Ward and the Secretary of which was Mr. Hockridge, who I believe will also be a member of the commission. There will also be a person appointed by the Governor.

I wonder whom the Government has in mind. Will he be a man from local government? Will he be an elected member of a council, perhaps a Mayor or someone connected with the Local Government Association? I should like to know what the Minister has in mind. The commission will have the wide powers of a Royal Commission, and recently a Royal Commission has dealt with local government. Clause 6 repeals part of the principal Act and re-enacts in its place a provision regarding matters referred by petition or counter petition for investigation by the commission.

The provisions would apply to several circumstances, particularly to areas that wish to sever themselves or areas that wish to join another council. This could be on the way to amalgamation, which the Minister wanted in the first place. Whilst I agree with clause 8, which deals with how-to-vote cards, I think all members know that those cards are a problem. I think all of us would do away with them, but we cannot do that, because we are concerned that our opposition will give out the cards. If we do not give them out, we feel we will be under a handicap. The only way to solve the problem would be to legislate on the matter, and I wonder whether it would be a good idea to start in local government in this regard.

By clause 9, there will now be no charge of 10c for people inspecting the minute books or a record of the minutes. Any person may ask a council for a copy of the minutes, and copies have been given freely to those who have taken the trouble to ask, but a council was able to ask for a mere 10c as a fee for the copy. This has been deleted, and the council will be obliged to provide the copies free of charge. In some council areas, the ratepayers could be involved in the cost because the council was unable to charge for the copy.

Mr. Vandepeer: What if it was a group?

Mr. MATHWIN: If a group asked for several copies, I suppose that the council could put out the minutes for public inspection at a convenient place, but what is a convenient place? It would be like displaying a copy in the council chambers or in the local library, but it would not be easy for some people, particularly the aged and infirm, to get to the council offices, the library, the post office, or wherever the minutes might be displayed. I suppose that the council would be obliged to give a free copy to people who asked for one. It would be better to have a charge for supplying the minutes.

Clause 11 deals with the local government holiday. A holiday is granted by most councils now. It has been granted by several metropolitan councils that I have knowledge about. A council of which I was a member for about 14 or 15 years always gave one day a year for the council picnic. The council members and their spouses and children were invited to have a day out. This has always applied in the Brighton council. I think it has applied in the Glenelg council, and I know that it has happened in the Marion council over the years. The Minister may say that we are only legalising the matter, but I wonder how necessary it is to legalise it.

Clause 14 is a good provision dealing with the adoption of the Government assessment. This will assist councils regarding cost. The councils will not have to send out assessment notices, because everything will be done on the one Government valuation. One notice will now be sent out from the Valuation Department. In one way, the adoption of the Government assessment means that, apart from investigating and inspecting all properties in the area, the council will merely adopt the Government assessment, and the Government will tell the people what is the assessment on their properties. At present, the council is allowed to use the rate and to rate properties accordingly. That means that, in one area, comprising industrial, shopping and residential zones, the rates can be set differently; so, a business property could be rated differently from a residential property. As I believe that this will be a better system and will be an advantage to local councils, I support that provision. It is interesting to read the Local Government Act Revision Committee's report brought down recently. The committee comprised Messrs. Andrews, Hockridge, Pash, Tomkinson and Venning, and I well remember all the work that was put into its report. Regarding the minimum rate, page 32 of the report states:

> The concept of a minimum rate should be retained. The minimum rate should be designed to ensure that every ratepayer contributes effectively to certain fundamental costs of administration. It should not be designed as a revenue-raising measure.

The report also states that there should be no ceiling on rates. The other matter regarding rates is that of rating

Government property, and I see that the Government has taken no action on this matter.

Mr. RUSSACK: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MATHWIN: The committee's report at page 35 states:

Subject to certain specific and limited exceptions, the Government should make a payment to the extent of the rates otherwise payable in respect of Government-owned or Government-occupied property and the property owned or occupied by Government instrumentalities.

There is no doubt about the committee's feeling on this matter, yet the Government has taken no action on the matter. Page 103 of the Grants Commission's Second Report, 1975, regarding financial assistance to local government, states:

We also believe that local government should have greater freedom to determine the distribution of the rate burden than it enjoys in some States due to the restrictions as to the basis on which the rate may be imposed and the limitations as to type and amount of rates.

The matter of rates is dealt with in the Local Government Act Revision Committee's report and the Grants Commission's report. Regarding council finance, page 103 of the Grants Commission's second report states:

The commission is planning to commence its hearings and inspections for 1975-76 around the beginning of October, 1975, and to conclude the programme about the end of March, 1976, with the usual break during the December-January period. It is again planned to hold hearings in each region, but the procedures may differ somewhat from those of previous years. Evidence will be taken under oath, as required by the Act . . . .

Page 106 of the same report states:

The term "to function, by reasonable effort, at a standard not appreciably below the standard of other local governing bodies" is described in shortened terms as "fiscal equalisation"; that is, the equalisation of the annual financial resources of local governing bodies. There are two parts to this process. The first is the equalisation of revenue resources or revenue-raising capacity and the second the equalisation of costs of providing normal public services.

The old legislation provided that the strike of the rate was not to exceed 10c in the dollar, and it gave a minimum rate of ½c in the dollar. There was a special rate of 12c in the dollar. Amendments are made by striking out these provisions from the Act. I have an amendment on file to clause 37 that I hope the Minister will accept. Under clause 37, some council wards send out their rate notices at different times, but not on the same day. Under the new legislation, a surcharge of 5 per cent may be made for rate arrears after 60 days from the serving of the rate notice, and for each month thereafter an extra 1 per cent is charged, compounded throughout the year. This is an increase on the present charge of 5 per cent, under which people may have preferred to let the council wait, and leave the money in the bank. This does not come up to the standard of the recommendations in the Local Government Act Revision Committee's report, which states that the percentage struck should be equivalent to the bank rate. My argument with clause 37 is that, where rates are in arrears for a year or more, there is a charge of 5 per cent for the current year, plus 1 per cent for the months gone, and 1 per cent extra from the previous year. All these charges could occur at different dates of the month. There could be a 5 per cent charge on the 3rd of the month, another 1 per cent on the 12th, and the 1 per cent from the previous year could be on the 23rd. The new complicated system for charging for rates in arrears will be difficult for councils to calculate and to explain to the ratepayer how the system works. It would be impossible to explain it so that it could be understood. I therefore believe that this clause should be amended. I have on file an amendment, although at this stage I am not permitted to refer to it.

The Local Government Act Revision Committee made recommendations regarding this matter. It can be seen from page 4191 of its report that the Town Clerk, who put forward the submission in favour of an interest rate of 10 per cent, discarded the idea of a flat rate of 10 per cent in favour of a rate of 1 per cent above the highest ruling bank overdraft rate. This suggestion was not implemented by those who drafted the Bill. In its report the committee suggested that the word "fine" be removed, it being considered not a good word to be included in the Bill. It might embarrass old people, for instance, who might not make their payment by the due date and, perhaps for the first time in their lives, could be confronted with a fine. It was suggested that this could be termed an instalment, or something of that kind. This has been done in clause 37 but not in clause 38. I should be interested to know whether any right of appeal exists in this respect.

The other matter to which I draw members' attention is clause 52, which adds to many provisions the words "letter box". Again, this has been done on the recommendation of the Local Government Act Revision Committee. On page 623 of its report the committee refers clearly to the letter box problem. It also states that, where letter boxes are placed on pavements, the problem exists of Postmaster-General's Department staff riding their motor cycles or scooters on the footpaths, causing a hazard to people in the area. The Act provides that letter boxes must be 10ft. from the nearest edge of the pavement. However, problems are experienced in this respect, particularly in the metropolitan area, because, although some footpaths are 9ft. wide, others are only 4ft. or 5ft. wide. One wonders how that fits in with the Act. The Government ought to take notice of the matters I have raised. Generally, I support the Bill, which can probably be regarded as a Committee Bill. I will have more to say on the Bill in Committee.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I wish to make one comment regarding a matter that has been brought to my attention by the Gawler corporation, the Mayor of which indicated that he would vote against the proposition if reference to Parliament was involved. The corporation is not at all satisfied with ratepayers having open access to its records and copies thereof. The corporation believes that this will involve it in much expense. At a time when every cent counts, this could create many problems. The Gawler corporation is indeed concerned about this matter, and I give the Minister fair warning that during Committee many clauses will rate much attention.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS COMMISSIONER'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 4, line 16 (clause 14)—After "omnibuses" insert "only".

No. 2. Page 4, lines 17 and 18 (clause 14)—Leave out all words in these lines.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

The amendments are to all intents and purposes those that were moved in the House. This matter was, I think, reasonably fully discussed, although it is perhaps desirable that I briefly expand, because it seems from some comments that have been made that there may be a misunderstanding in relation to the intention of the Municipal Tramways Trust or, indeed, the State Transport Authority regarding future operations. When the M.T.T. took over the operations of 12 private operators, and subsequently two others, it was agreed that the whole of their operations would be taken over: the whole of their assets acquired at market value, and those assets included the plant, equipment, real estate, etc. Since then, we have operated the services that were previously operated by the private licensees. The purpose of this provision under dispute is to put beyond doubt the authority's right to operate services that were operated previously by the various licensees whose services were bought out. It is not intended, as apparently some people fear, that we are suddenly blossoming out into the interstate bus transport area. The Government is not going to try to put Ansett-Pioneer out of business; nor is it going to compete against them. However, if the Brighton Football Club goes to one of the State Transport Authority's operators who, as a former private operator, used to take it to some location in another State for an end-of-year trip, the Government believes that it should be provided with the same service rather than have the club left in the wilderness, unable to go anywhere.

Mr. Mathwin: It's the thin end of the wedge.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Glenelg has a small but poisonous little mind. Is the honourable member willing to say to the State Transport Authority that it should immediately go out and cancel all the contracts that have been entered into in good faith? Is he advocating that the authority should say to people who ask it to take over their services, "We would love to do so, but the Liberals in the Upper House refuse to let us do it."?

Mr. Mathwin: What would you say if the shoe was on the other foot?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no other foot. It is a simple statement of fact. The Bill simply puts beyond doubt what is currently being done by the State Transport Authority. If the member for Glenelg, with his poisonous little mind, wants to say that what the authority is currently doing is wrong, let him stand up and be counted. However, if he wants to create the fear, which has no foundation at all, that suddenly the Government is going to operate services to other States in opposition to Sir Reginald Ansett, he is entitled to do so. Sir Reginald Ansett believes in a two-airline policy, but obviously the member for Glenelg wants a simple, single policy: everything for one and nothing for anyone else.

The attitude that has been adopted on this matter is ridiculous. I do not believe the Opposition opposes what the Government is doing. Unfortunately, a seed of doubt has been sown by someone, unknown to me, who has suggested that suddenly the State's resources are to be used to put private bus operators out of business.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you deny it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course I deny it, and the Leader ought to have more brains than to suggest that a denial is necessary. He ought to know better. Obviously, the insidious minds of people like him are causing this problem.

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is usual for members to refer to other members not as "him" or "her" but in the proper manner. I ask you, Sir, to call the Minister to order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order is upheld. I hope all honourable members will ensure that this happens in future.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The position is plain and simple; 14 metropolitan operators have asked the Government to take over their services and, when the Government acceded to their request, it did exactly what it was asked to do. The Government took over their line haul services and their charter work services, which include operations throughout the length and breadth of Australia. The Bill simply puts beyond doubt the action in which the State Transport Authority is currently involved so that in future there shall be no misunderstanding.

Mr. Venning: There's plenty of misunderstanding.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There would be in the mind of the member for Rocky River, because it is extremely small. To those members who think that the Government intends to get into the regular services of an inter-capital nature, I can say only that someone has fed them with a heap of gobbledegook. It is untrue, and the Government is not doing it. However, it is making provision that, where sporting clubs and other organisations approach the State Transport Authority asking for charter work to be undertaken, the authority is capable, beyond a shadow of a doubt, of undertaking that work.

Mr. WARDLE: I see the Minister's point of view, which he has made clear. I am satisfied that most Opposition members would expect such an obligation to be met; that is sensible and reasonable. However, I should have thought it would be easier to put something in the Bill relating to the safeguards to which the Minister has referred, rather than for him to go to all the trouble to which he has gone in assuring the House that this is the position. I think the Minister would readily agree that this leaves the position wide open. If that is so, and the Minister does not intend to leave the matter wide open, surely without much thought the provisions of the Bill could have been closed up fairly easily and reasonably to the extent to which the Minister wants it to operate. Has the Minister considered amending the Bill to that extent?

Mr. EVANS: I understand the point that the Minister has tried to make. However, if the Bill allows the State Transport Authority to ply for hire on any conditions (and it will do so if the Bill passes), the Minister's assurances mean nothing. There is no guarantee that he will always be the Minister. Even if the Party of which he is a member remains in office, the Minister cannot expect to remain a Minister for time immemorial. The State Government Insurance Commission, when it was set up, was not intended to deal with life assurance. However, as the Government wanted it to do so, it tried to amend the Act to allow the commission to deal in life assurance. If this legislation allows the opportunity for the Government, through the State Transport Authority, to go into

interstate travel on a large scale, I believe a Minister at some time (and it could even be a Liberal Minister) could do so. If the Minister is so concerned about existing contracts, as none of them would be more than 12 months in advance, he can arrange for them to expire at the end of 1976.

More importantly, if the Government said it was not going into this field and informed the people that it had contacted the private operators that could take it on, I am sure the Brighton Football Club, for instance, would not be concerned if it had to travel at a similar rate in similar conditions. The only reason previous operators operated in the interstate field was that the closer urban transport business was not profitable. The Minister knew this, and has subsidised some other operators in the State, but in the case of the 14 he chose not to do so. There is no need to continue this part of these operations. If the Minister says it is necessary to complete the present contracts, I would ask him to tell us how many contracts are extended after the end of 1976. I would support strongly the move that has been made to have this Bill amended and, if the Minister is prepared to stipulate the end of 1976 for the contracts to expire, I am prepared to accept that, but there is no purpose in a State Transport Authority plying for hire interstate.

Mr. RUSSACK: This evening the Minister said it was ridiculous that the State Transport Authority had anything in its mind regarding going beyond its operations at the moment. I asked him a question concerning the buses that are to come to South Australia, and from memory he said 88 would be built to conform to normal road travel standards. The Minister qualified that by saying many of these buses would be used for the Elizabeth and perhaps the Hills districts. It does give the possibility for these buses to be used for longer interstate trips. While I can accept what the Minister has said, that the authority is not proposing to blossom out into the interstate passenger services, I would like to reiterate what the member for Fisher has said, that the Minister will not always be the Minister.

If a provision is established in the Statutes of the State, action can be taken at any time according to those Statutes. The Minister's assurance holds good for only as long as he is the Minister. Once that amendment is inserted in the legislation, it is there for good and all, or until another amendment is made. We believe that now is the right time to see that the correct thing is done. I think provision can be made so that it can be spelled out that there shall not be any extension on those operations that are being conducted at the moment. The Minister gave an example of the transportation of a football team from South Australia to some other State.

Mr. Harrison: Because they're loyal, and they demand it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RUSSACK: I point out to the honourable member that, a company cannot conduct a business and wait for people to come to it. It must look for business to make it profitable; it has to advertise and solicit business to be profitable. I say here and now that the State Transport Authority would solicit business and would endeavour to develop that business. You have to go forward, or you go backward.

Mr. Harrison: We're going forward.

Mr. RUSSACK: We have an admission from the honourable member that the authority will go forward and will extend, and that is the thing we are concerned about.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Gouger has the floor, and interjections must cease.

Mr. RUSSACK: The Minister said that someone had sown a seed in the minds of the Opposition. I suggest that, as we do read the Bills, we must understand what is in them. A provision is in this Bill to provide for interstate travel with no restriction whatsoever, and it is thus possible for competition to be introduced between private enterprise and—

Mr. Harrison: What's wrong with that?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Gouger has the floor and interjections are out of order.

Mr. RUSSACK: There is nothing wrong with fair competition, but today 75 per cent of people in the work force in Australia are employed by private enterprise. When there can be unfair competition in these fields, we have a right to defend private enterprise and the very good service that is in existence at the moment. The member for Fisher said that, regarding the operators taken over by the authority, it is the long interstate trips that are the profitable trips and the short metropolitan trips that incur the steep losses.

I accept what the Minister has said as far as he is personally concerned. I take into account that he has informed this House today that there will be buses prepared and adequately fitted to carry out these tasks. However, when a provision such as this is written into an Act it is there and can be implemented. As we wish to see a limitation on the operation of this possible interstate transportation of passengers, we oppose the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments unduly restrict the operations of the Bill.

Later:

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

Consideration in Committee.

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

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

As this matter has been adequately aired in the House, I do not think that anything will be achieved by going over the ground that has already been covered. I move this motion so that a conference can be held.

Motion carried.

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

represented by Messrs. Keneally, Mathwin, Russack, Virgo, and Whitten.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 9.45 p.m.

At 9.45 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 12.40 a.m. on Friday, November 14. The recommendations were as follows:

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

Clause 14, page 4, lines 16 to 18, leave out all words in these lines and insert in lieu thereof the words—

30. The authority—

(*a*) may, within the State, operate—

(i) motor omnibuses;

and

(ii) passenger carrying vehicles in consideration of a lump sum paid for the use of the vehicle;

and

(*b*) may, outside the State, operate passenger carrying vehicles in consideration of a lump sum paid for the use of the vehicle and as part of that operation operate the vehicle as a motor omnibus.

Later:

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

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The compromise reached was as good as could be achieved and will not unduly inhibit present operations. I pay my respects to, and express appreciation of the services rendered to the conference by, the Chairman of the State Transport Authority. He has been able to advise members of the current situation. Further, the Parliamentary Counsel's work was most helpful.

Mr. RUSSACK: I concur in what the Minister has said. The results of the conference will mean that the *status quo* will be retained and that the operations will remain as they are at present.

Motion carried.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

NATIONAL TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1—After line 8 insert new clause 1a as follows:

Amendment of principal Act, s. 6—1a. Section 6 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the passage "set out in the schedule to" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "under".

No. 2. Page 2, line 11 (clause 3)—leave out "rule and by-law have by resolution submitted to" and insert "rule or by-law has by resolution of".

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

These are amendments about which the Legislative Council has consulted the Commissioner of Statute Revision, and he has agreed to them. Obviously, they are of great moment!

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the importance of these amendments, I agree to them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have pleasure in supporting the motion. Obviously, the Legislative Council is now settling down to do the job for which it has been elected, and that is to act as a true House of Review.

Motion carried.

PEST PLANTS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 1484.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This Bill has caused much consternation—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Amongst the pests.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister wants to call some of the town clerks and councils, particularly those in the Hills area, pests, I do not think he can—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He didn't call any of them pests.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to discuss the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The problem, Sir, was that the Minister interjected. I was half-way through saying that the Bill had caused much consternation when the Minister of Transport said, "Amongst the pests". I have received much correspondence from some councils in my districts, particularly Hills councils. I have a document called "The weeds scene", compiled by Mr. J. M. O'Neil, Secretary of the Weeds Advisory Committee. Although this is a comprehensive document, I want to refer to some of the material in it, as it gives some of the history of the compilation of this Bill. It states:

Some of the support gained, however, has now been temporarily lost. A minority of councils have caused letters criticising the Bill to be sent to members of Parliament. The detail of criticism given in many of these letters is mostly inaccurate and misleading and provided by councils unaware of amendments made since the conferences, or by councils determined to remain as they are at present whether working actively or not.

That is a criticism of some of the councils in my district. There is much concern among councils in the Hills and Southern Districts Association. The member for Alexandra will probably have more to say about that. The pamphlet continues:

The State was then divided into 20 boards. A special subsidy is available to provide the extra money required, that is, if 3 per cent contribution plus normal subsidy is not enough to finance the board. Many Lower South-East and Adelaide Hills councils have claimed that individual councils can administer the Weeds Act more cheaply and efficiently as a single unit. Some prefer to remain under the current Act, or want the choice of remaining as a single council board under the proposed Act. The committee agreed to the principle of single unit boards. No minimum requirement to form a board is stated in the Bill, therefore any such council will be required to submit to the commission evidence of its ability to form and maintain a viable single unit.

That is the assurance which has been given to councils and by which their objections are supposed to be overcome. The fact is that the Bill gives the authority complete jurisdiction over councils, and that statement is cold comfort to those councils which are not in favour of the Bill. All that says, and all the Bill says, is that they can make submissions. If the authority believes there should be 20 boards, and if it believes in its judgments the councils should be lumped together to form boards, they will be lumped together. They could get the most eminent

counsel to make submissions, but, if the authority believed they should go into a board, that is where they go. That assurance, which is written in the document, is not really worth much. Another section I should like to quote, headed "How will boards be formed?", states:

It is anticipated that the commission will produce and distribute a map showing proposed grouping on a State basis. The map must take into account present grouping; and ask councils to consider the map and decide their own board grouping. It is believed that the majority of councils will resolve this satisfactorily.

That does not seem to be the way it is working at the present time. Here is the significant sentence:

Similarly, the commission has authority to cause proclamation when agreement cannot be reached.

I think there is much evidence that agreement will not be voluntarily reached and that the commission would have to exercise its authority if it hoped to get these boards proclaimed. I am not really objecting to this pamphlet, but I am saying that there is really no assurance in it that is worth anything to councils objecting to the scheme. In some areas, there is considerable objection to the scheme. It is apparent, when looking at the situation in Victoria, that that State spends considerably more money annually on weed control, yet that State is considerably smaller than South Australia. Each year the Victorian State Government allocates a sum of money for vermin and noxious weed control, and this is the principal source of funds available to this board. In 1971-72, the allocation was $3 166 000. The salaries and allowances for staff amount to an additional $1 000 000 annually, which is paid from the same Government funds as are the salaries of other public servants.

Additional funds to assist research projects are provided by various primary industry groups, and in 1971-72 this totalled $75 000, so we see that well in excess of $4 000 000 is spent annually in Victoria on the control of pest plants. I now refer to the situation in South Australia regarding country council areas where the weed problem must be tackled. The total rate of revenue available to country councils in 1974-75 was $15 087 000. If we take 3 per cent of that, we get a figure of $452 640. The Government's contribution will be one-half of that, which is $266 320. If we add that to the 3 per cent from councils that will be spent on weeds, and the half of that amount which will be a Government subsidy, we get a grand total of $768 980, which will be the maximum amount spent on weed control in South Australia. This is a very much smaller sum than the amount available and spent in Victoria, so the Government's contribution to weed control will be minimal.

The Bill is causing considerable concern. Although some of the councils in the area are more kindly disposed towards the Bill, I have received correspondence from some councils that are not pleased with it. I have received the following letter from the District Clerk of the District Council of Onkaparinga:

I enclose for your information copies of a letter sent by council to the Director of Environment and Conservation and two replies to that letter. Council is very disappointed that a Government department takes an attitude as shown in the reply to such a serious problem as African daisy. We feel that the efforts of council are being thwarted when we go to other ratepayers asking them to carry out weed control measures when this type of attitude is adopted by the Government.

You recall no doubt that the department has been critical of some councils who have not carried out their obligations under the Weeds Act and have introduced this proposed Pest Plants Bill to try to overcome these problems. This council had always endeavoured to meet its obligations with regard to weeds and to help and encourage ratepayers to do the same. Would you kindly follow up this matter on our behalf so that we can approach our ratepayers with confidence, knowing that weeds throughout the whole of this council area will be treated in the correct manner. Any further information you may require, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I have also received copies of letters from the Director of Environment and Conservation addressed to the council. The Director states that he has requested a report regarding the priority for the eradication of weeds from the Charleston Conservation Park, and that he would write again shortly. I have also received the following letter from the Director:

This department is aware of the South African daisy infestation at the above park. However, the area has only recently been acquired and funds are not available to enable work to be carried out in it during the current financial year. This matter will, however, be taken into consideration when preparing the Estimates of Expenditure for the 1976-77 financial year. Thank you for your interest in the weed problem in the Charleston Conservation Park.

Mr. Evans: Do you think that the Crown should be bound?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will come to that later. The correspondence indicates how silly it is for the Government to complain that councils are not doing the job when its own departments are not willing to try to carry out the work. The whole idea of introducing the Bill was to try to improve the control of pest plants on the pretext that councils were not doing their job. Yet, I have received a letter like that from the Director stating that the department had only just acquired the Charleston Conservation Park and, because of that, it had no funds to clean it up or try to control African daisy. What kind of response would a council get from a ratepayer if it said, "Bad luck, we haven't got the funds to clean the place up," but that is what the Crown, through the Director, is saying.

Many ratepayers have a perpetual shortage of funds, but they do not have that option. I agree with what the member for Fisher has said in the House from time to time, that it is ridiculous to try to compel ratepayers to eradicate weeds and to try to compel councils to enforce the Act, when the Government does not even try to deal with the weeds growing on its own property. That happened in relation to the Charleston conservation park. The council wrote to the department and asked it to do something about weeds, but it said, in effect, "Bad luck, but we have no money." One can see the objections of councils when they are being pressed to control weeds in their areas. They, in turn, must press their ratepayers who live alongside the properties, and this is a fruitless exercise.

I am aware of an infestation of African daisy on a property owned by the Woods and Forests Department in the Cudlee Creek area. The same applies to a lesser extent in the Chain of Ponds and Kersbrook areas. Certainly, in the Cudlee Creek area there is a heavy infestation of African daisy on the property controlled by the Crown and, in particular, a property that has been planted to pines by the Woods and Forests Department. I know of ratepayers in this area (and it is indeed steep country) who must climb around on the end of a rope to try and pull out African daisy plants.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is difficult.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will concede the point that the Minister has made by way of interjection: it is difficult. However, the Minister must also concede that it is farcical for councils to have to force ratepayers in neighbouring

properties to come to terms with controlling weeds. African daisy is a real problem in that area.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I want to hear from the shadow Premier and Treasurer.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I can only repeat again (and I think the shadow Premier and Treasurer would agree with me) that it is farcical to compel ratepayers to control weeds on their properties when they abut Government properties on which weeds, particularly those like African daisy, flourish, as there is a wide spread of seed. The Gumeracha council made a fairly valiant effort to control weeds in its area. I think the member for Light was with me when I toured around that area.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I was invited up there on one occasion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think the Minister might even have been there.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, perhaps not on that occasion. With the member for Light, I was taken on a tour of the Cudlee Creek area by representatives of the Gumeracha District Council. To show just how much money that council was spending, I point out that it put on a gang over the Christmas vacation to try to deal with African daisy in what was fairly inaccessible country. It was adjacent to Woods and Forests Department land, on which a top-class crop of African daisy was flourishing.

I do not want to labour the point, but it is absurd to try to force councils to deal with weeds and pest plants if the Crown is not willing to do its bit. I have already said that there are elements of compulsion in the Bill that are not acceptable to some councils. I am willing to support the second reading, because I think the Bill can be improved to overcome at least some of the objections that have been made to me by councils in my district. It is probably true to say that, on balance, more councils in my district are opposed to the Bill than are in favour of it. I know that at least one council I contacted believed that the Bill should pass. As I think the Bill is capable of improvement, I am willing to support the second reading.

I sum up by saying that I have read with interest the pamphlet called "The weeds scene", compiled by Mr. J. M. O'Neil, Secretary of the Weeds Advisory Committee. The fact still remains that the commission will indeed have complete authority. The important phrase out of all this is, "The commission has authority to cause proclamation when agreement cannot be reached." I have referred to the sum of money that is available for weed control in Victoria. It is about $5 000 000 a year, with a heavy contribution by the State Government. I have also referred to the amount of rate money that is available from the total rates collected by country councils in 1974-75.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order. In view of the enlightening nature of this speech, and because of the Government's obvious interest in the matters that the member for Kavel has raised, I suggest that he be granted an extension of 15 minutes in which to make his speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order cannot be accepted. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The total sum of money that will be available in South Australia, on last year's rate revenue, if we take 3 per cent of it, is $678 980. So, we in South Australia are not spending anything like as much money on weed control as is being spent in Victoria. I thank the House for its rapt attention to what has obviously been a most enlightening speech for Government members. I support the Bill to the second reading, so that I can move an amendment in Committee.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I understand that for some time a committee has been working on proposals regarding the control of weeds and pest plants, which have now been consolidated into a Bill and presented to this House. This has caused much concern to many councils which are conscious of the need to keep weeds under control. I know that councils in my district have tried conscientiously to control noxious weeds. But, of course, the landowner who does not care makes it difficult for his neighbour who does care. Because of this, there must be some way in which all can be encouraged to participate and keep pest plants under control.

I have tried to bring this matter to the attention of councils in my district, and have gained some indication of their thoughts. A submission was made to me by the Snowtown District Council, which has drawn up and adopted a comprehensive noxious weed control programme for this season and, to date, has met with a high degree of successs. I should like the House to bear with me for a few moments while I refer to that report, as follows:

The programme operates on the following basis:

(1) Council to carry out effective control measures on all council owned and Crown land and roadsides adjoining such property.
(2) Co-operation between the council and landowner re roadside control. This achieved by fixing and publishing dates by which certain various weeds are to be treated. It is important to set such dates to give sufficient time for council to undertake follow up work before the weeds have set seed, that is, whilst actively growing.
(3) Council to proceed with control measures where landowners have not complied with the programme.

The council considers that the above procedure with emphasis on public relations and co-operation is the most satisfactory method of effective long-term weed control. So that the above procedure can be put into effect there are certain basic requirements.

(1) Council must have available a suitable chemical spraying equipment and unit.
(2) Such equipment must be available when it is required.
(3) Experienced operators must be available when required.

The council feels that if, under the proposed new board system, the responsibility of carrying out the requirements of the proposed new Act is taken from councils, weed control may not be as effective for the following reasons:

(1) Plant—Assume that four councils are formed into a board under the new Act and each council has its own weeds operating plant. Such plant would have to be retained by each council for use on weed control work on its own property. If the board were to undertake all responsibilities under the proposed new Act it would be required to obtain several units to be equally as effective in weed control over the area of the four councils as each individual council could do in its own area. In regard to those areas where councils have not been effective in weed control and do not have their own plant and unit this would be a step in the right direction. However, in regard to those areas where councils have been active and effective in weed control and own their own plant, it would simply be a duplication of plant and therefore a waste of resources which are very limited.
(2) Operators—As we are well aware, weed control is a seasonal operation. If a board was required to employ its own operators the questions that remain unanswered are:
    2.1 How to find trained operators on a casual basis.

2.2 If trained operators can only be found on a full time basis, how are they to be employed during the remainder of the year?

As indicated above, several operators will be required and even if trained or suitable casual operators are available, will they be available each year and when required? As some noxious weeds mature very quickly, for example, caltrop, any delay in spraying could well result in the complete break-down of the weed control programmes. Councils themselves, however, are more able to readily adapt to such seasonal work and have suitable operators.

(3) Administration—It would be difficult to estimate just how much time and cost is involved in the administration of an effective weed control programme, sending out notices, costing, accounting and keeping records, paying and banking money. A lot of time is also involved receiving phone calls, conveying messages to officers and operators, and supervision of operators. If a board were to do all of this work a well-equipped office would be required and staff, resulting in duplication of administration facilities and an unnecessary use of resources. Again this type of work is only seasonal and can be handled quite capably within council's existing administration set-up.

(4) Legal Notices—If a board does not meet regularly, for example, once a month, the necessary authority from the board to issue a legal notice may be too late, as the plant may have matured. We realise that a board can meet as often as it deems necessary, but a councillor's time is valuable.

There are other factors also. Ratepayers should be able to readily contact administration officers concerning weed control programmes. This could be difficult under the boards system where the board carries out all requirements of the Act. Communication between ratepayers and the board is likely to be less than between ratepayers and the council, particularly if there are long distances to travel or a trunk telephone call has to be made. The council considers that, for a weed control programme to be effective, there must be good co-operation and, therefore, good communication between the ratepayers and the weed control authority and that this can best be achieved by the council and its officers. However, the council also realises that there are areas where effective weed control work is just not being done, and that something must be done in these areas. Therefore, it is suggested that the following amendment be incorporated in the proposed new Pest Plants Act:

If a council desires to carry out the requirements of this Act, it may apply to the Pest Plant Control Board for approval to carry out the requirements of the Pest Plant Act in a manner approved by the Pest Plant Control Board. In considering such an application the Pest Plant Control Board shall require the council to submit details of the manner in which it proposes to carry out the requirements of the Act for approval by the board with such alterations, additions and amendments as the board thinks fit and shall require the council to show that it has suitable and adequate equipment and competent staff to carry out work under the Act. If, in the opinion of the board, the council is competent to carry out the requirements of the Act it may by a resolution carried by a two-thirds majority of its members, grant approval to that council. No such approval shall be granted except with authority of the Pest Plant Commission. The board shall require any council to which such approval is granted to strictly carry out the requirements of the Act and require the council to submit, once every two months from the time approval is granted, to the board, a report of its activity under the Act, and an account of work carried out on which subsidy may be paid by Parliament. If a council, having obtained approval, does not carry out the provisions of the Act, such approval shall be withdrawn and, from the time approval is withdrawn, the board shall thenceforth carry out the requirements of the Act within that council area.

Other changes to the proposed Act will need to be made to allow for the above amendment or addition, but this would be best done by the appropriate authority.

There are areas in South Australia where a satisfactory programme has been carried out. There are areas that have been successful in controlling weeds, and the authorities in those areas are very concerned and would like to know whether they will be able to continue their work. Some of these councils have been extremely conscientious in effectively controlling weeds. I think of the Snowtown, Blyth, and Port Broughton councils, which have formed one group. Further, on Yorke Peninsula two areas are working conscientiously to eradicate weeds. The Bute council and the Kadina council also have done their best to control weeds. These groups of councils desire that attention be given to the areas involved. A committee established to examine the matter has had the responsibility of suggesting the legislation.

I know that some members of that committee have intimated that this would be permitted. They have been given to understand that, if people in an area have been working efficiently and doing the job required of them, they should be given the right to continue in the way in which they have been working until, if there comes a time when the system breaks down, perhaps a redistribution of the area or a reconstruction of the group could be put into effect. I ask that this proposal be considered and that the Minister make an intimation at an appropriate time so that people in these areas will know whether or not they can carry on. Some people consider that the 3 per cent contribution by councils will be insufficient to pay for the work to be carried out; they believe that, possibly, it will be necessary for them to contribute a higher sum in the future. I was interested in a special issue, published by the Agriculture Department for distribution to local government authorities, of a booklet titled *The Weeds Scene*. The booklet contains much information and gives a lucid explanation of the Bill. Under the heading "Discussion on Criticism of the Pest Plants Bill", the booklet states:

The Pest Plants Bill has, on the instruction of the Minister of Agriculture, been developed over a three-year period by the Weeds Advisory Committee in co-operation with local government, primary industries and the department. Twenty-three organisations have been consulted.

A local government representative (Mr. Reo Humphrys) from Yorke Peninsula has had considerable experience in local government and is a landowner. I believe that his advice has been invaluable, and he is not lacking in enthusiasm or interest. I compliment him, irrespective of what his opinion is, because he has made a great contribution to the committee. Another such man is Mr. Eldred Riggs (from One Tree Hill), who also has had wide experience and made a great contribution. Another man is Mr. Jack Sneed, of Mount Compass.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And Malcolm Groth, of Cambrai.

Mr. RUSSACK: All these men have had considerable practical experience. The Minister has rested on the advice of the advisory committee, which has been assisted by these men of wide experience.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you think they knew what they were talking about?

Mr. RUSSACK: Their advice was invaluable.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you think the Bill is any good?

Mr. RUSSACK: Many aspects of the Bill are good, but it is debatable whether the entire Bill is good. Surely, if the existing legislation could have been put into operation, it would have had the same effect as the Bill will have.

Dr. Eastick: The advisory members might not like the Bill, either?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:: Why don't you ask them?

Dr. Eastick: They've said they're against parts of it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I would like to know what they are.

Mr. RUSSACK: Two of the committee's members have had more than 20 years experience in local government, and one other member has had several years experience. They are all primary producers; therefore, both local government and primary industries have been adequately represented on the committee. Any committee and its members have a difficult task in producing a plan that suits everyone throughout the State. Some councils find it difficult to accept the administrative part of the Bill regarding the sending out of accounts and the other clerical work involved. I have spoken to some councils that would rather continue in the way in which they are operating now. They send out their accounts from their own council offices. I suppose that the board could make administrative decisions. A board is made up of members of the constituent councils. Regarding finance, the Government's contribution and the councils' contributions will be the board's responsibility, and it will appropriate the funds and control the weeds eradication programme on its own initiative. In other words, the board in each area will be autonomous to a large degree.

Many weeds in South Australia have caused concern over the years. As far back as 1936, there was a publication titled *Important Weeds of South Australia,* and it lists the star and saffron thistles, Bathurst burr, stink wort, nutgrass, purple stem, soursob, wild onion, hoary cress, variegated thistle, buffalo burr, etc. Added to the list are many more noxious weeds, some of which are perhaps more difficult to control. Bathurst burr was introduced into Australia in the 1840's, and is believed to have originated from burrs carried in the tails of horses imported from South America. Within a few years, it had spread to Bathurst, New South Wales, and the plant has come to be known throughout Australia as Bathurst burr. It is a noxious weed in all of the States, and is objectionable mainly because of the burrs, large numbers of which form on each plant. These burrs, which are egg-shaped and about ¼in. to ½in. long, are covered with hooked spines by means of which they cling tenaciously to clothing and to the coats and tails of animals. They are specially troublesome in wool, the value of which may be depreciated thereby. It fact, the weed has been responsible in the past for considerable financial losses in this country and in South Africa.

Because of the ease with which the seed-containing burrs are distributed, the plant has unconsciously been spread by man throughout most warm parts of the world, to such an extent that there has been some doubt regarding its native home. It is believed to have come originally from Chile, in South America, but it now occurs extensively in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australia. I have specifically referred to this weed because it is one which is easily transported and which can adhere to the clothing of human beings and to animals.

I recall that only a year or two ago a burr was brought from the northern parts of Australia to our agricultural areas. Bathurst burr, to which I have referred, originated in one country, was transferred here, and has spread throughout Australia by adhering to moving objects, be they animals or the clothing of human beings. Now, we find that the seeds can be transported in the tyres of trucks, and so on. This is why it is essential, more so now, when transport goes further and travels faster, than perhaps it was many years ago, that we have some form of weed control.

It is admitted that there must be a weed control system, but many points could be debated regarding whether this Bill produces the ideal system. Many councils have considered the Bill, and tonight I have recorded and repeated the considerations that have been submitted by one council that is interested, enthusiastic and conscientious in relation to the control of weeds: the Snowtown District Council.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support part of the Bill. Many weeds are covered, and the weeds in the metropolitan area that I know most about are fat hen, three-corner jack and dandelions (of which I understand the Gypsies make wine). Another pest in some parts of the world is the old stinging nettle. The Gypsies in Hungary make a potent drink from that, and it really has a sting. It has been stated that the mead that the old Welsh people make is made of many herbs, and that would include many weeds. Country members know of the weed problems on the outskirts of the metropolitan area and stretching to our borders. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SURVEYORS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

COAST PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Clause 4, page 2, lines 4 to 26—Leave out all words in the clause after "is" in line 4 and insert "repealed and the following section is enacted and inserted in its place:

22. (1) Where the board is satisfied that it is necessary or expedient to acquire any part of the coast for the purpose of executing works authorised by this Act, the board may, with the approval of the Minister, acquire land constituting, or forming part of, that part of the coast.

(2) Where the board is satisfied that it is necessary or expedient to acquire any part of the coast for any other purpose consistent with the functions and duties assigned to, or imposed upon, the board under this Act, the board may—

(*a*) with the approval of the Minister;

and

(*b*) if the land falls within the area of a council—

(i) with the approval of that council;

or

(ii) upon the authority of a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament;

acquire land constituting, or forming part of, that part of the coast.

(3) The Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972, shall apply in respect of the acquisition of land under this section.

(4) The board may, with the approval of the Minister—

(*a*) sell, lease or otherwise dispose of land acquired under this section;

or

(*b*) by agreement with the council for the area in which the land is situated, place the land under the care, control and management of that council.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

The Bill goes a long way towards meeting the objection previously put forward by another place. New subsection (4) of section 33 provides:

Where the board, acting with the approval of a council and in pursuance of its powers under this Act, acquires land within the area of the council, the board may recover from the council, as a debt, a contribution, determined by the board, not exceeding one-half of the cost incurred by the board in acquiring the land.

This ensures that the council must give approval before it is encumbered with a share of the cost of the purchase of land. The effect of the amendment is that, where the board desires to acquire any part of the coast for any purpose consistent with the functions or duties assigned to or imposed on the board under the Act, except for the purpose of executing works authorised by the Act, the board must get approval not only of the Minister but also, if the land to be obtained falls within the council area, of the council. Failing that approval, it must get the authority of a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament.

The effect of this, taken in conjuction with the provisions of clause 7, means that a council may refuse to give approval. Obviously, if the council does not wish to incur liability towards the cost of purchasing land it will refuse to give approval for the purchase, even though the council may be interested in the purchase being carried out. Therefore, the effect of the proposed amendment is that there is a real incentive to the council to refuse approval. In those circumstances, the only way the Coast Protection Board could proceed with its acquisition, even though it might be necessary in the interests of the State, would be to obtain the authority of a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament.

This could well cause unwarranted and unnecessary delay. For example, if a desirable piece of land, which it is required to reserve for aesthetic purposes came on the market next week, it would therefore be necessary, in the absence of approval from the council concerned, for the Government or the Coast Protection Board to wait until February, 1976, and then get the approval of a resolution of both Houses of Parliament before proceeding. In the meantime, it is possible that the land concerned could be otherwise disposed of and lost to the people of South Australia. For that reason the proposed amendment is undesirable.

It is also, I believe, undesirable that a council should have power to refuse approval for something that could be in the interests not only of people in the area, or even one local person, but also of the people of the State. For that reason, the Government does not accept that prior approval of the council should be obtained. There is no reason in the world why acquisition of land for purposes such as those referred to in the second reading explanation should depend on council approval when other Government acquisitions for purposes in the public interest are not so controlled.

Mr. ARNOLD: I oppose the motion. Members will recall when this Bill was debated last evening that all members on this side expressed grave concern about clause 7, which relates to powers of acquisition. What the Minister has just said is that councils would act irresponsibly. Councils are as vitally concerned about this matter as is the Government. The arguments put forward by the Minister would indicate that he believes that councils concerned are likely to act irresponsibly. Councils are keen for this legislation to pass. The inclusion of the Legislative Council's amendment will satisfy members on this side and adequately cover the concern they expressed last evening. I do not think the delays in going through the procedure involved in the amendment will unduly delay the board's work. The important thing is that the work is done properly in the interests of all the people. Councils are responsible organisations rightly concerned with coast protection.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the Legislative Council's amendment. A council may oppose the purchase of a property that could involve much finance, particularly in relation to local government in the metropolitan area. The board has done a good job but we must protect councils, which could be embarrassed financially. If a council does not wish to go on with an acquisition or to be responsible for the finance involved, Parliament ought to decide the matter. Any delay involved would be more than justified.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I oppose the amendment and am certain that Opposition members have misunderstood its impact. The Minister has pointed out clearly that, when doubt was expressed about a similar measure a few months ago, members said that, if any land was to be purchased by the board that would require funds from a council, the council should have a voice in the decision. The earlier legislation did not provide for that, but this measure does. The Act still provides that, where the board believes that land ought to be purchased at total cost to the board, without involving the council (and a large area may be required), in terms of the Bill as it left here the board would be able to do that. By another provision, if the board wanted to involve the council in expenditure, the council had to approve. The amendment provides that, if the board wants to have a section of the coast, before it can spend its own money it must receive the approval of the council or of both Houses of Parliament. That would be comparable to the situation that, before the Government could purchase national parks or conservation parks to be completely funded by the Government, it would have to go to the council and, if the council objected, the matter would have to be brought to Parliament. By that time, the land could have been cleared, and recreation areas could be lost. It seems ridiculous to suggest that the Government, before spending its own money, would have to go through this machinery. The constraints imposed on the board by the amendment are unacceptable.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment imposes an unnecessary restriction on the powers of the board.

Later:

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

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment) moved:

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

Motion carried.

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

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 2 a.m.

At 2 a.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 3.35 a.m. The recommendation was as follows:

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

Later:

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

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): I move:

That the recommendation of the conference be agreed to.

The managers for the Legislative Council were happy to allow the purchase of land for the purpose of executing works without the approval of local government, but they thought that, when it was being bought for aesthetic reasons, there should be a right of appeal by the landowner. Therefore, they suggested a local government body, and in the case of refusal by that body, the matter should go to Parliament. However, the managers for the Legislative Council accepted the view that this was an unnecessary and unwarranted step and that the Government could, if it wished, acquire the land under the national parks legislation. It was considered unwise to make a distinction between land bought for purely works purposes and land bought for aesthetic reasons. Although several methods of giving a right of appeal were discussed, it was decided that there was no suitable way to give it and the managers were happy to accept an assurance that the board would not act capriciously in acquiring land, and withdraw the amendment.

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER FOR GLENELG

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. WELLS: During Question Time earlier today, in a heated moment I addressed an offensive remark to the honourable member for Glenelg by calling him a "pommy bastard".

Mr. Mathwin: You didn't smile, either.

Mr. WELLS: I am not suggesting that I smiled, but I regret what I said and I apologise to the honourable member for having made such a remark.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, February 3, 1976, at 2 p.m.

While this is not the end of the session, it is nevertheless approaching the Christmas season, so it is therefore appropriate that I should offer my thanks to you, Sir, and the staff of the House for your and their work during the session. I wish all the staff, including the Clerks, messengers, domestic staff, cleaners, Parliamentary Counsel and the policemen on duty in assistance to the House, as well as all the people who have so excellently served the Parliament during this year, a pleasant break and a happy Christmas. We will see them back next year.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have much pleasure in associating myself with the Premier's remarks, and I should like to say, on behalf of the Opposition, that it is most grateful for the fine services rendered by the staff of this Parliament. I also thank you, Sir, the officers of the Parliament, including the Library staff, *Hansard*, the messengers, the domestic staff, the caretakers, the electrician, and the air-conditioning experts (of whom we have seen much lately). I hope that, when the hot weather comes, they will be pleased to know that the cooling system at least is working.

On behalf of the Opposition, I, too, extend Christmas greetings to all members and the staff. This Christmas, cards are likely to be the exception rather than the rule. For that reason, I make a point of extending Christmas greetings to everyone. I should like to put in one plug: the combined charities Christmas card shop will suffer this year, and I suggest that members may care to make some sort of a donation to these fine charities to make up for the Christmas cards that, I think, will not be sold. I associate myself with the Premier's remarks.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): On behalf of the Liberal Movement members in this place, and more particularly in place of my Leader, who must have already left on his morning run, I join with the Premier and Leader of the Opposition in thanking all members of the Parliament House staff, in all their capacities, for the work they have done during this session in making the lot of members easier, as well as smoothing the way for us, for the effective working of the House. On behalf of my Party, I extend Christmas greetings to all staff and members.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): It seems appropriate that Christmas greetings should be extended on behalf of all Parties. I thank all members of all Parties for their co-operation throughout the year, and wish them a merry Christmas.

The SPEAKER: I am sure all members will accord me the opportunity to reply on behalf of the staff. First, I thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the members for Goyder and Flinders, as well as other members who I know wholeheartedly support them. We have been served well by our staff in every aspect of the smooth running of this Parliament. Having entered this House in what could probably be described as unusual circumstances, and having been called on to fulfil this office in a way that no other Speaker has ever been called on to do, in that I had the least Parliamentary experience of any former Speaker, it was essential for me to lean heavily on the staff.

I pay my own personal tribute to them, especially to the Clerk of the House (Mr. Dodd), and to the Clerk Assistant, the Clerks at the table, and all members of the staff who have supported me in every possible way. I also take this opportunity to wish members and the staff and their families a happy Christmas and a joyous and peaceful new year.

Motion carried.

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

That the House do now adjourn.

In so moving, I wish everyone a merry Christmas and a happy new year.

Motion carried.

At 3.48 a.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 3, 1976, at 2 p.m.