

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, December 9, 1976

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:

Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment,
Evidence Act Amendment,
Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act Amendment,
Local Government Act Amendment,
Local Government Act Amendment (No. 4),
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act Amendment,
Mobil Lubricating Oil Refinery (Indenture),
Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 2),
Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment (No. 2),
Railways Act Amendment,
Superannuation Act Amendment (No. 2).

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

At 2.5 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to amendments Nos. 1 and 2:

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

Clause 14, page 5, lines 14 to 16—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

73a. (1) A prescribed postal elector may apply for registration as a general postal voter.

Clause 17, page 6, lines 12 and 13—Leave out all words in these lines and insert the following:

(a) the applicant is a prescribed postal elector.
and make the following further amendment to the Bill:

Clause 4, page 1, line 14—After "is amended" insert—

(a) by inserting after the definition of "officer" the following definition:

"prescribed postal elector" means an elector who satisfies the Electoral Commissioner—

(a) that if he were resident, on a polling day, at his usual place of living, he would be entitled to have delivered or posted to him a postal vote certificate and a postal ballot-paper pursuant to section 75 of this Act;

and

(b) that, by reason of the infrequency of the mail service available to him at that place of living, it would not be reasonably practical for him to exercise the right to vote provided for by that section on that polling day:

and
(b)

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

Later:

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

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:
That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

Motion carried.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a petition signed by 221 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the existing discriminatory position of blood relations be removed and that blood relationships sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to *de facto* relationships.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

HOUSING TRUST

In reply to Mr. WOTTON (November 24).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have been advised that an officer of the South Australian Housing Trust's House Sales Section has held three discussions with the couple concerned. These discussions have been of a general nature and no actual quotations have been given. The salesman concerned recalls an initial interview in August when general information regarding the trust's sales programmes in country towns was discussed, and at that stage he indicated to them that a timber-frame single-unit house at Woodside built on Housing Trust land was selling for \$21 800. The salesman pointed out that this figure did include land costs, land and effluent drainage charges, stamp duty and transfer fees, and fencing charges. The couple called again on November 5, when they were given plans of various houses to consider. When asked for an average estimate, the salesman indicated that the prices could be in the vicinity of \$22 000 if built on the purchaser's own land. The salesman suggested to them that after perusing the plans they could make contact again with him on November 11, to actually indicate the house design which they would require.

At the interview of November 11, the couple showed a preference for a certain house type. The salesman said now that the couple had indicated the specific design they required the trust would obtain an actual quotation. He did mention to them, however that the trust had received in the previous days a quotation for a similar type house built on trust land at Tanunda which was for \$26 000. He then told the couple that, in view of this, and allowing for the land cost as well as the possible escalations which could occur in the six months it would take to erect the house, the estimate would be in the order of \$25 000. At no time has any actual figure been quoted to the couple, as the trust has had no definite idea of the design required or extras to be included. When salesmen discuss prices with people interested in the special sales scheme, they can only generalise and give estimates based on recent sales. They do attempt, in giving people some idea of cost, to take into consideration possible increases which may occur before the house is actually available for handover. The trust received the official application from this couple on November 16, 1976. The trust is now awaiting definite confirmation from them before it obtains a firm quotation.

In reply to Mr. BECKER (November 25).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The South Australian Housing Trust purchased from Princes Enterprises Proprietary Limited, for \$75 000, the property at 26 Tennyson

Street, Kurralt Park, comprising five flats, the price representing a cost of about \$15 000 a unit. The property was inspected before purchase by a licensed valuer and, irrespective of the lower price paid by the vendors a week earlier (of which the Housing Trust was aware), the Housing Trust was (and is) satisfied that \$75 000 was the market value at the time.

BOAT LICENCES

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (November 10).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Suitable officers of the local courts at Whyalla and Port Augusta have been contacted who, subject to the concurrence of the Director-General of the Legal Services Department, are prepared to accept appointment as examiners. These officers should receive the necessary instruction and equipment within the next two weeks.

RADIOACTIVITY

In reply to Mr. VANDEPEER (December 2).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: To produce additional radioactive material it is necessary to have material in a high state of purity assembled in such a manner as to exceed a critical mass (nuclear reactors, etc.). This cannot be achieved with low-grade material, such as is contained in the Port Pirie dumps. In fact, fissile material has been removed in the exported uranium. To produce an explosion of any nature, chemical or nuclear, requires more energy to be produced at the point of explosion than can escape by ordinary conduction processes. While some energy is produced from natural radioactive disintegrations, such as are associated with the dumps, the total heat energy produced throughout the dumps would be less than that associated with a single household incandescent globe and would escape easily by normal processes. There are much more highly active materials produced in reaction waste, and these when concentrated can give off considerable quantities of heat which, if confined without provision for the energy to escape, would give rise to a steam generated explosion. Such an explosion may have occurred in Russia.

ANSTEY HILL PARK

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (November 25).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As working has continued in the Tea Tree Gully quarry (which is within the Anstey Hill Recreation Reserve of the State Planning Authority) unforeseen changes in geological structure have been encountered by the operation. This meant that the original specification for finished levels and landscaping incorporated in the indenture between Quarry Industries and the State Planning Authority has required modification in the interests of safety. It has been necessary, therefore, to change the rehabilitation plans and, in time, to change the after-use proposals. There will no longer be sufficient room to construct an oval on the floor of the large quarry. A working group of staff from the Mines Department and the State Planning Office has examined the technical aspects of rehabilitation of the quarry. Their recommendations have allowed for a safe and efficient extraction of material while at the same time reducing the visual impact of the quarry as part of a proposed public park in the Hills Face Zone. The landscape design and site planning proposals,

at this stage, provide a framework of areas and vegetation within which a variety of recreation activities may be accommodated once quarrying has ceased on termination of the lease in 1980. The State Planning Authority has recently created a further working group to study the quarry and the Anstey Hill Recreation Reserve and to make more detailed recommendations for their development as a public park.

PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

In reply to Mr. SLATER (December 1).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This zebra crossing is planned for conversion to pedestrian actuated signals during 1977-78, subject to the availability of resources at the time.

FESTIVAL CENTRE

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (December 2).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In reply to questions about car parking facilities in the Festival Centre car park for members of Parliament, I have received information that these areas will come under the control of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, as set out in the proposed amendments to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act which are going through the present session of Parliament. The number of car parking spaces to be reserved for members of Parliament has been agreed at 70. However, there is provision for a maximum of 84 spaces. By using a system of movable bollards, the number of spaces available can be varied at 30, 52, 67 or 84. The number of spaces to be reserved for members of Parliament will be advised periodically to the Theatres Manager of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust by the presiding officers of Parliament. The Parliamentary car parking area will be controlled inside the car park by a boom gate which will be activated by an anti-pass back card key system held by each member of Parliament and allocated and issued by the Public Buildings Department. During non-manned periods, there will be a receptacle outside the car park in Festival Drive which will accept the card key and electrically activate the centre pair of main gates.

KANGAROO ISLAND SETTLERS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee upon the Investigations into the Financial Problems of War Service Land Settlement Lessees on Kangaroo Island, together with minutes of evidence.

Ordered that report be printed.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move: That Standing and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion without notice:

That Order of the Day: Other Business: No. 11 be taken into consideration forthwith and the Bill pass through its remaining stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House, and there is present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House; is the motion seconded?

Several honourable members: Yes.

Dr. TONKIN: This somewhat unusual action is being taken as the result of events in the House yesterday, and in fact during this week, because of the failure, as most members know, of a conference that was held on another similar Bill that was introduced relating to workmen's compensation.

The reason why it is necessary to suspend Standing Orders is that normally it would not be possible to introduce a measure encompassing the same matter that had already been decided by the House. The Bill, which was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw in another place, corrected many of the anomalies involving workmen's compensation and dealt with section 51, including the basis for compensation, but it contained no insurance clauses. The Minister's Bill dealt with the basis of compensation, without altering it very much, and contained clauses relating to insurance. We are told that the conference that took place in this Parliament yesterday lasted for less than seven minutes. There are grounds in both of the Bills for common agreement: in fact, there are eight or nine such grounds. It would not be proper for me to ventilate those grounds now but, because those grounds of common agreement are there, I believe it absolutely essential that this matter of workmen's compensation be brought before the House again.

There is, and there has been put to me, another way of achieving this end, namely, rescinding the decisions taken on the Bill considered previously. That step, which was outlined to me by the Deputy Premier (and I appreciate his concern in the matter), would be a clumsy step that would involve both Houses, and I cannot see that we could reach any rapid agreement on those matters of common interest. If, on the other hand, we introduced the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw's Bill into the debate at this stage, it would be possible to delineate the grounds of common concern this afternoon, and I think that, without difficulty, we could get them through this Parliament, as a whole, before we rise at the end of today's sitting.

It seems to me that there are two major areas in which there is unlikely to be agreement at this stage: the section 51 clauses and the insurance clauses. They will obviously take considerable time, discussion and study (that I fully admit). I believe it essential that, if we are to do the best we can for industry in this State, ensure that we are in line with the other States, and look after the rehabilitation of this State's workers, we should get on and settle those areas of common agreement. If we can bring that matter forward, it is quite possible this can be done. I do not intend to go into the reasons why the Government decided yesterday that it would not compromise, or why it was willing to sit in a conference for only seven minutes. I sent the following letter to the Premier today:

Workers' compensation legislation in this State is in urgent need of revision in that the cost of workers' compensation at present is one of several factors restricting our industrial development. With the loss of the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill following the failure of the conference between the two Houses there is no chance that the adverse effect on industrial development can be corrected.

South Australia cannot afford an overhead burden higher than other States if we are to compete favourably with them. However, the matter can still be raised within the short time which remains to us in this sitting. The Bill introduced by the Hon. D. H. Laidlaw in the Legislative Council (Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, No. 23), is currently on the Notice Paper under Orders of

the Day—Other Business. The proposals contained in that Bill, which has already passed the Upper House, provide for benefits which are as good as or better than those in any other mainland State, and better than those introduced into the A.C.T. in 1975, and endorsed by the Whitlam Administration. So that the matter may be brought before the House again I intend to move this afternoon that Standing Orders be suspended so far as to enable this Order of the Day—Other Business to be proceeded with forthwith, and in view of your expressed concern about the matter generally I am confident of your support.

The Opposition is quite prepared to sit for as long as is necessary to enable the matter to be ventilated further and for amendments to be considered and for the matter to come to conference between the two Houses if that proves to be necessary. I remind you again that the legislation has already passed the Upper House. Conferences have occurred at night in the past and could do so again on this matter. If this course of action is not agreed to and the present Act is not amended until the latter part of this financial year, I believe the consequences for industry in South Australia could be most adverse.

Mr. Langley: You had your chance, and you know it.

Dr. TONKIN: We did not have our chance and the matter was dealt with far from satisfactorily in conference. We are now giving the Government an opportunity to consider the Bill on the Notice Paper which deals with workmen's compensation which can be used most effectively to amend the legislation to bring it into line with other States and to significantly help the state of industry in South Australia. If we do not suspend Standing Orders at this stage, there is every possibility, in fact it is probable, that the Bill will lapse and it will not be possible to debate it again.

Mr. Langley: You made—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I am outlining reasons why I believe Standing Orders should be suspended. I have received a letter from the Premier in which he states that the Government's policy on workmen's compensation benefits shall not be less than the amount that a workman would be paid if he were at work. That is a matter for discussion and debate that could have come to conference, but the Government apparently was inflexible about it. In his letter the Premier stated:

The Government's statement in the House yesterday was clear and the Government therefore has no intention of proceeding with this or other private members' business.

The Premier said that the Government would oppose the suspension of Standing Orders. He went on:

It is quite apparent that this is a move by the Opposition to endeavour to excuse itself publicly for the fact that it has denied to industry the benefits which were contained in the Government's amending Bill and which the Legislative Council has foolishly laid aside.

That is not the reason for moving the suspension of Standing Orders. The reason for the motion is to bring the matter before this House again in a reasonable way, and the reasonable way is by dealing with the Bill which was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw and which was passed through the other place and brought into this House. It seems to me that the only logical thing the Government can do is to accept the suspension of Standing Orders and reactivate this Bill which is now before the House so that the matter can be dealt with again.

We have not in any way denied to industry the benefits which were contained in the Government's amending Bill; I do not believe there were significant benefits to industry in the Government's amending Bill in the overall effect. I realise that this motion may contravene Standing Orders and the practice of the House and I am quite prepared for a ruling on that, but I was not willing to let this occasion go by, in spite of whatever ruling you, Sir, may give, without at least trying to bring the matter before the House so that it can be debated again.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion.

Mr. Dean Brown: Shame!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is moving suspension of Standing Orders to allow a Bill that would otherwise not proceed before the House to proceed, when the subject matter of that Bill has already been debated at considerable length in this House and in another place, and has been the subject of disagreement between the two Houses that has not been resolved. At this stage there is no resolution of that disagreement, and no sign of it. Therefore, for us to suspend Standing Orders to allow this other measure to be debated in the House will achieve absolutely nothing, since there is no sign that the matter at issue can be resolved.

The Government was concerned to ensure that any avenue be taken to give to industry the benefits contained in its Bill, but in order to do that it had to be clear that the majority in another place was willing to reverse the stance it had taken on the matter of principle that the Government has clearly stated is not negotiable: that is, that a workman on workmen's compensation shall be paid the amount while he is off work that he would have been paid if he were at work. The Government has made clear that that is the basis of its policy, and that it cannot go beyond that. To negotiate that stand in any way would be to deny the very mandate of the Government and the basis of support that the trade union movement has given to workmen's compensation measures in this State.

Mr. Dean Brown: Now we are coming to the real masters.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a question of masters: the Government agrees with them. The people seeking to be masters in this matter are those in another place who will deny to industry the benefits in our Bill.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about the masters who cracked the whips this morning?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will tell the House what happened, because this will show how honest the honourable member is being in his interjections. After I had sent the letter to the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Deputy Premier conferred with the Leader and told him that if, in fact, the Opposition was willing to accept that the Government's proposals in relation to section 51, which effected the principle that I have enunciated, would be implemented, we would be willing to put up motions in this House and in the other place to rescind the motions of yesterday in order to allow the matter to go to conference, so that all other matters contained in the Bill could be negotiated at the conference. But we had to have—

Dr. Tonkin: The Minister said that section 51 would not be negotiated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly: I said that all matters other than section 51 would be negotiated. We made clear that we are not in any circumstances willing to put forward in this House for further debate a measure to which the Government cannot at all agree. The Leader then went off to get instructions about that offer, conferred with members from another place, and came back and said, "It's not on" or "We can't do that."

Dr. Tonkin: You know that that's not true either. All I did was get people to talk to the Minister on the subject, and that was what he stipulated—consideration and discussion with the other side. That is exactly right, so why don't you get your facts straight for a change?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What happened after the Minister had spoken to the Leader was that a message was brought back that it had to be Laidlaw's Bill.

Dr. Tonkin: That's right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is not willing to discuss that Bill further; there is no point in further discussing something on which there can be no agreement at all.

Dr. Tonkin: Not even if there is common ground?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no question of there being common ground on section 51. The Leader knows perfectly well that the major question in this matter is the question whether workmen who are off from work are to be paid whilst they are off from work what they would be paid whilst they were at work. Without that provision no measure could go forward on this issue. The Government is unwilling to discuss further an alternative when the alternatives have already been debated fully in this House, and there is no point in wasting the time of the House if it is evident from the start that no agreement can be reached. Industry was willing to accept that that should be the principle of the Bill, and members opposite will deny to industry that benefit; that is on their heads. This motion today to suspend Standing Orders is simply a sham. The Opposition knows that all it is proposing is to put up something on which there can be no agreement and which would merely be a waste of time.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Dr. TONKIN: Does the Premier intend to support Mr. Hawke in his proposals for talks with the Federal Government on a possible wage freeze pact, and, if so, what positive action does he intend to take in the matter? Mr. Hawke has shown a degree of statesmanship in his responsible attitude to the present economic problems of the country. I am tempted to say that it is an element of statesmanship which is perhaps greater than usual. However, left-wing union officials have expressed opposition to the proposal and are attempting to scuttle any reasonable attempt by Mr. Hawke to negotiate with the Government to help overcome inflation. On the local scene, Mr. John Scott has been most bitter in his attacks on Mr. Hawke. By this action, those union officials will be acting against the best interests of everyone in the community. Is the Premier therefore prepared to co-operate and give support to moves to discuss a wage freeze in Australia and to support Mr. Hawke in his moves to open discussions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I notice that the Leader asked me to support a wage freeze. He did not talk about concomitant measures which would have to be undertaken.

That reveals the Leader's normal bias in these matters. He wants to stop the workers from increases in prices for their product, which is their labour, but he does not say much about the other people who are putting up prices to the community.

Dr. Tonkin: If you had listened carefully you'd have heard—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I listened very carefully to the Leader's last phrase, which asked me again quite specifically whether I would support a wage freeze. There has been some suggestion by Mr. Hawke that this aspect of policy can be explored in talks between himself and the Federal Government. As to that matter, the State Governments have not been consulted but if, out of talks which have been forced by the States with the Federal Government, proposals should arise for an economic package which involves some degree of restraint all round in the community and if that were agreed, the State Government of South Australia would play its part. We have put forward proposals relating to matters of this kind to previous Federal Governments, and have indicated our willingness to co-operate in any agreed overall national policy. Mr. Fraser recently has been very reluctant to have talks of any kind with me, and refused to the Premiers, including Premiers of his own political colour, a Premiers' Conference on the economy. Whilst we were prepared to co-operate in talks relating to the future of the economy, Mr. Fraser did not want to talk to us. We have forced talks, because we have demanded a Loan Council meeting which Mr. Fraser could not refuse under the terms of the Financial Agreement. Constitutionally, a Loan Council meeting must be held when three Premiers require one, and consequently the Federal Government is having to talk to the States next week. In those talks, the States will be putting forward constructive and positive proposals in relation to the economy, and I hope that Mr. Fraser will be receptive in relation to these matters.

WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Works explain to the House the reasons for the present publicity campaign on the sensible use of water? Whilst the public seems to have grasped that the Minister is trying to save them money, the Opposition (particularly the member for Davenport) seems to be doing everything possible to undermine the campaign, to the detriment of the public at large.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have read with great interest the comments made yesterday by the honourable member for Davenport. I can only say that, in his usual inane, superficial and vituperative manner, the honourable member has deliberately misinterpreted the purpose of the campaign. He talks about the waste of public money on the campaign, yet less than three months ago in this House the Leader of the Opposition asked me to launch a major campaign to save water. I shall quote what the Leader said on that occasion, because I think it is relevant. He said:

The Government should conduct an intensive campaign by placing posters on public transport and using the press, radio and television to get the message home.

That publicity campaign, if undertaken, would have cost just as much as if not more than the present campaign. As usual, the Opposition was advocating a campaign for the wrong reasons; in fact, theirs was to have been a water conservation campaign because of the drought year. For the Government to have conducted such a campaign would

have been nothing more than blatantly dishonest because, despite the drought, our sound advance planning and our present pumping programme from the Murray River means that we can supply the Adelaide metropolitan area with all the water it needs. We do not have to save water because of any threatened shortages. For the Opposition to acknowledge that, it would have had to admit that the Government has done an excellent job in relation to water supplies in South Australia. The reason for the present campaign is simple and straightforward: more consumers are using more than their basic allowance of water and, as a result, they have to pay for the excess water they use.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And the basic amount they can use has been reduced.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If that is so, it is a good reason for telling them. The Government was conscious that many people were not fully aware of the situation. We estimate that, in the present consumption year, more than 50 per cent of consumers will have to pay for excess water. The member for Kavel might listen to that. It would have been irresponsible and callous if the Government had not launched this campaign to inform the public that excessive and wasteful use of water can be a costly exercise. I would imagine, if the member for Davenport was in my position—and God forbid that that should ever happen—that he would cynically sit back and say, "Let the money roll in. The more unaware the public is, the better it is for the Government coffers. Let the public suffer, if the books look good at the end of the financial year."

Mr. Coumbe: Who wrote this for you?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I dictated this reply, because I wanted to be sure I covered all the facts. If the honourable member does not believe me he can check with my steno-secretary. This campaign will cost about \$50 000, but I contend that the cost will be infinitely higher if an unaware and questioning public on receipt of their excess water accounts were to deluge the Engineering and Water Supply Department with individual complaints, requests for information and demands for meter tests. The cost in man hours to deal with all those individual requests would be much higher than \$50 000. The demands for meter tests would be massive and, as the member for Davenport is probably aware, there is no charge to the consumer for a meter test if it is found that the meter exceeds the prescribed accuracy limit. The cost to the consumer if a meter test reveals that the meter is accurate is \$5. Since this is invariably the result of testing, the consumer suffers the loss of a further \$5. I should also make clear that the \$5 charge does not cover the cost to the E. & W.S. Department of such testing, so the consumer loses and so does the E. & W.S. Department. The member for Davenport talked about the price of water. He is typically selective to support his personal bias. He has dealt with only part of the picture. He continually omits to acknowledge that giving a supply of reticulated water to metropolitan Adelaide is more difficult than for any other capital city in Australia. We are, as I have said on many occasions, the driest State in the world's driest continent.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you talking about reticulation, or supply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Reticulation and supply. We cannot reticulate if we have not got the water. We have the lowest rainfall in Australia: compared to that in Sydney and Melbourne, it is very much lower. Also, we have the highest annual evaporation rate. In the overall context of the E. & W.S. Department's supplying

water and providing sewerage to the Adelaide metropolitan area it is interesting to note that a survey of comparable properties carried out during 1975-76 indicated that, on an overall water and sewerage basis, Adelaide's charges were lower than those in Sydney, Melbourne and Perth. While the basis of rating is different in each case, examination of the figures also revealed that for an occupied dwelling in Sydney a minimum of \$106 water and sewerage rates must be paid, whereas in Adelaide the payment for an occupied dwelling could be as low as \$48. The trouble with the member for Davenport is that he cannot accept that anyone would do anything from a good motive. This is a cynical attitude that is typical of his Party, a Party that has traditionally and continuously conned and misled the people, and it is doing a good job of it Federally right now, too. The Liberal Party dresses up its public statements and attempts to give them a veneer of respectability, but it does not succeed. I wish that the member for Davenport would accept that the campaign on which the Government has embarked and in which it is involved is a genuine attempt to save people the embarrassment and discomfort of receiving very large excess water bills during this year and next year.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether it is a fact that the Premier's Department is to be split, with Mr. Bakewell in charge of economics and Treasury and Mr. Inns in charge of policy administration?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have previously announced that Mr. Bakewell will be moving to another position from that of Head of the Premier's Department. An announcement will be made about that matter shortly. As to Mr. Inns becoming head of the Premier's Department, the directorship of the Premier's Department will be advertised and filled by the Public Service Board recommendation to the Government in the normal way.

FLOOD PROBLEM

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Premier authorise an investigation into the flood problem that is frequently experienced by residents of Stirling North, a town near Port Augusta, with a view to determining the best way of overcoming the problem and the best method of financing the cost? The residents of Stirling North are living in what is now a flood plain, which a few years ago it may not have been, as a result of the construction of the east-west railway line and the construction of roads within the area. This has caused the movement of water to change. Stirling North is a very popular urban area for people to move into, but the flooding that they are experiencing is more than annoying. I point out that there is difficulty because neither of the local councils that administer Stirling North (the Quorn-Kanyaka council and the Wilmington council) has the financial resources to overcome this problem. I would appreciate it if the Premier could have this matter looked into with a view to assisting the councils.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will look into the matter and get a report for the honourable member.

MISS ADELE KOH

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say whether, in view of the fact that Miss Adele Koh was expelled from Singapore as a security risk by the Premier's former friend and

colleague, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, her position in the Premier's Department, with obvious access to confidential information, presents any threat to the security of his department, the Government, or the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know how low the honourable member tends to get, but I suppose I have yet to discover it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has made a statement that Miss Adele Koh was expelled from Singapore as a security risk. I do not know what is the basis for that statement. The position was that Miss Adele Koh was the features editor of the *Singapore Herald*. No allegation as to improper activity in relation to security was ever made against her. However, the *Singapore Herald* was critical of Mr. Lee Kuan Yew in some things, but not I think in her area of the paper, and the paper was ordered to be closed. Some of the people connected with the *Singapore Herald* were, in fact, taken into detention without charge. Miss Koh, being a Malaysian citizen and not a Singaporean, was given 24 hours to leave Singapore as a member of the staff, which she did. I point out to the honourable member that Miss Koh, prior to that, had been an instructor in the Malaysian Army. No allegation concerning her as a security risk has ever been made by any Government, and for the honourable member to carry on with that kind of tittle-tattle against a member of my staff who cannot defend herself in this place is just an example of the kind of way the Opposition is prepared to deal with politics in this State.

HOMEMAKER SERVICE

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Community Welfare give any indication of the success of the homemaker service established jointly by the Thebarton Residents Association and the Community Welfare Department's Mansfield Park and Thebarton district offices? I was intensely interested when this department began operations to provide relief to the many women who found themselves in very difficult circumstances because of domestic problems, etc. I know that some people in my area have availed themselves of the opportunity to seek advice and relief from this organisation, and I should like to know whether or not the acceptance of this service is widespread and whether the Minister intends in the future to increase the activities of this department in other districts.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am pleased to report that the homemaker service is proceeding well at Thebarton and that my department is looking at possible ways of expanding its operation. As the honourable member knows, the homemaker service involves placing an experienced and successful homemaker with a family to act as a model mother for a woman who, perhaps is having difficulty coping with domestic and other problems that are occurring. The homemaker's job is not to act simply as a household helper performing tasks for the family: her role is to play an educational part in assisting to provide practical help in solving domestic problems in the home. It is interesting to note that an evaluation of the results of the Thebarton pilot scheme indicates a considerable degree of success, with clients taking over the tasks they had been performing with or under the assistance of the homemaker provided. Statistically, perhaps it is a modest beginning.

Seven homemakers are currently employed working part-time with several families simultaneously, and we have assisted 35 families. It seems to me (and I know that the department has already reached this conclusion) that the service has definite potential for growth. One avenue being examined is in the use of specialist homemakers to work with particular groups, say, Italian or Greek homemakers in their communities.

MINISTERIAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier ensure that in future Ministerial employees observe the provisions of the Public Service Act and be subject to the same discipline and control as are public servants? My question is supplementary to replies to a couple of Questions on Notice last Tuesday, and you, Mr. Speaker, would realise that this is the first chance I have had to question the Premier orally on this matter. One of my questions was whether there were any reasons, apart from confidentiality, for employing these people. The Premier said that the reply had already been given in Parliament, but it had not been given. The Premier said that, if I spent more time in the House, I would not be asking such redundant questions. That was straight-out abuse, because I had raised this matter, and I have been present on every occasion on which it has been raised.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: If that's the case, it would have been pure luck.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I manage to make my presence felt (and I speak with modesty) at least as much as do other members.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Outside the Chamber, too, on occasions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Even outside the Chamber, too. The other question I asked (having a good idea of the answer) was whether Ministerial employees were subject to the provisions of the Public Service Act, and I received the reply that they were not so subject. It is acknowledged, even by the Premier himself, that most Ministerial employees are the personal and political friends of Ministers. I have received several suggestions of extreme laxness among Ministerial employees, all of whom are well paid—much better than are most public servants. The complaints I have had about laxness go to punctuality and attendance at work. This type of complaint, which is current in the Public Service, has caused considerable ill feeling by public servants towards Ministerial employees.

It is common ground that this Government has greatly increased the number of such employees. Before the present Government came to office, there were hardly any. Obviously, from the answers the Premier has given, it is a system which is open to grave abuse by Ministerial employees if they choose to abuse it, as I believe that some of them at least are doing at present. I know of no other way to get over this matter, short of making these people subject to departmental control in the way in which I have suggested. It is for these reasons that I put my question to the Premier, because, unless something is done, I think that there will be some unpleasant and unhappy consequences for the Government itself.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what unpleasant or unhappy consequences the honourable member may be talking about. In fact, the Ministerial staff, to my knowledge, work hard and work longer hours than do public servants.

Mr. Millhouse: Your knowledge must be limited to some of the others.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All I can say is that, in the case of those who come directly under my control, they certainly work long hours.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you turning a blind eye to the others?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The control of Ministerial staff is in the hands of the Minister concerned. If the honourable member has particular allegations to make, he had better make them particular, and not make vague general accusations about Ministerial employees generally. I know personally, from my own Ministerial staff (and it has been to them that the honourable member's questions have generally been directed), that they work long hours and hard. In fact, numbers of other people from outside the Government who have been acquainted with the demands I make on my staff sympathise with my Ministerial staff as to the requirements I have for them.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You're a slave driver.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid that is at times so—not that some public servants are not similarly slave driven. I freely confess that I have worked Mr. Bakewell well beyond the bounds of duty.

Mr. Millhouse: He's not a Ministerial employee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know. I said that some public servants had been worked hard. I am certain also that Mr. Bakewell, a public servant who has been worked extremely hard, is not one of those who has complained about how hard the Ministerial staff are worked. He knows how hard they have to work. Discipline is exercised by the Ministers, and to my knowledge they require a great deal of work from their staff.

JOB HUNTERS CLUBS

Mr. OLSON: Is the Minister of Community Welfare aware of the criticism by a Federal member of Parliament of the work of his department's job hunters clubs, and has this criticism given any grounds for believing that the Federal Government's community youth support scheme is superior? I have heard indirectly that the Federal member for Barker recently criticised the job hunters clubs on two grounds—

Mr. Gunn: Dear Dorothy!

Mr. OLSON: —claiming that they had failed because the persons employed to run them were incompetent and they were not paid for their services. I understand that some members of the Liberal Party (I do not know whether the member for Victoria was one of them) had taken Mr. Porter to task over his remarks, because it is generally believed in local communities that the job hunters clubs are working well.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Apparently the honourable member for Eyre is nervous about what might follow. He must have seen the remarks referred to. My understanding is that Mr. Porter recently, in connection with the launching of the Federal Government's community youth support scheme in the South-East, made certain remarks suggesting that the South Australian Government's job hunters clubs were not very satisfactory and that the Commonwealth Government's were far superior. The remarks were to the effect that the people appointed to run the South Australia Government's clubs were incompetent and not paid, but he was wrong on both grounds. I can only suggest that Mr. Porter has a bias against universities, because the people appointed to run South

Australia's job hunters clubs in almost every case have been persons with degrees. Apparently he does not agree that university qualifications are of any use. Secondly, I can only assume that he has a bias against the voluntary sector and voluntary assistance. He complained that the people were incompetent because they were not paid. Many thousands of South Australians are giving great help to youth and to all sections of youth in South Australia on an unpaid basis. No-one would wish that to cease nor would they say automatically that it was incompetent because the people were not being paid. It is an insult to the many people in the community who give their time so freely.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He's biased against—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That may well be the case, but I am just surprised. I know that the *Naracoorte Herald*, which has not always taken a friendly attitude towards me (earlier I was criticised by someone in the area for being undemocratic, and I am sure the Editor does not know me), pointed out the error of Mr. Porter's ways, as I understand it. I am sorry that Mr. Porter is taking this line about the activities being provided to try to assist young people. I welcome the scheme: let us get that clear. I do not take Mr. Porter's attitude about the schemes in existence. I welcome it.

Mr. Chapman: And he explained it clearly and well.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not think the honourable member who is interjecting has any great record in the employment field or in endeavouring to provide assistance. The best advice the honourable member has been able to offer is that they should go without food for a while and then they would soon come to heel. I do not think that would have been much help to us. Many people in this country are worried about the position in which our youth is finding itself. People might score political points by arguing whose fault it is, how they got there and why the country is in this situation. I have no quarrel with that, but when it comes to considering the nitty gritty of the matter Mr. Porter ought to be more genuine. I welcome an additional activity in the field. I can see no problem. I expect our job hunters clubs to be able to work in a complementary way with the Commonwealth scheme.

Mr. Allison: But you—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I wish the member for Mount Gambier would give me a go. If I were a whimsical person I would wonder where the Commonwealth Government suddenly obtained the \$1 000 000 necessary to launch this scheme in a time of economic stringency which it is telling us about every day. All of a sudden it has produced \$1 000 000 with which to launch this scheme, which has some attributes similar to those contained in the Australian Assistance Plan, a plan which the Commonwealth refuses to fund further. I am not a whimsical person by nature, so I will not indulge in that whimsy further. I welcome this activity in the area, and I hope it presages a far more useful activity in the area of youth unemployment, that is, a change in the Commonwealth Government's economic policy so that we can get more jobs and less need for this kind of activity.

LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to take urgently whatever steps are necessary to withhold the printing and publication of the Land Settlement Committee report (Appendix A in particular), as tabled in the House this afternoon? Appendix A

is the only part of the report that concerns me in the proposal to have it published. Throughout the committee hearings on this subject, it was consistently agreed at committee level that the personal details relating to the specific 21 Kangaroo Island settlers would not be embodied in the report but indeed they would be appended to that report in what was to be known as Appendix A. The reason for that agreement at committee level was that those personal details and the actual recommendations applicable to the specific 21 settlers would not become public. It was understood and believed by the committee members that by so doing it would destroy the confidence of the banker-client relationship that ought to be preserved at every level, in this instance the Government being the bank and the settler being the client. Having undertaken to accept that principle at committee level and now to find that the whole of the document, including those personal details and the actual recommendations and the individual naming of the 21 settlers as they appear in Appendix A, is to be printed, I consider it is either an oversight or an act of sabotage and a breach of faith as not only accepted at committee level but in fact implied to the settlers concerned throughout the hearing. I seek the Minister's co-operation in this regard. Section 22 of the Land Settlement Act, 1944, sets out the duties of the committee in this regard and it states quite specifically in the first paragraph that the committee is to do the following:

To inquire into and report to the Governor upon any project for land settlement or any question relating to the settlement, development or working of any land, which is referred to the committee by the Governor.

I can find no reference in the Act that the committee is required to table such personal details in the Parliament, details which I believe actually belong to the settlers and their families.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will certainly have a look at the matter for the honourable member. I will ask the indulgence of the Speaker to hold the report and that no action be taken on the printing until we can examine the matter raised by the honourable member. I will do something about it as quickly as possible.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr. WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Education been informed by the Commonwealth Minister for Education of any proposed funding responsibilities for education that the Fraser Government may be endeavouring to unload on to the State Governments? In the *Advertiser* this morning is a report that states:

Canberra—The Commonwealth planned to make the States contribute more towards the cost of education, the Opposition's education spokesman, Senator Wriedt, said yesterday.

Proposals from an inter-departmental committee now being considered by the Government recommended the transfer of additional financial responsibilities for education to State Governments, he said.

The committee had been established to make recommendations on the areas to be transferred.

The result of this move would jeopardise Australian education standards.

Senator Wriedt said he believed the States had not been consulted or informed about the proposal.

I am sure all Australians are concerned about this. Has the Minister any information about the effect this will have on South Australia?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I know only what I have read in the newspapers. I noticed in an Eastern State newspaper earlier this week that there was speculation that discussion at Cabinet level on this matter was taking

place. I assume that Senator Wriedt's statement is based on that same source of information, however soundly based or otherwise. Senator Carrick, the Commonwealth Minister for Education, is also the high priest of new federalism and regularly tells Ministers of Education from the States at Australian Education Council meetings that in a few years, as a result of changes which he says are taking place in the financial arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States, it will be the States that will be the wealthy partners in the federalism arrangements and the Commonwealth that will have little financial responsibility or capacity. We have yet to see that happen in practice. I imagine that the university community for one would be extremely disturbed at any proposition which would mean a return to a mixed funding arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States. The States in turn would be concerned about anything but a completely automatic adjustment which would ensure that whatever additional finance they had to make to the tertiary sector would be returned to them under the normal funding formula for taxation reimbursement from the Commonwealth. Generally, it would seem to be a retrograde step that involves a return to increasing bureaucracy because of the need to involve two levels of Government instead of one. I think the university community generally would see itself as being a national resource that should properly be funded completely at the national level rather than at a State level. The same would be true of the college sector, although some courses at the advanced education level are still funded from State sources, although that has been a declining component as time has passed.

Concerning technical and further education, as the honourable member would be aware during the past three years there has been, in percentage terms, a considerable reduction in the commitment of the Commonwealth to this sector. In the present rolling triennium there has been an allowance for about a 7 per cent expansion: in fact, in contradistinction to what is happening in practically every other sector of education there is an enormous growth rate in this field, and I understand that the trend has been from about 25 per cent of Commonwealth funding for this area two or three years ago down to about 10 per cent at present. Unless additional funds are made available in this area from the Commonwealth the percentage will decline further. I have to be fair and say that, at this stage, it is all speculation, but I am sufficiently disturbed about it to ensure that I will discuss this matter with the Commonwealth Minister at the forthcoming Australian Education Council conference.

EYRE PENINSULA JETTIES

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Marine explain what the Government intends in relation to the future of Marine and Harbors Department jetties throughout the State, especially those at Tumby Bay, North Shields, Louth Bay, and Dutton Bay? If the jetties are removed, can they be replaced with a catwalk-type of structure to be used by the general public? The Minister will be aware of a confrontation that arose about the Tumby Bay jetty about two years ago. I have since been told that advice has been received that the North Shields jetty is in jeopardy, as are the jetties at Louth Bay and Dutton Bay. People in those areas are concerned that they may lose these jetties and are asking whether, if the jetties have to go, they could not be replaced with a smaller steel-framed structure

so that tourists and the general public could use them, as they would be adequate for this purpose. I understand that negotiations with the Coast Protection Board on this matter may be possible, as it is involved with regard to some tourist facilities.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Some time ago the responsibility for jetties throughout South Australia, other than those serving commercial interests, was handed over to the Minister for the Environment as Minister responsible for the Coast Protection Board. Up to that time the general policy of the Government (and it was a policy followed by the Playford Government for many years) was that the jetties would not be destroyed but would be shortened to a length of about 200 metres or to a depth of about 4 metres of water, whichever was reached first. The depth of water had to be about 4 m at the deep end. It became apparent that, because the Marine and Harbors Department was involved with commercial operations, we had to have a different attitude concerning jetties because of the tourist potential. It was considered that the Coast Protection Board was the most appropriate authority to handle this matter. The policy that has been maintained (and I do not think it has been reviewed, although I will obtain that information for the honourable member) has been for the Government to provide up to 80 per cent of the necessary capital to repair the jetties to a reasonable standard and for councils to take them over, lease them, and be responsible for future maintenance. However, some councils are reluctant to do this because they have a rate problem, but others are quite happy to accept the responsibility. I guess that the Tumby Bay council would be happy because, when we were going to shorten one of its jetties it reacted so violently that I was convinced that it could retain the jetty if it paid for it, and we would assist the council through the Regional Employment Development scheme at that stage. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

At 3.16 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Works made a totally unwarranted attack on me personally, and referred especially to the fact that I had not done my homework in relation to the cost of water. What can be noticed in the Minister's reply is that he did not quote from what I said as reported in *Hansard*. I shall read what I said to show that what the Minister imputed I said was incorrect. I said:

After a close examination of the facts it becomes obvious the Government is trying to justify large water accounts because South Australia has the most expensive water (cost per litre) of any State in Australia. The use of Government funds in an attempt to hide the high cost of water is a misuse of those funds and a shameful reflection upon the Government.

Details of the cost of water a kilolitre for the different States are as follows:

Sydney, 14·3c; Melbourne, 12·75c (residential) and 15c (industrial); Perth, 14·3c (with a reduction if paid by November 30, to 13·75c); Brisbane, no specific cost a kilolitre; Hobart, 12c; and Adelaide 16c.

My statement was correct, and I had done my homework; the Minister misquoted the facts.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You should be fair and reasonable.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have quoted the exact figures, and that is what I said I was quoting yesterday. The Minister, despite his interjections trying to cover up the point, has misquoted the facts.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: These figures used in any way you like give a wrong impression, and you know it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can I have my say? I did not interrupt you when you were speaking.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Davenport that he is making a personal explanation, and should not get into debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: What I said yesterday and what I quoted yesterday was the cost a kilolitre, and the facts as I have presented them substantiate everything I have said. What I said was absolutely correct; I had done my homework very well, and the Deputy Premier did not like it.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 21 and 22 (clause 55)—Leave out "by a number of factors one of which is" and insert "to a significant extent by".

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 5)—After line 26 insert the following passage after paragraph (b)—
"notwithstanding that other factors motivate or influence his decision".

No. 3. Page 3, lines 36 to 39 (clause 11)—Leave out the clause and insert new clause 11 as follows:

"11. Where, in proceedings for an offence against this Act, the court—

(a) is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the defendant discriminated against another;

and

(b) is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the defendant discriminated against that other person on the ground of his race,

the offence shall be deemed to have been proved."

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. The Government is willing to agree to these amendments only with the greatest reluctance. We believe that the amendments do nothing significant, and that they weaken the provisions of the Bill. We accept the amendments only on the basis that we believe that the Liberal members of another place cared so little about this subject that they would be more pleased for the Bill to have been defeated than to compromise on it. The Government therefore has no alternative but to accept the amendments. As I have said, the amendments will weaken the intention of the legislation and will make it more difficult to obtain a prosecution in circumstances where discrimination has occurred. In particular, amendments Nos. 1 and 2 will significantly weaken the intention of the legislation, because it will now be the case that, where a person is discriminated against on the grounds of race, colour or whatever, and some other matter the person discriminating chooses to say that

he did not discriminate to a significant extent on the basis of nationality, country of origin, colour of skin, ancestry etc., it will be difficult to obtain a satisfactory prosecution and hence a conviction.

The Government therefore believes that the Bill as it was originally introduced in this place and as it was sent to another place would have been more satisfactory and more appropriate to deal with discrimination. The Government believes that discrimination on the grounds of race or the other matters dealt with in the Bill is a most objectionable and abominable form of discrimination: it is probably the worst form of discrimination that one could imagine. In those circumstances, it is most unfortunate that the other place has chosen to reflect the views of people such as the member for Alexandra, who chose in this place to air his racist attitude and his bigotry before the people of South Australia. The Government much regrets that it has no alternative but to accept these amendments, but it does so with greatest reluctance. I give notice that at the earliest possible time the Government will take the necessary steps to include in the Bill the strength of the original provisions, which have been deleted by the other place.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): As I have said before several times, it is a great shame that the Attorney seeks to make every post a political whipping post. This legislation is non-partisan: it is certainly non-Party legislation. The Opposition's approach is a common and consistent approach. It may be more difficult now to obtain prosecutions under this legislation, but I do not believe that that weakens the legislation in any way: that the measure exists is one thing; that it is stronger than it was is another thing. The Bill will now abide by a fundamental principle of justice again. I should not have to point that out to the Attorney.

I do not intend to go into all the matters that I raised during the second reading debate. Clause 11 as it stood was a total negation of the basic principles of justice. Clause 11, as it will be under amendment No. 3, is a fair and reasonable compromise. It gives due deference to that fundamental principle, and it puts the onus of proof somewhere in the middle, which is entirely satisfactory. The inclusion of the words "to a significant extent" is important, too. Whatever else we do in this place, we must not pass legislation that railroads people, no matter how good the cause. That comment applies to any cause, whether racial discrimination, drug peddling or anything else. Everyone has rights under the system of justice as we know it. The amendments to which we are now agreeing uphold those principles of justice.

Mr. WARDLE: I am exceedingly pleased that the other place has thoroughly considered this issue. I suggested in the second reading debate that I hoped that the other place would adopt that procedure. These amendments are not identical to those that I would have included, but they are similar. I am pleased that the Attorney has accepted them, because they make the legislation more reasonable. The measure might not be as strong as the Attorney wanted it, but that is no justification for its being so strong and having so many teeth. I was interested in the Attorney's comment that, at the first available opportunity, he would try to put back into the Bill what he had in mind. In the meantime, a case or cases may occur that will prove to the Attorney that the measure, with these amendments, will deal satisfactorily with that case or those cases.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you think he would acknowledge it?

Mr. WARDLE: He has no option but to try it; he is willing to do that, and I am glad. Although I have said that he has no option, he does have other options.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Ineffective, though.

Mr. WARDLE: Be that as it may, the Attorney has said that he is willing to go along with the amendments, about which I am pleased. I am especially pleased that he has agreed to amendment No. 3, which reverses the onus of proof and which is a terribly important basic principle.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 4)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment:

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CAPITAL PUNISHMENT ABOLITION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment.

Page 2, lines 19 to 26 (clause 4)—Leave out subsections (1) and (2) and insert new subsections (1) and (2) as follows:

“(1) Notwithstanding any provision of any Act or law, but subject to subsection (2) of this section, no sentence of death shall be—

(a) imposed upon, or recorded against, any person;

or

(b) carried into execution upon any person, and where, but for this subsection, a person would be liable to sentence of death under any Act or law, the Court before which that person is convicted shall, in lieu of sentencing him to death, sentence him to be imprisoned for life.

(2) Sentence of death shall be passed upon a person convicted of murder, and the sentence unless commuted shall be carried into effect in any of the following cases:

(a) where the convicted person has previously been convicted of murder;

(b) where the victim of the murder—

(i) was a member of the police force, or a prison officer;

and

(ii) was murdered while acting in the course of his duties as such;

(c) where the murder was committed in pursuance of an agreement or arrangement under which the convicted person received, or was to receive, valuable consideration for committing the murder;

(d) where the murder was committed in pursuance of a scheme or design—

(i) to terrorize the people of any country or state, or of any national, ethnic or religious group;

or

(ii) to extort any benefit from the government of any country or state, or from any national, ethnic or religious group;

(e) where—

(i) the victim of the murder was a child under the age of twelve years;

and

(ii) the murder was committed in the course of the commission of an offence of a sexual nature upon the victim.”

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

I do not intend to delay the Committee with a dissertation on this matter. I think everything that usefully could be said was said in the debates in this House during November.

Mr. Millhouse: You know you've got the numbers in the Upper House, anyway.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is as it may be. That is all the more reason why the time of this place should not be taken up with a long debate. The amendment would totally compromise the intention of the Government. As I said in the second reading debate, the basic question which the Parliament must ask itself and which each member must ask himself or herself is this: are there any circumstances in which the State is justified in taking the life of one of its citizens? The Government's answer is an emphatic “No”. We believe that to accept the amendment would be to accept that in some circumstances capital punishment does act as a deterrent and does achieve those aims which the retentionists have suggested it achieves. I believe that this place should reject this amendment unanimously and send the matter back to the Legislative Council for further consideration. In effect, it is a last gasp attempt by the retentionists to endeavour to save some form of capital punishment. The Government recognises this amendment as just that, and rejects it accordingly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I totally disagree with the outlook of the Attorney-General in this matter. Having said that, I must qualify my remark in the present situation. He calls this the last gasp of the retentionists. I would say it is the greatest sham I have ever known.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: We agree on that point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Good. We have an amendment which I must say personally would not be acceptable to me. We have it passed, as I understand it, on the casting vote of the President of the Legislative Council, and then one of the members of the Liberal Party who had voted for this goes outside and says, well knowing what the result would be down here, that when the Bill comes back to the Legislative Council, unless the amendment has been accepted down here, he will vote for the Bill in its original form.

Mr. Evans: In fairness to him, he did say it in the Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps he did. I heard it first on the wireless this morning, and I saw it in the *News* this afternoon. I immediately thought of the remark, which the Premier has made many times when he does not want to disclose his hand, that he does not signal his punches. If anything signalled a punch, this did. I have little doubt that the whole scheme was hatched in the Party room of the Liberal Party and that Liberal Party members in the Upper House thought they would put up this pretence for a while and then let it go; whether or not the Hon. Mr. Cameron's gaffe was also worked out up there in the Party room, I cannot say. I would doubt even that the members of that place would have agreed to that. This makes the whole debate absolutely hollow and futile. We know the result. As the *News* says today, South Australia's hanging law will end today. It is as certain as anything can be.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It will not end until the Bill goes through.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the headline. It will go through the two Houses, and it will still need the Royal Assent. Having criticised what has gone on in that place in the strongest possible terms—and I have little doubt that some other members in this place will share my views even if they do not air them—I do not believe that this

amendment could work. In my view, it is necessary to have capital punishment for all capital offences or for none. The United Kingdom tried this scheme and it was found not to work. It is easy to see why there are all sorts of anomalies. In the United Kingdom, it was decided that an offence would be a capital offence if the murder were linked with a robbery.

Mr. Coumbe: Premeditated.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but they linked it with robbery. If someone was murdered in the street and if the murderer snatched the handbag at the same time, that was a capital offence; if he did not, it was not. That was one anomaly. One anomaly I can see immediately in this—and it is only experience that discloses most of them—is the very common suggestion that it should be a capital offence if a police officer or a prison officer is the victim. Everyone who has tried this sort of middle course puts that up. What about people who work for security firms? Why should not they be included? They have as much right to the protection of the law, because they are protecting property.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Or bank tellers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, we could go on and on.

Mr. McRae: A citizen coming to the rescue of the police.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My friend from Playford gives another example. We could go on finding anomalies in any attempt such as this to steer a middle course. That is what the English found. I cannot support this amendment at all, because it will not work. I am still of the opinion that we should retain capital punishment, but the actions of another place, and particularly what has been said publicly by one member of that place, make this whole debate a sham. To that extent, I must agree with the Attorney-General that there is no point whatever in debating the matter at length.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was one member in this place who was opposed to the Bill. I was not privy to any Party room discussions in relation to what has eventuated from the Upper House, but if the amendment does nothing else it highlights some of the ghastly situations facing people who are charged with protecting the community. No-one relishes the thought of capital punishment. One would be a ghoul if he did. The murder of a police officer is mentioned in the amendment. We know what happened in that regard in Great Britain when capital punishment was abolished, and we know the difficulties experienced there in trying to reintroduce capital punishment. If the polls are any indication, about 85 per cent of the people want to reinstate capital punishment, but they cannot get it through the Parliament.

Another situation dealt with in the amendment concerns a murder committed in pursuance of a scheme or design to terrorise the people of any country or State or of any national, ethnic, or religious group. Let us look at the situation in Israel, where wanton acts of terrorism are rife. In that country, the reinstatement of capital punishment is being considered. Probably the type of crime which most shocks the community is that involving the murder of a child under the age of 12 years, especially where the murder is committed in the course of the commission of an offence of a sexual nature upon the victim.

In my view, far too much emphasis is placed on the criminal in this situation and not enough thought is given to the victim of this violent and often most horrible of crimes or to the families and relatives of these people. Despite the misgivings of the member for Mitcham, I

am prepared to support these amendments. I think there is a strong case for retaining capital punishment on the Statute Book. If the Government wants to commute the death sentence it can. Once this provision is erased from the Statute Book it will be difficult to reinstitute. The day could well come when we will rue the passing of this legislation in South Australia.

Mr. EVANS: I hold the same view that I held earlier. I do not believe that there is any proof that, having the opportunity to hang somebody, or take their life by any other method, because a group of fellow citizens has decided they are guilty of murder, will decrease the numbers of the crimes in that field. If that provision is removed from the Statute Book, I do not think the number of murders committed will increase. If by abolishing capital punishment it can be shown that in our society there is an increase in this type of crime compared to other areas of crime I would be the first to look at the proposition again. I believe that we have the opportunity to prove once and for all whether there is any difference in having this provision on the Statute Book or otherwise.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's a high cost to pay.

Mr. EVANS: There are high costs to pay today in other areas of the law where we have taken the easy way out. The Deputy Leader made the point about the situation in England. I think the whole of English society has started to degenerate and that this is possibly its problem. The Minister of Education shakes his head, but if our society takes the same path we may find that we have to have more respect for the laws we have and that we will have to encourage those who impose the penalties to impose more severe penalties in the areas where imprisonment or large fines prevail. As I have said before (and this cannot be provided for in an amendment), in cases of the more vicious premeditated murders the murderers should be gaoled for the term of their natural life when found guilty, never to be released unless found innocent. I know that it would cost society much money to keep those persons in gaol, but I believe strongly there is every justification for society to say that that person will never be given his freedom again.

Since I voted on this matter only a few weeks ago, I have been surprised by the number of young people in the 16 to 22 year age group who have approached me to tell me that they believe I am wrong. They respect my opinion and I respect theirs. On a previous occasion a couple of years ago when I voted in favour of the abolition of capital punishment, the young people had a different approach; they believed I was right in voting against capital punishment. I want it on record that I respect their view, and I am amazed at the number of young people who now realise that there is a problem in the enforcement of law and the operation of law in our community and who believe that I am wrong in voting against capital punishment. I personally cannot support their view. This is a conscience vote, and the young people understand that. I would like them to know that I understand their point of view and that, if in the long term there is an increase in murders, I will support the reintroduction of the death penalty.

Mr. GUNN: I have not changed my view on this matter. Since it was first brought into the House by, I think, the former Attorney-General (Mr. King) I have always believed there are cases when it is justified to use capital punishment. As the member for Mitcham has pointed out, unfortunately people in our community are prepared to stop at nothing to achieve certain aims. They are willing not only to endanger but also to take the lives of many innocent

people who have no way to protect themselves. Yet, this Government is prepared to remove from the Statute Book a provision about which it has the final say, since it decides whether the penalty will be carried out. Cabinet has the final say whether the death sentence is carried out, so there is no logical reason to have this legislation passed.

This is clearly another example of the Labor Party wishing to bow to the whims of the extremists in its ranks. I respect the view of the member for Fisher, but I think we will see the same thing take place as has taken place in the United Kingdom, with the public clearly requiring legislation of this nature to be returned to the Statute Book. We will then find it difficult to re-enact legislation of this nature. I believe this is a retrograde step. I support the amendment proposed even though I do not think it is workable. I see a number of anomalies in relation to the amendment, and I believe the other place would have been better to have rejected the legislation and left the position as it was.

Mr. BOUNDY: I rise to reinforce the attitude I took to this measure when it was before the House at the second reading stage. I believe, as I have always believed, that this is a black and white issue and the amendment does not improve the position; one is either for abolition or for retention. I think that the anguish the people of America are going through in relation to the Gilmore case is indicative of what happens when the death penalty still prevails. The Statute Book says that it can be carried out, and public opinion says it is right to carry it out, but consider what happens. Gilmore almost did the job himself, by committing suicide. Why did they not let nature take its course? He was brought back to life so that the State could execute him. Now we see all the procedures of appeal taking place to prevent his own wishes and the laws of the land being carried out. I think that case is farcical.

Mr. Wells: He's now requesting it not be carried out.

Mr. BOUNDY: I have not read that. Although I respect the views of my friends and colleagues who want to see the death penalty retained for the reasons they have stated, I think that, when it came to the point of making the decision personally to take another's life in cold blood, they would resile from that duty in most cases. I would be as ready as any other person to take someone's life in the heat of the moment if he endangered my family but, having prevented that deed, I believe that nothing would be gained six months later by taking his life for what he had done previously. Our mistake in South Australia is that we are too kind in our parole provisions. For the heinous crimes that have been referred to as justifying the retention of a qualified death penalty, I believe that we ought to imprison people for the term of their natural life, and I think that they would suffer more.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise to speak on this Bill, which has not yet finally passed the Parliament, in the expectation that it will pass and in the light of my knowledge that this will be the only opportunity I shall have to say anything further on the matter. I do not want to raise the issue again, but simply place on record that I believe that today will be a day of great historic importance to South Australia, with the passage of the Bill, and that it will go down in history as a day of suitable enlightenment for South Australia. I believe that we are about to take a great humanitarian step. Abolition of capital punishment is a mark of a compassionate, humane society. I believe passionately that the Bill, in

passing through Parliament, will mark a new era of enlightenment in South Australia. To me, it is a matter of great personal satisfaction that I was able to introduce the Bill in Parliament on the occasion of its final passage, but I should not like this opportunity to pass without paying a tribute to two members who, throughout their Parliamentary careers, have battled and struggled for the implementation of this measure.

I refer to the member for Ross Smith, who first introduced a measure of this kind in the early 1950's and who, since then, has supported measures of this kind until finally today he no doubt will have the great satisfaction of seeing the Bill pass. The other member who has struggled through his Parliamentary career to see the passage of a message such as this and the removal of capital punishment from the Statute Book is the Premier, who certainly, as much as the member for Ross Smith, is responsible for the fact that the public of South Australia has now come to accept the need for this measure. I think it fitting that I should pay a tribute to the work that they have done in trying to ensure the passage of this Bill, and I acknowledge the undoubted satisfaction they will have in the knowledge that the Bill has finally passed into law in this State.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment destroys the main purpose of the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

RACING BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

KANGAROO ISLAND SETTLERS

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved:

That the report and minutes of evidence of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement on the investigation into the financial problems of war service land settlement lessees on Kangaroo Island, tabled this day, be withdrawn and the order for printing of the report be discharged.

Motion carried.

MENTAL HEALTH BILL

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be extended until Tuesday, March 29, 1977.

Motion carried.

NOISE CONTROL BILL

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be extended until Tuesday, March 29, 1977.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 4.1 p.m. to 4.48 p.m.]

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved:
That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.
Motion carried.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

COUNTRY FIRES BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

- No. 1. Page 4 (clause 5)—After line 20 insert "and".
No. 2. Page 4, lines 24 and 26 (clause 5)—Leave out all words in these lines.
No. 3. Page 4—After line 29 insert new clause 6a as follows:

6a. (1) It is the duty of the Minister in whom the control or management of Crown lands is vested to take reasonable steps to reduce the danger of the outbreak of fire on those lands, or the spread of fire through those lands.

(2) It is the duty of a Minister or other instrumentality of the Crown in which the ownership of any lands is vested to take reasonable steps to reduce the danger of the outbreak of fire on those lands, or the spread of fire through those lands.

- No. 4. Page 5, lines 17 to 20 (clause 8)—Leave out paragraph (d) and insert new paragraph (d) as follows:

(d) four shall be persons who are, in the opinion of the Governor, suitable persons to represent the interests of regional associations;

- No. 5. Page 5, lines 30 to 33 (clause 9)—Leave out subclause (1) and insert new subclause (1) as follows:

(1) A member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of four years unless he is one of the persons first appointed as members of the Board in which case he shall be appointed for such term of office (not exceeding four years) as is specified in the instrument of his appointment.

- No. 6. Page 7, line 4 (clause 15)—After "15" insert "(1)".

- No. 7. Page 7 (clause 15)—After line 14 insert new subclause (2) as follows:

(2) The Board may test and appraise fire-fighting equipment and other equipment that may be of use for fire-fighting and publish the results of the appraisal for the benefit of C.F.S. organisations.

- No. 8. Page 10, line 9 (clause 24)—Leave out paragraph (b).

- No. 9. Page 10 (clause 26)—After line 30 insert new subclause (3) as follows:

(3) The Board has an absolute discretion to enter into contracts of insurance in respect of its liability to pay workmen's compensation to persons to whom this section applies with such insurer or insurers as it thinks fit but it shall not enter into any such contracts until it has, by public advertisement, called for tenders from insurers in relation thereto and has considered all tenders submitted in response to the advertisement.

- No. 10. Page 20, lines 44 and 45 (clause 50)—Leave out subclause (8).

- No. 11. Page 21 (clause 51)—After line 43 insert new subclause (6) as follows:

(6) Where there is a fire upon a Government reserve, and the person in charge of the reserve, being a prescribed officer or a forester, is present at the scene of the fire, a fire control officer shall not exercise any power conferred by this section upon the reserve except with the approval, and subject to any directions, of that person.

- No. 12. Page 23, lines 11 to 13 (clause 55)—Leave out subclause (2).

- No. 13. Page 24 (clause 61)—After line 18 insert subclause (3) as follows:

(3) A person shall not, without lawful authority, destroy, damage or interfere with any vehicle or fire-fighting equipment of a C.F.S. organisation.

Penalty: One thousand dollars.

- No. 14. Page 24, lines 21 to 23 (clause 63)—Leave out subclause (1).

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. Some of these amendments were discussed in this House, and I think that in general the amendments improve the Bill. I do not intend personally to talk to any one of the amendments, but I do not deny honourable members the right to do so if they wish.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased that the Government has accepted these amendments, which greatly improve the Bill. I am pleased that it has at least seen the wisdom in the amendments moved on an earlier occasion in this Chamber, but I am sorry they were not accepted at that time, as that would have speeded up the processes of the legislation. I am pleased we have arrived at a compromise on the amendment covering the control of bush fires in national parks. The original amendment was not practical. We would have reached the stage where people would not fight fires. Many of the people in charge of national parks are well meaning and have the interests of the department at heart, but they are not experienced in bush fire control and most of them would not have had experience in controlled burning-off operations. Probably most of them have never lit a fire in their lives, and are not likely to do so. I am pleased the Government has accepted a reasonable compromise. I believe whoever was responsible for advising the Minister was out of touch with realities and did not have practical knowledge of fire control.

I hope this legislation will greatly assist the control of bush fires in this State, because most of us know the loss of life and property that can occur through bush fires. Many people have to give their time without payment, and many times they have given their time to the protection of the valuable assets of this State. I hope the legislation will protect those well-meaning people.

Dr. EASTICK: In relation to amendment No. 3, I have had drawn to my attention an instruction, which is index No. 11 issued by the Emergency Fire Service and in which it is indicated that it is understood the Engineering and Water Supply Department will be called upon only after all available volunteer and local government resources have proved inadequate to cope with a situation threatening life and valuable property. It sets out the requirement that the authority for Engineering and Water Supply Department assistance vests in obtaining information from the Director of the Emergency Fire Services. In those areas where the department has a number of reserves (for instance, the Williamstown area, with the Barossa, South Para, and Warren reservoirs) the use of equipment, especially four-wheel drive jeeps, has in the past been available to the local fire-fighting people and has assisted in controlling fires in the area.

This instruction means that use of the equipment will not be permitted without the direct agreement and authority of the Director of the E.F.S. Much of the property is interspersed with other property, and it would seem that, in the best interests of the Woods and Forests Department,

which is also adjacent, and the E. & W.S. Department, with its reservoir reserves, the instruction should be reconsidered so that the jeeps, which are useful in surveying the area, can be made available for fire-fighting without having to go through so many lines of communication. I accept that willy-nilly use of the equipment of any Government department must be considered, but these areas comprise valuable property, including grazing and residential areas, and consideration should be given to leaving the discretion with the officers of the E. & W.S. Department in the area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I think the honourable member would appreciate that common sense should prevail in all situations. The Crown is not bound by this Act. The fact that the amendment highlights the duties of the Crown lays down some guidance in the matter. The points made by the honourable member will be noted and heeded. The whole thing does not fall apart merely because public servants are involved; common sense still prevails. If it is possible to use the equipment to the best advantage, it will be used in that way. Amendment No. 3 strengthens the situation; otherwise, there is no instruction.

Dr. EASTICK: That is not quite the case. Will the Minister look at the E.F.S. Fire Instruction Index No. 11, which specifically indicates what happens in relation to the E. & W.S. Department's being called out?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We will note and take heed of what the honourable member has said.

Dr. EASTICK: Common sense cannot prevail where so many inquiries must be made before equipment can be used in cases where, if the equipment could be used at the discretion of the local E. & W.S. Department employee, useful work could be undertaken. I had hoped to bring up the matter in Question Time, except that that period was curtailed because of circumstances beyond my control.

Motion carried.

TRADE MEASUREMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1 Page 2, lines 6 to 8 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

"Port Lincoln abattoirs area" means the area comprised in the hundred of Lincoln.

No. 2. Page 5, lines 1 to 4 (clause 12)—Leave out all words in these lines.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Mr. BLACKER: I support the motion. The first amendment refers to an anomaly that I have explained in the second reading debate. It overcomes the problem that exists because the municipality of Port Lincoln does not embrace the entire residential area of the city. The amendment will cover the total residential area, and I support it.

Motion carried.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 7, line 34 (clause 33)—After "may" insert "with the consent of the Minister,".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to. One amendment has been made to clause 33 requiring that, before any material is published by the Director arising from the results of taking samples of minerals from the land comprising a mining tenement, he must get the consent of the Minister. This seems a reasonable provision, and I am happy to accept it.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, March 29, 1977, at 2 p.m.

On moving this motion it is customary, when it is the end of the session, to thank everybody in sight and wish them well. This is not the end of the session, so my thanks will be a little shorter than they will be at the end of the session next year. I wish you, Mr. Speaker, the staff of the House and all those concerned with service to members and associated with the House a happy festive season and a happy new year.

I particularly would like to place on record the appreciation of this House for the service of the Clerk of the Parliaments, Mr. Ivor Ball, whose last Parliamentary day this will be. Mr. Ball commenced as a junior clerk in the South Australian Railways on January 25, 1927. He transferred to the State Bank in 1928, and from the State Bank to the House of Assembly as office clerk on July 21, 1937. He also became Secretary of the Joint House Committee in November, 1941. He was promoted to the position of Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms in the Assembly in March, 1946. In February, 1952, he was promoted to Clerk of the Legislative Council. On April 1, 1953, he was appointed Clerk of the Parliaments. Before his retirement on February 25 next he will have completed 50 years in the service of the State, almost 40 of which have been in the service of this Parliament. As Secretary of the South Australian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association since 1953 and the foundation Secretary of the South Australian Parliamentary Bowling Club, Mr. Ball has become very widely known in Parliamentary circles in Australia and in many overseas Parliaments. I do not think that there is a Parliament which can be visited by members of this Parliament where the members do not immediately say, "Give my regards to Ivor Ball."

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He has been of tremendous assistance to members of this Parliament both in relation to the work within the Parliament and in connection with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Even when members are not going overseas on association business, his wide knowledge of Parliaments and their service elsewhere has been of enormous assistance to members in connection with their making studies elsewhere. Everyone in the Parliament will be losing a close association with a friend

in Ivor Ball's leaving this Parliament, but I am sure that, with his life-long interest in this Parliament, he will be around and we will see him still.

With those words, I again wish all my fellow members and all others associated with this Parliament a happy Christmas and, I hope, a more prosperous new year.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Premier in the remarks he has made and in his expression of thanks to all the staff. Certainly, we will have an opportunity later to express our thanks more fully, but I think that we are all conscious of the service we enjoy here from members of the staff and others associated with the House, and we are particularly grateful for those services.

Another matter must be brought forward (and I am pleased to see that the member for Flinders is looking so well this evening). I could describe him as yet another good man biting the dust, but it would be wrong of me to do so. I am sure that the Premier would join me in wishing the member for Flinders every future happiness, hoping that the eighteenth will be a significant date for him.

I also pay tribute to Ivor Ball. It is amazing and somewhat difficult to comprehend that someone could have been in Government service for 50 years (and that is a wonderful record), and his 40 years service in Parliament is also remarkable. This Parliament will not be the same (with every respect to whoever may follow him), without Ivor Ball. He has been the Joint President of the Society of Clerks at the Table in Empire Parliaments and a completely indefatigable worker for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in South Australia and in Australia, and he has been all that the Premier mentioned. He is certainly known throughout Australia and the world. It is not only a question of everyone in other Parliaments knowing Ivor Ball: indeed, it was almost not done to go to another State or overseas and visit a Parliament without making certain that he had made arrangements for the visit beforehand, and those arrangements, which he made so assiduously, were much appreciated by members.

I wish all members and others associated with the House a very happy Christmas and a prosperous new year, and I trust that our return in the new year will see a return to prosperity.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Because we are approaching the Christmas season, which is one of good will, we can on this occasion, I hope again as we always do, put aside our many political enmities. I sincerely support all the remarks that have been made on this occasion by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. I, too, have known Mr. Ball for well over 20 years, and certainly

whenever I have needed the help of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association he has given it to me abundantly. I am very grateful to him and I hope he has a happy and long retirement.

Also, I express my best wishes to the member for Flinders. I think I am the last member of this place to have come in as a bachelor and to have married; indeed, I cannot remember any other member who has come in in that state and who has gone out in another, and here I do part company with the Leader. I thoroughly recommend that state to the member for Flinders. I hope that he and his wife-to-be will be happy and that we will see much more of them for a long time to come.

I was interested to hear the Premier say this was not the end of the session. There have been a number of rumours floating about that, in fact, it would be, and that we would not meet again in this session. I do notice something that he said the other day has not come to pass, and this motion shows it. He said it would be after March before we met again, sometime in the last quarter of the year, but now I find that we are to meet again on March 29. Obviously, there has been some discussion on the other side.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why can't you remain pleasant for a little longer?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When are you going to wish the member for Hanson a happy Christmas? That's what we're waiting for.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am full of charity. I thought I was speaking with charity to the members of the Government and I include every member in this place because it is Christmas. I might not otherwise but, because it is Christmas, I include every member and, in case I am further provoked, I think I had better stop now. I conclude by wishing you, Sir, a very happy and holy Christmas.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the remarks of the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham, and wish everyone the compliments of the season. I hope that the new year brings forth renewed interest. I thank members for their courtesy and words of congratulations about the forthcoming event. I wish you, Sir, the officers of the House and all members the compliments of the season.

The SPEAKER: On behalf of the officers and the whole staff of this House, I express appreciation of the good wishes members have wished them and, in return, on their behalf, I wish each honourable member a joyous Christmas, and a peaceful and happy new year.

Motion carried.

At 5.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 29, 1977, at 2 p.m.