

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

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

POLICE PENSIONS BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

MEMBERS' BEHAVIOUR

The SPEAKER: Before calling on notices of motion, I ask honourable members to refrain from conversing loudly when His Excellency sends a message, in order that it may be heard in silence. As the undesirable practice of conversing while the message is being read is receiving comment from outside, I ask for the co-operation of honourable members in this matter.

QUESTIONS**DARTMOUTH DAM**

Mr. HALL: As a meeting of the River Murray Commission was held yesterday and as there is a lack of any public report, as far as I can ascertain, on the results of its deliberations, will the Premier tell the House what important facts, especially those regarding the estimated cost of the Dartmouth dam, were discussed at the meeting?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commission endorsed the estimate given to it by the Snowy Mountains Authority of a cost for the construction of the Dartmouth dam of \$64,000,000. The necessary legislation has not yet been proclaimed in the other States or here, nor has a contract been let for the diversion dams. The New South Wales Government has indicated that it intends to take the initiative in negotiating with the Commonwealth Government about financing the sum between \$62,700,000 and the \$64,000,000 of the endorsed estimate. That initiative has been undertaken by Mr. Askin.

KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT

Mr. RYAN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government is negotiating for the purchase of the M.V. *Troubridge* to continue the service from Port Adelaide to Kangaroo Island?

Mr. Venning: A Dorothy Dixer!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: If the Government is so negotiating, will he say what stage the negotiations have reached, and, if there are terms of settlement for the purchase of this vessel, who will be making the announcement that such a purchase has been arranged? I should like to explain this question, which is not a Dorothy Dixer. The following article appears in today's *News*:

The South Australian Government is definitely negotiating to buy the Kangaroo Island ferry *Troubridge*. This is disclosed in the annual report of the Adelaide Steamship Company Limited released today. The report said the Government opened negotiations through shipbrokers at the end of the last financial year. The company said it hoped soon to make a report on the negotiations.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I intend to be as precise as I can because some members like me to be very precise at times. Yesterday afternoon, I think at about 10 minutes past five, at the conclusion of a conference I had in my office commencing at 4 p.m., my Secretary informed me that the Secretary of the Adelaide Steamship Company had telephoned and had conveyed the following information:

That in the report of the Chairman of Directors to the shareholders of the Adelaide Steamship Company, due to be given today, the following would be included:

Since the close of the year the South Australian Government through shipbrokers has opened negotiations with us for the purchase of the *Troubridge*. We hope to make an announcement shortly.

That is a statement of fact, but I have chosen not to make it public, for reasons which are obvious to all concerned. However, I have no control over the Chairman of the Adelaide Steamship Company and, if he chooses to make an announcement to his shareholders, that is his business and the business of the shareholders. As I am not one of those shareholders, it is certainly none of my business. In regard to what stage the negotiations have reached and who will make the announcement, all I am prepared to say at this stage, in the interests of the State, is that the statement made by the Chairman of Directors is factual, and in due course, on behalf of the Government, I will make a statement.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what is the future of the ferry service that the Government undertook to install between Kangaroo Island and the mainland? When this proposal was adopted the Minister announced, I think in June last year, that it was hoped that the ferry service would be in operation

in time to meet the expiry in June, 1972, of the subsidy in respect of the *Troubridge*. Subsequent statements have made it clear that the ferry service will not be installed by the time of the original estimate. Now that the Government has disclosed (and the Minister has stated) that it is negotiating for the *Troubridge*, the obvious question arises of what is the future of the ferry service and what progress has been made on that project.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I want to correct one statement made by the honourable member. The Government has not disclosed negotiations with the Adelaide Steamship Company: they have been disclosed by the Chairman of Directors of the company, and I have merely confirmed what he said. I personally believe that there is a future for a ferry service, and we are working towards this end. At some later stage I hope to make a statement that will include a little more information.

BREWING KIT

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to my recent question about the home brewing of beer?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that, provided the home brewing kits are used in accordance with instructions issued with the kits, there is little likelihood of poisoning resulting. However, as in all cases of food preparation, care should be taken to avoid the use of containers and apparatus that may contaminate the food. The Public Health Department and local health authorities endeavour to provide continual advice and education on food preparation and handling, but it is not considered that special publicity is needed in this instance.

TERTIARY EDUCATION

Mr. CLARK: Will the Minister of Education comment on the statement in this morning's newspaper that the Parent-Teacher Council of South Australia has asked the Commonwealth Government, through the Prime Minister, to take full responsibility for all post-secondary and tertiary education in South Australia? As honourable members know, the parent-teacher council comprises the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the South Australian Association of State School Organizations, the South Australian State Association of School Welfare Clubs, and the High and Technical High School Councils Association of South Australia. As these are

all representative bodies that are intensely interested in education, I should be glad to hear what the Minister has to say about the submission that has been made to the Prime Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The submission made by the Parent-Teacher Council of South Australia has been made with my knowledge, and I certainly support it. If implemented, the proposal that all tertiary education should be taken over by the Commonwealth Government would provide a substantial boost to the funds that individual States have had available for primary and secondary education. I believe this would get us over many of the financial problems currently existing, and it would avoid many of the arguments now taking place between the States and the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Clark: In relation to matching grants, for instance.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. I think that it is unlikely at this stage that the present Commonwealth Government will accede to the request, for that Government has recently refused my submission on behalf of South Australia that Commonwealth support for teacher training should be on the same basis as is Commonwealth support for universities and colleges of advanced education. The submission made some time ago would have meant that, in respect of the recurrent costs of teacher training, South Australia would have received \$1 from the Commonwealth Government for every \$1.85 spent by South Australia on such teacher training. At present the Commonwealth Government will support teacher training only if it is undertaken in multi-purpose colleges of advanced education. Associated with its refusal to help meet recurrent costs of teacher training at the new Murray Park Teachers College, at Bedford Park, at Salisbury, and at Adelaide, has been an acceptance of our proposal to combine the School of Art and the Western Teachers College as a single college of advanced education at Underdale. The Commonwealth Government will support teacher training at Underdale on the \$1 for \$1.85 basis. Although I am pleased that the decision has been made to support teacher training at Underdale when the new college of advanced education is built there, I am disappointed that the Commonwealth Government has seen fit to reiterate its decision not to support recurrent costs of teacher training at any single-purpose teachers college. There seems to me to be no logical distinction to be

made between teacher training in a multi-purpose college of advanced education and teacher training in a single-purpose teachers college.

Yesterday, when the Director of Teacher Education and Services (Mr. Harris) and the Superintendent of Teacher Education (Mr. Anders) gave evidence to the Senate Standing Committee, sitting in Canberra and inquiring into the role of the Commonwealth Government in teacher education, this point was strongly made on behalf of South Australia. We hope that, as a consequence of this committee's investigations, some change in the present intransigent attitude of the Commonwealth Government in this matter will be achieved. I think the parent-teacher council is to be commended on its present approach: it represents the ideal objective to which there is little sign at present of the Commonwealth Government's agreeing. However, if it produces a change in the Commonwealth's attitude regarding teacher education or in the current formula for recurrent costs assistance for universities or colleges of advanced education so that fees could be eliminated, we shall have taken a great step forward. I remind members that, if the Commonwealth Government would agree to a \$1 for \$1 basis of support in respect of recurrent costs of universities and colleges of advanced education, the fees charged at those institutions could be completely eliminated, and this would be a tremendous advance. Several possibilities may come out of the approach that is being made by the parent-teacher council. I wish it every possible success and hope that all members will give their full support to the council's submission.

Later:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Following the matter raised in this morning's paper by the parent-teacher council in its submission to the Commonwealth Government, I have tried to gain additional information relating to the area of further education (tertiary education in technical colleges and in adult education centres throughout the State). I believe that it is necessary to provide this information so that some of the general impression created (that tertiary education is concerned purely with universities, colleges of advanced education and teachers colleges) can be corrected. Following the Tregillis report, the National

Conference on Training for Industry and Commerce in May this year focused attention again on the need for some kind of survey of the work force and its training needs. The arguments put forward on behalf of further education, without detracting from the needs for universities and colleges of advanced education, were succinctly made in the last paper forwarded to the Department of Education and Science by the Director of Technical Education in New South Wales. The following is a quotation from a Ministerial statement made on August 19, 1970, by Mr. Nigel Bowen, when he was the Minister concerned:

The current pattern of Commonwealth spending on further and higher education in the six States (excluding the Commonwealth Territories, Australian Capital Territory and Northern Territory) is shown in the following table extracted from the Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates. For the year 1970-71, the total expenditure by the Commonwealth Government for universities was \$109,679,000; for colleges of advanced education, \$37,245,000; for technical colleges, \$13,765,000; for teachers colleges, \$13,021,000; total; \$173,710,000.

Without detracting in any way from the great importance of other educational institutions in that table, there are grounds for maintaining that greater assistance should be provided for technical colleges. Enrolments, Australia-wide, in technical colleges are about 400,000, universities 100,000 and colleges of advanced education 40,000. The large number of individuals enrolled in technical colleges is itself a reflection of the major role of those colleges in helping to develop, in those who have left secondary school, a wide range of skills needed in the work-force. Considering their contribution towards developing an adequate work-force, the technical colleges have a role of such national significance that, in the long run, no Commonwealth Government can afford to ignore them or to tolerate a situation in which insufficient support is given to them. The attention of the Commonwealth Government should be drawn to the present situation.

The 1966 census in Australia showed that professional practitioners (architects, engineers, scientists, doctors, dentists, lawyers, etc.) constituted less than 2 per cent of the work-force. With teachers and clergy added, the group made up less than 5 per cent of the work-force. The same census revealed that less than 3 per cent of the work-force held a university degree. On the other hand, 30 per cent to 40 per cent of the work-force was to be found in technical (technicians), supervisory, clerical, commercial and skilled occupations for which

one may prepare through technical colleges. The argument clearly indicates that the greatest contributor to industrialization and the development of skills in the work-force is receiving the least support from the Commonwealth. That for colleges of advanced education is naturally even greater than the expenditure from the Commonwealth, as it is required to be supported by the States in matching grants.

I have made this statement because I believe that, in the whole matter of tertiary education, whatever we say about the importance of developments in universities, teachers colleges, and colleges of advanced education, in the modern world we simply cannot afford to neglect that area of tertiary education, namely, further education at the sub-diploma and sub-degree level, which in the years to come will be the area of most rapid expansion.

RATION DOCKETS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Premier say whether the Government Printing Office is printing ration dockets or food vouchers in expectation, in the near future, of a high level of unemployment induced by the Commonwealth Government's financial policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have heard the rumour to which the honourable member has referred. I do not know the political complexion of the gentleman who originated it but I can say that his name was probably Rip Van Winkle, because the Government Printer has not printed ration tickets since the Second World War.

REMARK WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the condition and efficiency of the town water supply in Renmark? Recently I received a letter from a resident of Renmark complaining about the lack of pressure in his water supply. Because of the extensions that have taken place in Renmark in recent years, apparently the single water tank is inadequate and does not provide sufficient pressure to maintain a good supply to all water users.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have the matter investigated and obtain a report on the complete set-up and the pressures in the area. Further, if the honourable member gives me the name of his constituent concerned, I will have that case examined.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport report to the House on the present position of negotiations between the South Australian Government and the

Commonwealth Government to link Adelaide with the standard gauge railway system? It is extremely important to the future economic health of South Australia, particularly that of Adelaide, that this city be linked with the standard gauge system.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A few weeks ago I told the House that general agreement had been reached between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government to connect Adelaide to the standard gauge line. As a result of our activity, we had been able to achieve an agreement that provided for standard gauge connections to the major industries, unlike the agreement which the former Government accepted and which excluded these industries from the standard gauge connection. Since then, officers of the South Australian Railways and the Commonwealth Railways have been working on the details of the project to produce a draft that would form the basis of an agreement which is necessary because the Commonwealth Government has suggested (and the State Government has agreed) that, rather than work on the 1949 legislation, it would be better to have a separate agreement and separate legislation. These negotiations between officers a few weeks ago reached a stage where the next step necessary was for the Commonwealth Minister and me to meet to determine the outstanding matters that the officers considered required decisions on policy that only the Ministers could make. At that stage, the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport was about to leave on an overseas tour. I understand that he is still overseas but is due back at the end of this week or early next week. Arrangements have been made for me to meet the Commonwealth Minister in Canberra at 11 a.m. next Wednesday. I hope that all the outstanding matters can be resolved then and the agreement finalized and accepted by the two Governments. Then, subject to the necessary legislation being passed by the two Parliaments, the project will be able to proceed. I can only assume, and sincerely hope, that when the legislation is introduced, both Houses will support it enthusiastically and give it a swift passage.

COROMANDEL PLACE EXCAVATION

Mr. JENNINGS: Can the Minister of Works say whether Engineering and Water Supply Department workmen dug up the wrong street last week, as alleged in that rather amusing source of misinformation, the "Today" column in yesterday's *Advertiser*?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The report was completely incorrect. The workmen did not dig up the wrong street, as alleged in the article referred to by the honourable member. Having read the column, I naturally inquired within the department, and the report submitted to me states:

A report in the "Today" column of the *Advertiser* yesterday claimed that Engineering and Water Supply Department workmen had excavated a trench in Coromandel Place when it should have been in another street. The report was completely incorrect: the workmen did not dig up the wrong street.

These are the facts. The work of relaying an important water main in Coromandel Place was commenced on October 4 with the full knowledge and co-operation of the Adelaide City Council. On October 7, council officers asked the department to cease work temporarily until they had been able to give further consideration to redevelopment of the area. This redevelopment would probably affect the position and size of the water main in Coromandel Place. The Town Clerk of Adelaide has written to the department thanking the department for its action in ceasing work immediately upon being requested to do so. He also expressed regret at the inconvenience caused to the department.

PAYNEHAM ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether properties at the intersection of Payneham Road and Portrush Road have been acquired by the Highways Department, and whether Portrush Road is soon to be widened between Payneham Road and Magill Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I do not have that information with me, I will obtain it for the honourable member.

FRUIT FLY

Mr. HARRISON: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture for a report concerning the number of claims made and the sums to be paid as compensation as a result of the recent fruit fly outbreak in the Albert Park District?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

MAMBRAY CREEK SCHOOL

Mr. KENEALLY: As the Minister of Education has very thoughtfully informed me that he has a reply to my recent question about the Mambray Creek Rural School, will he now give it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. I always aim to provide as efficient a service as possible for members of Parliament, not

only for members on this side but also for members opposite. In view of the excessive distance that some children would have to travel to Port Germein if the Mambray Creek Rural School were closed, it is intended that the school will remain open so long as the numbers continue to justify it.

MOSQUITOES

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to my recent question about the mosquito nuisance? If he has not yet received a reply, will he please treat this matter as urgent because, at the last meeting of a council in my district, the matter was stated to be one of great urgency because it seems that this summer will be the worst summer on record for mosquitoes breeding in the Port Adelaide district?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will speak to my colleague and try to obtain an early reply.

HANCOCK ROAD INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of October 6 regarding the intersection of North-East Road and Hancock Road, Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The intersection of North-East Road and Hancock Road was the subject of investigation by the Road Traffic Board as part of the accident study by computer into hazardous locations. Pending the reconstruction of North-East Road, recommendations have been made by the board to the Highways Department and the local government authority that, as an interim measure, safety bars be installed to delineate the intersection and turning points. It was also recommended that the intersection be resealed and some adjustment made to the bus stop positions. The whole of North-East Road is under reconstruction, and it is expected that widening work will be carried out on this section in 1973-74. Traffic signals will be installed as part of the improvements on completion of the roadworks.

PRINCIPAL PLANNING OFFICER

Mr. SIMMONS: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to appoint a Principal Planning Officer (Buildings) to the Education Department and, if so, when will the officer be appointed? I understand that this position was advertised some time ago and, because of the desirability of filling it, I should appreciate knowing whether an early appointment can be expected.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A Principal Planning Officer (Buildings) is to be appointed to the Education Department. Applications were called some time ago, and the stage has now been reached where applicants on the short list have all been interviewed and the recommendation, I believe, has been made. We received applicants from other States and from private enterprise, as well as from public servants. The standard of the applicants was high, and I hope that the formalities that must be completed by the Public Service Board can be completed within the next week or two so that a public announcement can be made. When appointed, this officer will head the building team within the Education Department and be responsible for ensuring that the whole process of briefing the Public Buildings Department's architects is organized so that the planning stages of projects will go ahead much more smoothly and so that projects will be designed down to a cost rather than up to a certain standard.

A matter of great concern, not only since I have been Minister but for a long time, has been the cost per student-place of providing school accommodation, and it is vital that any client department that briefs design architects on building projects should provide the briefs in such a way that the utmost economy in the use of funds can be achieved. I think all members are aware that this has not always been the position, so any change in administrative procedures that will improve the situation is desirable. Criticisms have been levelled at the Public Buildings Department on this score, but it is not just that department which should take the blame when difficulties arise with respect to buildings being designed at too high a standard. After all, the architects' section of the Public Buildings Department provides a service for the client, and if the client demands certain things, the department must provide what has been asked for by the client department. I hope that the procedures being adopted within the Education Department will improve considerably the way in which briefs are prepared within the department and that this may indeed set a pattern for the whole of the Government service for years to come.

BRICKLAYING APPRENTICES

Mr. BROWN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry indicate the success or otherwise of the pre-apprenticeship training scheme for bricklayers which has just commenced? As the Government has taken steps to encourage

young people to seek apprenticeship training, I believe that we should do our utmost to see that such a programme is successful.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am pleased to report that the pre-apprenticeship course in bricklaying is progressing extremely well. I have received a report from the Headmaster at the Marlestone Technical College, where the course is being conducted, which indicates that most of the trainees are continuing to cope satisfactorily with the theoretical work as well as the practical projects and are producing surprisingly good work, considering that the course has been in progress for only nine weeks. However, some difficulties are being experienced by the irregular attendance of some trainees; this appears to be due to the lack of any payment to the trainees while undertaking the course. As most of them had been working at some type of employment beforehand, it is a hardship for them to undertake an 18-week course without any remuneration and, consequently, the temptation of one or two odd days work proves hard to resist.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry plans for conducting further seminars on industrial safety in country centres?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As there is too much audible conversation, I cannot hear what the honourable member is saying.

Mr. CURREN: On July 12, a seminar on industrial safety, held at Barmera in the Riverland, was well attended by representatives of all local industries and local government, as well as by officers of Government departments. The seminar created much interest in industrial safety and safety in sport.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: We have plans for further seminars in country areas. The seminar held at Barmera in the honourable member's district, which I had the pleasure of declaring open, was a great success, as it was well attended and created interest in the area. There is no doubt that next year we will consider holding one or two more seminars in country areas.

SCHOOL SPORT

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Education say whether a satisfactory solution has been found in regard to the availability of teaching staff to supervise school sporting activities on Saturday mornings?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think I would have no difficulty in giving a dissertation on this matter, but as this would certainly provoke comment from Opposition members, especially the member for Alexandra, I do not intend to do that. Saturday morning sport is a matter of concern and is proceeding during the third term of this year in the normal way it has proceeded in the past. Certain alternatives are currently being considered, but many complications are involved, not the least of which is that anything done in relation to teachers who supervise sport on Saturday morning should be extended to any other teacher who is involved in any other kind of extra-curricular activity in the school, whether it be on Saturday morning or Saturday afternoon, or even at night during the week. One cannot justify the payment of additional sums to teachers who take sport on Saturday mornings, unless something similar is done for the music teacher, for example, who spends some nights organizing the production of an operetta or something of that description. The range of extra-curricular activities in many of our schools is so wide that, in order to apply a general policy, the financial implications start to become very serious indeed. The present position is still unresolved and all I can say to the honourable member—

Mr. McAnaney: You're taking your time.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, I will observe your ruling and I will not reply to any interjections that are made.

Mr. Goldsworthy: String it out a bit.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The various alternatives open to us, together with the relative costs and productivity of each alternative in regard to achieving the desired result, are still being considered by my officers.

MUSEUM FACILITIES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question I asked on September 30, concerning museum facilities?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The South Australian Museum has been, and hopes, if possible, to continue, making exhibits available on short and long-term loan to suburban and rural museums and to local councils on special occasions such as the centenary celebrations of

the City of Unley. It further assists by supplying technical advice and a restricted number of old display cases and cabinets to certain museums. At present, for example, the staff are designing the museum to be set up at the Naracoorte Caves National Pleasure Resort and are considering how best to help with the development of the paddle steamer *Industry* recently given to Renmark. Local museums rightly tend to concentrate on displaying the relics and history of their own areas, a policy which should, in general, be supported as it demonstrates to the children the efforts which went into developing the area in which they live and encourages tourists by giving a variety of display reflecting the various regions of the State. The amount of specific display material of such local interest the South Australian Museum can provide is restricted. This is not necessarily a handicap as the local problem is usually how to refuse exhibits, without offending donors, rather than hunting for them. But material of more general significance could be made available under adequate conditions of security and conservation.

There is, however, a definite need for the introduction of a series of educational display boxes containing objects, photographs, tape-recordings and notes to teachers on the contents of the boxes. Such miniature travelling museums would then be circulated to schools on demand as is already done in other States of Australia. Such educational boxes are currently being designed by the staff of the South Australian Museum with the hope that their introduction will not be long delayed. Branches of some State museums have been set up in Western Australia, Queensland and New South Wales, at least, with varying degrees of success. Such a way of achieving decentralization is expensive and could become monolithic. The same result can, however, be largely obtained by encouraging (a) the development of museums set up by local initiative and under local control with the State museum supplying technical assistance, some display material and advice; and (b) the State supplying some financial assistance under agreed conditions as to the maintenance and safety of the collections and the standard of the displays.

SECURITY FORM

Mr. PAYNE: Is the Attorney-General aware that a current condition of entry, for Postmaster-General's Department purposes, to the Weapons Research Establishment at

Salisbury or Woomera is the signing of a form which appears to be an invasion of the individual privacy of South Australian citizens? This form is addressed to the South Australian Commissioner of Police and is a request to the Commissioner to make available to the P.M.G. Department details of any convictions of the persons concerned. My attention was drawn to this matter by a constituent and a copy of this form appears in the current issue of the *Tele-Technician*, the journal of the Postal Telecommunication Technicians Association (Australia).

The Hon. L. J. KING: I know nothing of the matter raised by the honourable member, but I will inquire.

CITRUS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the quality of citrus?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has stated that the major part of the current citrus research programme of the Agriculture Department is concerned with fruit quality because of the importance to the industry in this State of the fresh fruit markets, especially for export.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation taking place. As the honourable Minister is replying, he deserves to be shown courtesy by honourable members.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The skin texture of oranges is closely related to fruit size and nutrition. For this reason the production from young trees always presents a problem in that the fruit from such trees tends to be large and the nitrogen status of these trees is difficult to maintain in balance. Phosphorus status of the trees is a major factor in citrus fruit quality, and a significant research finding by the department was the demonstration last year of the importance of banding phosphate fertilizer applications to get response. This is especially significant in young trees. A similar problem occurs with potassium fertilizers in that either the fertilizers must be banded or heavy initial dressings given before trees will start to show a response. Frequently the cause of nutrient imbalance in young trees is not so much excessive use of nitrogen but rather a lack of response to applied phosphorus and potassium unless banding is used. The control of fruit size in citrus is largely a function of the number of fruit on the tree, and of irrigation management.

The alternation of heavy and light crops of valencias is regarded as the most serious problem of the citrus industry in South Australia and is the major subject of research of the Citrus Research Officer (Mr. P. T. Gallasch), who is investigating all aspects of fruit setting and methods of manipulating the number of fruits carried on the trees. A long-term citrus trial at the Loxton Research Centre includes treatments involving irrigation levels, but the relationship between citrus fruit size and water regime is quite well understood. The problem of over-sized fruit on well-watered trees is not so much one of too much water but rather too few fruit and hence the emphasis on the research into fruit setting and control of cropping level. The Agriculture Department is not undertaking any specific research into salt management of citrus. The problem of the overall effect of poor quality water in upsetting the general nutrition and physiological balance of citrus trees is recognized and, although the quality of Murray water is now satisfactory, growers have been advised to change from overhead to undertree sprinklers as the best answer to poor water quality.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Premier report to the House on the result of the visit to South Australia last week of Mr. Fuji, a representative of a Japanese citrus importing firm? Mr. Fuji visited South Australia as a direct result of the Premier's visit to Japan earlier this year and his negotiations with the Japanese department concerned with the importation of citrus into that country.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Fuji, who is President of the Japanese Citrus Importers Association, and an assistant from the Fuji Hajema Company visited South Australia briefly last week and we were able to show him the citrus areas. He visited Waikerie and saw orchards and packing sheds. He expressed much satisfaction with the quality of citrus in South Australia and he is to visit the State again soon for a *more extended* stay in order to get plans to export citrus to Japan to the stage where we can complete negotiations with the Japanese department concerned.

NORTHFIELD SCHOOL

Mr. WELLS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about tenders being called for the construction of three tennis courts at the Northfield High School?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is expected that tenders will be called in the *Government Gazette* of November 4, 1971. The slight delay in the date previously stated for the

calling of tenders has been due to the necessity for the department to examine the final designs submitted by the consultants, combined with the time necessary for the printing of sets of documents for tendering purposes. As it normally takes three weeks from the time of calling tenders to the time they close, the closing time can be expected to be about November 29.

DRY CREEK SEWERAGE

Mr. JENNINGS: Can the Minister of Works say whether work on extending the sewerage system to Dry Creek in my district has been suspended and, if it has, can he say how long this hiatus is expected to continue?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Offhand, I am not aware of any delay in extending the sewerage system to the area referred to by the honourable member, but I will obtain a report for him as soon as possible.

FAIRVIEW PARK HOUSE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier consult the Housing Trust with a view to having rental accommodation provided to a family who live in my district and whose house was burned down yesterday? This house, which was situated at Buckley Crescent, Fairview Park, was owned by relatives of this family of six (a man, his wife, and four children) who lived there. Because this man is in ill health, he is presently unemployed and receives a part repatriation pension. Therefore, obviously the family cannot pay a high rent for private accommodation. Although most of their furniture and clothing was lost in the fire, fortunately good people have helped them in this connection. Having seen this house this morning, I doubt whether it can ever be restored and occupied again. The family is at present split up amongst relatives in four different homes. As this is obviously not desirable, I have suggested that an application be made to the trust today for rental accommodation, and that is the course the family will follow.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the case referred to by the honourable member to see whether there is any way we can help.

DUTHY STREET

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the improved safety measures in Duthy Street have resulted in fewer accidents, and whether further improvements will be made? Recently, "stop" signs were installed at three main intersections where many accidents had occurred.

and rumble strips were installed at other intersections in an effort to induce motorists to drive more carefully.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Duthy Street is one of the problem streets of the metropolitan area, and may possibly be the worst problem street. However, the important point is that, as it is not an arterial road, it is completely under the care and control of the local council. The Road Traffic Board has been extremely helpful: I believe that studies have been undertaken and statistics obtained which have been analysed by the computer and much information gained. The other point worth considering is the fact that the Pak Poy committee report on road safety recommended that consideration be given to the geometry of some of our street designs in order to convert intersections into T junctions. I suggested that discussions could take place with the council to ascertain whether a private study could be conducted. I am not sure how far the discussions have progressed at this stage, but I will inquire and obtain the information for the honourable member.

ORAPARINNA NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SIMMONS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what plans the Government has to develop the Oraparinna National Park to make it more readily available to groups such as university and high school students, youth clubs, scout troops and similar organizations? Last weekend I had the pleasure of visiting this national park and I was most impressed by its natural attractions, the basic facilities available at the old homestead buildings, and the enthusiasm of the rangers. I believe that a relatively small outlay on furnishings, toilet facilities, and signposting would make a wonderful asset much more readily available to groups from schools, amongst whom I am pleased to say there is a growing awareness of the need for conservation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am pleased that the honourable member visited this area and that he enjoyed the facilities at the recently dedicated national park. The park area contains two houses that are occupied by rangers and their families, as only a few weeks ago we appointed a second ranger to this area. It is obvious that, without grazing, the area will regenerate quickly and be a tremendous asset to the State as a national park. Fortunately, on this park is a group of buildings making up the shearers' quarters that

were constructed before the property was purchased, and these buildings are in good condition. The National Parks Commission intends to install double bunks in these quarters so that many of the groups referred to by the honourable member will be able to camp on the site, particularly as the kitchen facilities are available. In addition, a large and modern woolshed is located on the property, and this can be converted and used as accommodation for large numbers of young people in these groups. When finance is available it is intended to convert these facilities so that they can be used in this way.

ALBERTON SCHOOL

Mr. RYAN: Will the Minister of Education ascertain when work will commence to convert Hosie's property, which was purchased at a fairly high price and which is close to the Alberton Primary School? I have raised this matter many times with the Education Department, and some time ago I wrote to the Minister and received a reply that work would commence on this property within the next few weeks, to enable the ground to be prepared and planting to take place in the spring so that the area would be available as a sports ground for the school at the beginning of the 1972 school year. I conveyed this information to the Secretary of the school committee when I received that letter, but today the Secretary telephoned me and said that there was no sign of activity.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I remember that this matter was raised previously, I will inquire about it on behalf of the honourable member. However, at present the Public Buildings Department is having much difficulty in obtaining tenders for this type of work, in the metropolitan area at least, and it may be that this difficulty applies to a wider area than the metropolitan area.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Throughout the whole State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Apparently, only one contractor has tendered for this type of work with the department. The department has tried to obtain other contractors so that this urgent and important work could proceed more rapidly.

PORT AUGUSTA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. KENEALLY: As a further example of the thoughtfulness he displays for the welfare of members of both sides, the Minister of Education has told me that he has a reply to my recent question about the Port Augusta Primary School.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Port Augusta Primary School has an enrolment of 295, but an estimate of future enrolments prepared by the Headmaster expects a decline to about 250 in the next three or four years. I believe that this is not a consequence of a declining population in Port Augusta, but that it is a consequence of the development of newer primary schools in the outer part of the town. The school consists of nine rooms in solid construction and four classrooms, together with a library, an activity room, an art-craft room, and four unoccupied rooms in timber frame construction. Some of these rooms are occupied by the School of the Air. A four-teacher open-space unit is planned for erection at this school, and should be ready for occupation by the third term in 1972. This will greatly assist with the upgrading of the accommodation.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation. The Minister is entitled to be heard in silence, and I ask honourable members to extend that courtesy to those who are on their feet.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am greatly surprised that all members are not vitally interested in what is happening at Port Augusta. Proposals have been forwarded to the Public Buildings Department for the modification of part of the solid construction building to provide improved administrative and staff facilities. A dual timber unit is to be converted to provide more spacious and improved library facilities at the school. Several existing timber frame rooms will be removed from the site in order to provide much needed playground space. When the plans now in hand have been brought to fruition, Port Augusta Primary School will have teaching accommodation of a high order.

SUBVERSION INVESTIGATION

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Premier make available whatever information he can obtain concerning the activities of an organization known as the Australian Subversion Investigation Office? I have had handed to me a booklet entitled *Two Articles on Race and Subversion* by D. S. Cahn and R. A. Strong. This book was published by the Minton Publishing Company, Post Office Box 94, Northcote, Victoria, on behalf of the Australian Subversion Investigation Office. It contains two articles, the gist of which is that the present policy of Governments to encourage the Aboriginal to maintain his own culture and traditional standard of life, if he wishes to do so, is part of a Leninist subversory tactic

in line with the Marxian dialectic of promoting the form of an antithesis to the present thesis, which is our current society. I have raised this matter because I understand that several members have received circulars from this organization, inviting them to contribute to this publication. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could briefly quote two or three sentences to give members an idea—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked the Premier to investigate the matter. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know of this organization. From the sound of it, it is the sort of organization that has been associated with certain sections of the League of Rights movement in Victoria, because it expresses somewhat the same sort of view. I think it is perhaps significant that the initials of the organization are the same as those of the Australian Security Intelligence Organization. I have no doubt that it was by design that the group chose those initials, but I will have an investigation made to see whether we can find out anything about this show.

MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education give me details of a tender let to erect a canteen at the Modbury High School, particularly as to the cost of the shell and when it is expected to be completed? Tenders for the project were called on August 23 and closed on September 10, and I know that a satisfactory tender was received.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to obtain the information requested by the honourable member.

OUTER HARBOUR TERMINAL

Mr. RYAN: Will the Minister of Marine obtain a report from the Marine and Harbors Department on when the new terminal at Outer Harbour will be completed and available for shipping and the general public? Recently, I had occasion to meet an oversea passenger liner when it berthed at Outer Harbour, and the criticism by people who had to use the antiquated facility had to be heard to be believed. The conditions to which the shipping companies and the passengers are subjected must be seen to be believed. Not only are the present facilities being criticized by the people who must use them, but similar criticism is also being levelled at the department by oversea interests.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I visited Outer Harbour last Monday, and I agree with the

honourable member's comments about the old passenger terminal. However, I point out, in regard to criticism of the Government or the department about this matter, that it was the present Government that decided to proceed with construction of the new terminal. If the honourable member has visited the terminal recently, he will know that structural steel work for the new terminal has been completed and, as I am not certain how long the building of the passenger terminal will take and when it will be ready for occupation, I will get that information. Of course, I am sure that the new building will be a big improvement on the present one.

VINTAGE CARS

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport, through the Motor Vehicles Department, give preferential treatment in the registration of vintage cars? As the Minister knows, these cars are usually used only on special occasions and, because they are not normally in use, I think the Minister could consider giving such preferential treatment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It so happens that I have information on this matter, because the member for Victoria asked me a similar question about a week ago. In fact, I told that honourable member today that I had a reply.

The SPEAKER: The question is out of order, then.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, Mr. Speaker, I said it was on a similar matter.

The SPEAKER: Will the Minister please take his seat? If it is a question dealing with the same question as the member for Victoria—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, it is similar.

The SPEAKER: I will allow it on this occasion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I assure you that it is not the same question, Mr. Speaker. It is related to the same subject matter, but we have many questions on the same subject matter during Question Time. It is common practice for the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to exempt veteran and vintage cars from registration when they are used in connection with club rallies, street processions, and like entertainment. Section 14 of the Motor Vehicles Act provides:

If the Registrar is satisfied that a vehicle is intended to be driven on roads solely for the purpose of taking part in a street procession or other like entertainment, he may, in writing,

exempt the owner and driver of that vehicle from the obligation to comply with any specified provision of this Act on any day or days.

The interests not only of the veteran and vintage car owners but of other motorized vehicles used in processions, and so on, are covered by the exemption available in terms of the Motor Vehicles Act, on application to the Registrar. Of course, it must be pointed out that a third party insurance cover for the vehicle for the day or days required is also necessary. When vintage or veteran cars are used on roads in circumstances other than those connected with rallies or in special circumstances for which exemptions may be issued, the normal registration is required.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. SIMMONS: Can the Minister of Works say when the block on the corner of West Beach Road and Marion Road, Netley, will be built on to provide the new Government Printing Office? In the meantime, will he arrange for the crop of mustard weed and salvation jane to be cut? A constituent has complained about the effect of this infestation on the health of his son. The block is in the Hanson District, but the boy lives in my district and has to pass the block to go to Netley school. He is asthmatic and is so distressed by the effects of the pollen that he has to be transported to and from school. I have inspected the block and have found that the weeds are above head height. Doubtless, they will constitute a serious fire risk once they have dried off. In the meantime they are a source of infestation of vermin as well as being a health hazard.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not sure when work will be commenced on the new Government Printing Office at Netley. However, I shall have the matter investigated because of the fire hazard. It must be a fairly good crop to be above head height, but it is very good soil. It was used for market gardens for many years, and no doubt this has resulted in the good crop. Seriously, though, I will see what can be done.

PARA HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Para Hills High School.

Ordered that report be printed.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (HOURS)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Code, 1967-1971. Read a first time.

Mr. HALL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I have introduced the Bill in the hope that South Australia will have Friday night shopping again before Christmas wherever it is required, and with the co-operation of members of this House this will be so. It may be especially advantageous now that it has been decided that we should have daylight saving, because it will give a longer period of twilight in which to enjoy Friday night shopping. My previous view on this matter is well known, as it has been the subject of much discussion in this House and the subject of a public inquiry.

The referendum has been criticized by members on this side, because it dealt with a limited question and resulted in about 50,000 of the electors not voting and 43,000 voting informally, despite the inadequacy of the question. Since that time there has been much public reassessment of attitudes to increased shopping hours, and the public has come to realize that we must seek out, where possible, the freedoms we can enjoy that do not inhibit the freedoms of others. Because of this, the public of South Australia is moving towards the stage where it is asking for, in many cases, unrestricted shopping hours. It is my personal belief that there should be no restriction on shopping hours: that the public should set the demand and that the retailers would answer it by providing a good service according to that demand and at times when it is profitable to provide the service. The public patronage of a business so concerned would obviously affect the hours desired.

This Bill contains simple provisions to enable shops to open until 9 o'clock on Friday night only: this is done so as not to confuse the issue, as it was confused in the referendum. At that time the opponents of 9 o'clock shopping on Friday night combined to produce a fear in the minds of the public that Saturday morning shopping would be threatened and lost if a "Yes" vote was obtained. I do not want the argument to be widened, and for that reason I have not moved according to my personal views but have contained the Bill so that it relates to Friday night shopping only. I believe this has the wholehearted

support of members on this side. Many people are now expressing opinions that they did not express before. I refer to recent statements made by union leaders, people with whom I have seldom agreed. I refer to Mr. Scott, of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, and to Mr. Cavanagh, of the Miscellaneous Workers Union. Both of these gentlemen have taken a stand in relation to freedom in regard to shopping opportunities. Yesterday, Mr. Scott was reported to have said:

I think, as a lot of other people do, that the referendum last year was badly handled. People voted against night shopping because they feared they would lose Saturday morning shopping if Friday nights were retained. I think people are now ready to vote in favour of night shopping, and in fact in favour of open slather shopping.

On this occasion I agree with Mr. Scott's views. Yesterday, Mr. Cavanagh was reported to have said:

There is a need for shops to be open for more than just Monday to Friday. The current economic situation is such that our members must either have their wives out working or they must themselves work excessive hours. Because of this we must have extended shopping hours. If we are to have shopping for the workers, we must either have it for longer than just Monday to Friday, or we must have night shopping.

This is significant because of the influence of the trade union movement on the Labor Party in this House, and it leads me to believe that we might look forward more optimistically to Friday night shopping than we did when we discussed the issue before. I call for a free vote on this matter by Labor Party members. We know the travail which they went through and which those who lost their freedoms went through during the action that ensued after the referendum. It is history now to recall the public meetings we attended. Members of the Labor Party representing outer metropolitan areas, and I, as Leader of the Opposition, attended meetings which were also attended by other interested parties from other districts. At those meetings Labor Party members said that they preferred night shopping but that they were bound by their Party pledge to uphold the majority decision of Caucus.

The member for Playford was straightforward and honest in putting his view to the electors he addressed and in putting that position clearly to the House, and I pay a tribute to him for not evading or avoiding the issue. He put up a valiant, if ineffective, defence of that pledge. Other members of the Party also

placed their view before the electors, and all Labor Party members in those districts told their constituents that they were bound, first, to their Party, and secondly, to the electors. They said that the remedy the electors had was at the ballot-box at the next election. I hope that this matter can be settled by the Bill and that it will not be an electoral issue at the next State election.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Save their skin!

Mr. HALL: Well, I leave it there. I hope it can be settled now. I therefore call on the Labor Party to allow a free decision for its members to vote as they think they ought to vote on this issue.

Mr. Coumbe: As their electors would like them to vote.

Mr. HALL: As they think they should vote. I am afraid that members do not always have the chance to please their electors. I have just pointed out that members opposite voted against their electors, and the Premier approved of their so doing. He cannot adopt an attitude different from those who voted against what their electors wished. In the interests of the passage of this Bill, which I commend to the House, I ask that the Labor Party give a free vote to its members. I ask that they vote on the Bill on the basis of giving more personal freedom to South Australians. It is a recognized fact (and if all members reflect on it they will agree) that one of the things this House constantly does is regulate people. This session the Attorney-General has introduced measures to restrict people's movements considerably by some of the protective legislation he has introduced.

I am not arguing the worth of the measures, although I think that in nearly all cases I voted for the legislation, with reservations. I will not argue the legislation again, but if members reflect on the work of the House they will see that much of it restricts people's freedom in some way or other in the interest of the common good. I believe that, in the face of this constant new regulation we are imposing on people and restricting personal freedom, there should be some counter move, a conscious seeking out of areas in which we can find new avenues of freedom for people so that there is some counterbalance and so that in the end we are not just people without any initiative to move according to our personal wishes. In this issue, we have an area where we can move without hurting other people; if this measure inconveniences some, it will be relatively few, who will be looked after by the Industrial Court.

This is an area in which to allow people more freedom, and this is basically what I ask honourable members to vote on. We have, by taking away the freedom that people north and south of the city had previously, caused inconvenience to tens of thousands of people. Only this morning I was told of a couple who both worked in the city and who previously used to do their shopping at Elizabeth. Since the cessation of Friday night shopping they have, of necessity, to shop in the city, and no longer shop at Elizabeth. This has two effects: it has reduced spending in the area in which they live, and they are no longer able to enjoy shopping together on Friday night. Shopping in their area has been denied them, because they both work during the day and must shop during lunch hours in the city.

Mr. Coumbe: That's only one example.

Mr. HALL: Yes, but it is a common one, and much trade has been diverted from the outer areas to the city centre. I have seen figures on this, none of which is reliable, but it is generally accepted that some trade has been taken from the outer fringe areas and brought into the city as a result. People must shop where it is convenient for them to shop. I suppose it may be said by city business interests that if (perhaps I should say "when") the Bill is passed some of that trade will move from the city centre back to the outer areas. This would be looked on with disfavour by central city business interests. I believe that any such attitude is short-sighted, because Friday night shopping in the city would give city traders an opportunity to create a most attractive evening shopping venue. For instance, I believe that the creation of a mall in Rundle Street, together with Friday night shopping, would create an area of vital interest to many people, especially young people, who would enjoy such freedom.

Mr. Wright: Tell us why you did not do this.

Mr. HALL: It is not up to me to go back several political generations. The honourable member may laugh, but it was his Government that took away Friday night shopping from areas that had it. We did not take it away: that is the simple difference. I hope the member for Adelaide will approach this matter on a much more co-operative plane. The last act in this somewhat sordid drama is that his Government (although he was not a member, and he may not have agreed) discontinued Friday night shop-

ping. I want to restore Friday night shopping to those who had it, make it available to all who want it, and allow shopkeepers to open if they so wish. I hope that that explanation satisfies the member for Adelaide about who was responsible for taking this action. It is possible for central city traders to use this ability to create an extremely attractive and viable trading area. I am sure, as someone indicated by interjection, that this would add vitality to Adelaide. Indeed, yesterday I heard a person criticize Adelaide, which he said lacked identity and had not sufficiently developed its own character as a city. That may or may not be so, but I believe that there should be this type of freedom to allow certain forces in the community to be capable of generating Adelaide's own character. I do not think that we should be tied in a legal straightjacket regarding the hours during which we can enjoy ourselves and shop, etc.

I do not believe that that should be restricted by this House. Such a restriction, in the light of certain movements in other States, is ridiculous; it is saying that South Australians are not sufficiently mature and that perhaps we should go back to 6 o'clock closing in hotels. It is saying that we should go back to that situation when we so misjudged the South Australian community as to retain that restriction long after it should have been removed.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Long after!

Mr. HALL: Apparently it was thought that South Australians were not sufficiently mature to enjoy extended liquor trading hours and to have lotteries. I remember making the first move in this House to extend liquor trading laws in this State.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's an old joke.

Mr. HALL: The Premier may say that, and I do not wish to push a personal barrow—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader must link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. HALL: I link my remarks by relating to this matter the example of extended liquor trading hours. If the Premier cares to examine the reports of the news media at the time, he will find that I was the first member to take public responsibility for such a move, and this was long before he put his name publicly to any such move. I have dealt briefly with the effect that the removal of a freedom has had on people in outer areas, and members who represent those areas are well aware of that effect. I have also dealt with the effect on the inner areas and referred to the way in which

Adelaide can develop attractively through Friday night shopping. I now refer to the small shopkeeper who, as a result of longer trading hours, has a chance to use his initiative and to increase his trading and turnover in significant areas. Indeed, it is likely that the smaller trader will be able to seize the advantage of greater trading hours in more cases than will the larger organization.

It has been said that increased trading hours will increase the cost of goods, but no-one has been able to substantiate that statement. On the other hand, there is no evidence that the cost of goods at, say, Elizabeth, has been reduced in any way since trading hours were limited there. I have had no evidence put before me that prices have fallen and that competitive traders have been able to pass on to their customers any savings that may have been made. We all know that trading hours are not compulsory and that they exist simply so that traders may avail themselves of those hours.

If there is a great saving to be made as a result of shorter hours, it is always possible for an astute trader, if he wishes, to operate for only five or six hours a day and to pass on to his customers the benefits of the savings that he makes. In this way, it is also possible for him to gain custom because of the cheaper prices. As there is no longer any retail price maintenance, a trader can obtain supplies and pass them on to the customers at a certain price to customers who are looking for cheaper goods and who benefit as a result. This is a matter of the market's meeting the customer. I do not imagine that South Australian retail interests, whether they be large or small, are so dense as not to avail themselves of all the trading opportunities that exist and not to avail themselves of trading hours according to the economics of the organization concerned.

Some difficulty has been raised concerning those who work in shops, and it is said that Friday night shopping will be greatly resisted by all shop assistants throughout the State. Although some shop assistants may resist this move, not all shop assistants resist it. I have met some who do and some who do not, but some assistants welcome the opportunity to earn more by working additional hours on Friday evening, while others like not to have to work on Friday evening. However, one thing we know is that in a significant area of South Australia Friday night shopping operated previously (until this Government took it away), and it was organized smoothly—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It wasn't.

Mr. HALL: Apart from the artificial division, to which I think the Minister refers, it operated smoothly. The artificial division is not continued under this Bill, for I intend that Friday night trading hours should be available to all areas in the State. When promoting a case for a "Yes" vote prior to the trading hours referendum, I met many people who worked in shops on Friday evening and who wanted to continue to do so, and I found little support among shop assistants in Elizabeth, for instance, for a "No" vote. If this situation has been organized in the past, I believe it can be organized better in future. As Australia takes on late-night shopping, activities in other States can be studied, including better rostering, carrying more staff in busy periods and less staff at other times, and obtaining from the court proper wage provisions for overtime. All this will ensure satisfactory conditions and rewards for shop assistants.

I have every confidence that the smooth operating of the scheme can be applied across the State basically to the advantage of many shop assistants and certainly to the advantage of most South Australian citizens. There is a growing concentration of people in the city; indeed, the building figures applying over the last year or so indicate a tremendous increase in the building of flats. This means that there will be a greater density of population in the metropolitan area and a greater need for people to move about with increased mobility for personal convenience. People will find that they will enjoy many of the things they now regard as a chore. Shopping is one of the things that families and young couples will be able to enjoy doing together. I believe that Friday night shopping will be welcomed in the city, which is an area of increasing density of population, and also in country areas, where it would obviously be convenient for country people.

I commend this short Bill to the Government. Clause 2 is the operative clause. Paragraph (a) provides that section 221 (1) of the Act be amended by inserting after "on every weekday" the words "other than a Friday, 9 p.m. on a Friday". At present this subsection states that the closing time for shops shall be 5.30 p.m. on every weekday and 12.30 p.m. on a Saturday. My amendment will simply remove Friday from the weekday provision, providing for closing at 9 p.m. on that day, rather than 5.30 p.m.

Clause 2 (b) relates to hairdressers, altering the provision in subsection (2) of the Act so that they may remain open until 9 p.m. on Fridays. I hope that the vote on the Bill will be a non-Party vote and that, for the convenience of citizens, we may have, before Christmas, Friday night shopping.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (BALLOTS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2187.)

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): Last week, when the Leader explained this Bill, I was somewhat amused to hear him say that he was sure that he had the unanimous support of all Opposition members. No doubt he would be pleased to be able to say that he had the unanimous support of those members with regard to his leadership of the Party.

Mr. Rodda: What are you talking about?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have no doubt that he has devised this bright idea to demonstrate further his hatred and the hatred of his Party for the working class and the trade union movement of this State.

Dr. Eastick: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am certain that this sort of move to impose a penal clause on trade unionists will not improve the Leader's already shaky position. I remind members opposite that the trade union movement does not interfere with the running of any other organization, and it is extremely opposed to any other organization's attempt to interfere with its affairs, particularly when that organization is a conservative Liberal Party. I have no doubt that the Leader's promotion of this Bill is for cynical political purposes. This is one of those gimmicks that we expect to be dragged up by a Conservative Party to cover up the bungling of the Commonwealth Liberal Government. Members opposite bring this forward to hide the fact that industrial unrest today stems from workers being alarmed at the high cost of living and the high prices of housing. The position is worsened by the serious increase in unemployment, which is at present concerning us. No doubt the Bill was designed to aggravate further the industrial unrest, and as an attempt to discredit the trade union movement. I am not opposed to trade unions holding secret ballots if they want to hold them. Indeed, many unions now hold secret ballots. However, I am certainly opposed to pressure

being put, by employers or organizations that think they are likely to be affected by a strike, on unions to hold secret ballots. This matter is entirely up to the unions, many of which, as I have said, use the secret ballot now.

In his second reading explanation, the Leader said that a number of prominent union leaders favoured secret ballots. I am sure that the Leader would like to believe that, but he knows that it is not true. If he does believe that, I suggest that he and anyone else who believes it should be certified, because the Australian Council of Trade Unions and most unions throughout the Commonwealth have publicly announced their protest at this. The most telling criticism comes from moderate union officers, and authorities on industrial relations, who believe that the scheme is unacceptable and unworkable. I will not force my opinion on members opposite, who know and have always known where I stand on this matter. I wish to refer to an article which appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on August 27, 1971, and in which the opinions on secret ballots of prominent members of the Liberal Party appeared. Referring to the Commonwealth Treasurer and former Minister for Labour and National Service (Mr. Snedden), the article states:

Indeed, he took this view after considering secret strike ballots last year. He discussed the issue with the general secretary of the British Trades Union Congress, Mr. Victor Feather, on an overseas visit and was impressed by the argument that secret ballots were more often likely to favour strike action. A paper prepared at that time by officers of the Department of Labour and National Service pointed to the problems of conducting a ballot on a nationwide scale, the delays settling a strike which necessitate holding another secret ballot and the conflict which would arise in imposing the penal sanctions of the Arbitration Act if unionists voted in favour of a strike. This paper also pointed out that section 45 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act already empowered the Commission to order a vote of members on a dispute, but this section had been invoked only three times since 1928 because of the administrative problems involved.

The article then gives the opinion of the Secretary of the Federated Clerks Union (Mr. J. Riordan), who is referred to as being right wing. The article states:

Mr. Riordan believes that a serious danger of secret ballots lies in the greater power they will give to shop stewards. "The shop steward is on the job and has an open line to the union members," he said. "The only access the properly elected union official has to his members is through a meeting. Members will not be as fully informed of the issues under

secret ballots. At a meeting, the union official has a responsibility not only to those members involved in a dispute but to the rest of the union. He also has a responsibility to the State Labor Council or the A.C.T.U. for the effect of his actions on the whole labor movement. A shop committee, even assuming there are no political motives involved—

I cannot say the same about the Leader of the Opposition—

is not concerned with these factors. The shift of power to shop stewards will increase wild-cat strikes. Mr. Riordan believes that secret ballots will also prolong strikes by making them more difficult to arbitrate. It is a most complex and unwieldy system,” he said. “For example, who is eligible to vote? Are non-union members and unfinancial members eligible? These facts will have to be checked against company records. Before a union sends out ballot papers it will have to check that members are living at the address they claim. By that time you are up to day three or four and then you must allow time for the postal services to operate. A strike which might be settled in a day could take a week to settle.”

“Then if the courts want to impose a fine, can they be justified in fining a union or union officials who have no responsibility for the secret ballot vote? The system is also wide open to manipulation and intimidation. The Communists can get hold of the ballot-papers. That happens now with the existing election ballots. No-one experienced in union affairs would support secret strike ballots. I am convinced that the majority of employers do not favour the idea.” Employers’ spokesmen are remaining quiet about the Government’s proposal but many are known to be unenthusiastic.

The Senior Lecturer in Industrial Relations at the University of N.S.W., Mr. G. W. Ford, said that the basic assumption behind the secret ballot legislation that workers would vote against strike action was wrong. This had been demonstrated by the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 in the U.S. Despite it, unionists followed the recommendations of their leaders in virtually every case. The conservative Eisenhower Administration abandoned the Act.

“My objection to the secret ballot legislation is that it is a gimmicky, sticking-plaster approach to a serious problem,” Mr. Ford said. “Australia should follow the example of Canada, which experienced this same industrial unrest in the mid-1960’s. The Canadian Government set up a special task force of some 50 local and overseas experts to study the country’s industrial relations system thoroughly. The task force produced more than 100 papers on specific problems which are now a valuable textbook and on which the Canadian system is being remodelled.”

Industrial relations authorities agree that the conduct of secret ballots on strikes will present many practical difficulties. Another problem is the fate of the penal clauses of the arbitration laws. A secret ballot vote in favour of strike action will not make a strike legal but will vest it with much greater authority and justification and make the imposition of penal sanctions more difficult.

They are the opinions of the present Commonwealth Treasurer in the Liberal Party, a right wing union leader, and a university lecturer on industrial relations. As I have said previously, the present industrial unrest is due to the unfavourable situation that the workers are in at present. I notice the member for Torrens smiling, and I am sure he agrees with me.

Mr. Coumbe: I don’t necessarily agree with you.

Mr. McAnaney: He’s laughing at you.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: No, the member for Torrens has had more experience than has the member for Heysen, whom I would not expect to be laughing, because I know his attitude to the working people. I am convinced that the cause of the unrest is the economic situation that the worker is in at present, and I think the member for Torrens would agree with me that most of the workers’ wives are forced to go to work at present. They do not go by choice, because most of them have small children to look after and home duties to carry out, but it is essential that they go to work so that they can make ends meet.

The Liberal Party’s get-tough policy towards the working-class people certainly will not be accepted by the workers. I think members of the Liberal Party now realize this and that it is forcing them to the wall. They are becoming desperate and frustrated in their efforts to impose disciplinary measures on working-class people. This is obvious. Whenever a Liberal Government has an economic problem, the first thing it does is blame the workers. Then it sets out to create unemployment, saying, “That will fix them up and quiet them down.”

This is happening today, and it is completely unreasonable for any Commonwealth Government to ask a section of the community (I refer to the working-class people) to tighten their belts but to let the other people ride roughshod over the workers by increasing prices. Many problems are associated with this issue and it could place our industrial relations, which are already strained, in a similar position to that which obtained, say, at the time of the Eureka Stockade or during the shearers’ strike in the 1890’s. I am not surprised at what I consider to be the intention and purpose of the Opposition, in its hope to create similar industrial unrest, in a vain effort to gain political power.

Finally, the Government does not object to unions holding secret ballots. It is entirely up to the members of a union whether they want

to hold a secret ballot. The Government's opinion, like that of the Donovan Royal Commission in the United Kingdom, is that ballots of union members should be taken only at the request of the union or its members concerned. Most unions have this provision at present. Therefore, I consider that the Bill is completely unnecessary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): If the Government cannot do any better in advancing arguments against the Bill than the Minister of Labour and Industry has done in the last few minutes, the case in favour of the Bill is decided beyond doubt. The Minister said so little about the merits of the proposal that the whole tenor of his speech was abuse of the Leader and other members on this side and of the Party to which we belong. I suggest that this is not the line of thinking of the overwhelming majority of people in the community on this subject. As I go along I intend to deal with one or two of the points that the Minister tried to make.

Mr. Wright: Deal with R.S.L. ballots, while you're at it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will deal with the points as I see fit.

Mr. Wright: Deal with company ballots, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham has the call in this debate, and he is entitled to be heard in silence. If other members want to contribute to the debate, they are at liberty to do so at the right time. I am going to insist that the honourable member be heard without interruption.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is extraordinary that the almost insane interjections which occurred last week during the speech of the Leader are now being heard from the member for Adelaide as I begin my speech. They show the depths of feeling and hatred which members on the other side have for this proposal. The Minister said that the trade union movement did not interfere with the running of other organizations. Only yesterday I raised in this House a matter which shows the grossest interference by a trade union in this State with the affairs of a company. Although I was very disappointed that the matter received no publicity in the paper this morning, I remind the Minister of the matter which he said he would investigate.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Are you back on the hotel dispute?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not talking about the Seven Stars Hotel; that is another matter. I am talking of the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not repeatedly rise and call honourable members to order. The honourable member for Mitcham is quite capable of making his own contribution without the assistance of Government members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remind the Minister of the advertisement which was placed by the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society which informed people who might seek employment with Aresco Trak-Chief to consult the Secretary of the union first. When they do consult the union they are told not to work with that firm. If that is not an interference in the affairs of another organization, I do not know what is.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That is just advising their members—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Just advising their members, is it, when union officials tell members that one of the reasons why they should not work for the company is that the company has secret ballots and that the union will boycott the company in the near future? Is that not interference with another organization? This matter, which should be ventilated, shows that trade unions do interfere with the affairs of other organizations. Many similar instances could be given and all members know this, as the Minister of Labour and Industry must know it better than anyone else. I will say no more about what the Minister said. If members on the Government side want to deal with this aspect, I shall be glad to hear their explanations and support for what the Minister tried to say. I have been trying (and I have had no help from the Minister) to work out why members on the other side so bitterly oppose this Bill.

Mr. Slater: Because it won't work.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, the reason so far as I can work out is that most of the members of the Labor Caucus in this Parliament are former trade union secretaries or officers.

Mr. Simmons: That is not true.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Peake says it is not true but I checked and found that at least 15 of the members of the other side have been trade union officials.

Mr. Simmons: You are wrong, because I was—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That makes it 16. There is no doubt about the fact that most

of the members opposite are former trade union officials.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the Premier?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not include the Premier, who has said he was at one time secretary of Actors Equity, and I did not include any member about whom I was not sure, so there could be more than 15. I did not include any of the four members in another place and, if I had done so, it would have increased the number considerably. Undoubtedly, if secret ballots are introduced to decide matters of this nature, union officials will lose some of their power and therefore their control of the unions. I am convinced that is the real reason why there is such fanatical objection to this measure from members opposite and apparently from the Labor Party as a whole. There can be no other reason and certainly no other reason has been suggested by the Minister or by anyone who has publicly opposed this measure. That is the key and it is one more example of the way the Labor Party is dominated by the trade union movement; it is merely the political wing of the trade union movement, and the trade union movement for this purpose is the officers of trade unions who at present wield a tremendous power within their unions and who would lose that power if secret ballots were introduced. Members opposite oppose the Bill because most of them are former trade union officers.

It has been suggested by the Minister and by others that trade unions do not interfere with other organizations and that they should therefore be left to control their own affairs undisturbed. The fact is that the trade union movement in this country is so powerful a body that the actions of unions and of the movement as a whole do impinge significantly on the lives of all citizens, and there is no gainsaying that. The community has a right to interest itself in the proper running of such a powerful organization. I am not alone in putting forward that view. A very prominent member of the Federal Labor Party, the man who it is said would be Minister for Labour and National Service if the Labor Party won a Commonwealth election, has said precisely the same thing.

Mr. Coumbe: The shadow Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The shadow Minister for Labour and National Service has said the same thing. I have a copy of the transcript of the Australian Broadcasting Commission programme A.M. of June 24, recorded in

Launceston at the time of the Labor Party biennial conference in that city. There is a note at the bottom of the transcript when Mr. Clyde Cameron, M.H.R., was talking about the rejection of his proposal to introduce Government-controlled ballots in respect of union decisions and the watering down of his recommendation for voluntary penal clauses in industrial agreements. He was asked by a Mr. Barber if this happened because members of the conference were scared off by union pressure. He was asked:

Do you agree or do you accept the fact that the report is an attempt to interfere with the internal working of the union movement?

Mr. Cameron replied:

Of course it is. It is an attempt to interfere with the internal workings of the union because, after all, registered unions get very great benefits under the arbitration laws; they get monopoly rights to particular industries, they, through registration, become the only unions that are allowed to operate in given fields, and this being so, they can't expect to have an open go.

Mr. Cameron, who said precisely what I have said in somewhat different words, is a prominent Labor man, the shadow Minister for Labour and National Service, and the Commonwealth colleague of Government members. Government members should not accept what I say. If they do not want to accept what I say, they should accept what their own colleague, the spokesman of their Commonwealth Party, has said on this issue. We know that Mr. Cameron's proposals were rejected by the A.L.P. conference, for the reasons I have given I believe. I have said that that interview to which I have referred was in the context of that rejection. I have a copy of the watered-down version of the policy statement after it had been mangled by the conference but, unfortunately, I have not been able to obtain the original. However, the watered-down version states:

Labor will also ensure a system of democratic control of all unions, allowing the fullest participation by members in their union affairs—a system of participatory democracy.

Are not secret ballots part of participatory democracy? Of course they are. Are they not a part of democratic control? Are they not a part of participation by members in their union affairs? Of course they are, and no honourable member, unless blinded by prejudice, would deny that that is so. There is no doubt, either, that most unionists (not only most of the people in the community) want secret ballots in union affairs. Last week the Leader of the Opposition referred to certain Gallup poll results and said that 73 per cent of those whose

opinions were asked for throughout Australia were in favour; but what he did not say (and what I say to complement his remarks on this point) was that 70 per cent of the unionists want the secret ballot, too.

I have tabulated poll results, and members can see them if they want to check what I am saying. Those people in favour of the secret ballot appear under three headings: there are L.C.P. voters, A.L.P. voters, and union voters, and "union" is defined in column 4, which shows that 39 per cent of the people polled said that they, or the head of the household, was a member of a trade union. What do we get there?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: The poll was taken of a very small section of the community.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Gallup poll has been found to be remarkably accurate.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Not this one!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister makes the exception to suit himself. What is the position here? A total of 37 per cent of the unionists polled would like to see a secret ballot supervised by the Electoral Office, a further 26 per cent would like to see a secret ballot supervised by union officials, and 7 per cent were undecided. That shows that 63 per cent of the unionists who were polled were in favour of a secret ballot supervised either by the Electoral Office or by their union officers; but only 17 per cent of the unionists polled favoured the taking of a decision by a show of hands. Yet all Government members apparently favour that method, although only 17 per cent of unionists do, 3 per cent being undecided. They are trade unionists. What do we find in today's *News*? Page 3 contains a report from Tasmania on the action of some wives of unionists who have been called out on strike. The wives are so damn cross with what has happened that they are going to take the matter into their own hands.

Mr. Venning: Fair enough!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I agree. That is only today's example of the feeling which not only the wives of unionists but many of the unionists themselves have about being dragged out on strike without having any say in it themselves or without sometimes even knowing the issues at stake. Good luck to those women! I hope they talk some sense into the union officials or get rid of them in some way, if possible. I believe that most unionists want this system and would see, if they had this power of the secret ballot, that they would not go out on strike until there was a real cause to strike,

not just something told to them by their union officials. I have already referred to Mr. Cameron, the colleague of Government members, who appears to differ with them on this matter. I have only the doctored document after it had been through the hands of the delegates to the conference, so I cannot say what Mr. Cameron's original proposals were at first hand. A newspaper report sets them out as follows:

The committee's recommendations include provision to establish electoral machinery for union ballots to be conducted either by personal voting on jobs or by post.

The Minister said that that could not happen, because it would be impracticable, and that a week would pass before the ballots could be checked. The article continues:

Where this would be impracticable for any union because of the nature of employment of its members, another system of secret ballot would be adopted. There would be exemptions in the case of unions such as the Federated Ironworkers Association and the Shop Assistants Union which have built into their rules control of their elections by a Commonwealth electoral officer under the present provisions of the Arbitration Act.

Even the Minister said that unions should have ballots if they wanted to have them, but I do not know how they would solve the problems of rolls, ballot-papers, etc. I believe those problems do not exist, but the Minister cannot have it both ways: he cannot put those problems up as an obstacle to secret ballots, and then say that unions can have secret ballots if they want them.

Mr. Clark: How long have you been a Cameron supporter?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No-one has suggested that I am a Cameron supporter.

Mr. Clark: He happens to be right because he agrees with you for once?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the member for Elizabeth think that Mr. Cameron is wrong in this matter? He will not answer the question. He will not say whether he thinks Mr. Cameron is right or wrong, but he will try to trick me.

Mr. Clark: Do you believe he's right?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe he is right on this matter.

Mr. Clark: Then he must be wrong: anyone who agrees with you must be wrong!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Elizabeth thinks Mr. Cameron is wrong. What does the member for Adelaide think of Mr. Cameron?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide is not permitted to express his views during the course of the honourable member for Mitcham's speech. He can speak later. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know it is intensely embarrassing to members opposite to have their chief Commonwealth spokesman saying one thing that agrees with the view embodied in this Bill, while they must say something else.

Mr. Clark: That didn't apply to Mr. Cameron. He had a right to express his opinion, and he did.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right, and I believe that on this occasion he is correct. I have referred to him, because he is a prominent Labor man: he is the shadow Minister with a long experience of trade union affairs.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you agree with most things he says?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, there is no suggestion of that, but I believe that his authority in labour matters does back up the arguments that I put forward. When members opposite last week were interjecting during the second reading speech of the Leader of the Opposition, I could not help thinking of the arguments advanced over 100 years ago against secret ballots for Parliamentary elections. Quite frankly, the things that have been said today by the Minister, and the things that have been said publicly by others in opposition to this Bill, remind one of the arguments that were advanced against secret ballots for Parliamentary elections. I do not suppose any member here would suggest that members of Parliament should not be elected by secret ballot, but—

Mr. Clark: On a voluntary vote, with elections on a Tuesday!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have obviously disturbed the member for Elizabeth by what I have said; the interjections he is making now are so wild and foolish as to show that.

Mr. Clark: This is wild and foolish legislation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suggest that the honourable member talk to Mr. Clyde Cameron about these matters. I think I would know who would come off better in any argument they had. Let me refer to some of the arguments that were used against the secret Parliamentary ballot. I am sorry that the member for Mawson is not here, for they would appeal especially to him. I have a little book published in 1884, entitled *Handbook to Political*

Questions, and written by a member of Parliament (Sydney Buxton). He summarized the arguments and I will not go through all 13 of them; I will refer only to some of them.

Mr. Clark: What were his politics?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know and I do not care.

Mr. Clark: I do. Surely you're not going to quote a man whose politics you don't know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will leave that to the member for Elizabeth. Mr. Buxton said:

(1) That publicity is always the most effective way of correcting abuses.

I do not know whether members opposite think that, by having a public vote, abuses in unions on strike matters will be corrected. The next argument is as follows:

(2) That secrecy in the performance of a public duty is un-English and unmanly.

I suspect that this is an argument that members opposite must be using. The arguments continue:

(3) That a vote is a trust and should, therefore, be given publicly.

I do not know whether members feel that way about union members. Argument (7) is a good one, namely:

That, by diminishing political excitement, the ballot leads to much abstention from voting.

And the following argument is the last one to which I refer, namely:

(8) That it merely provides electors with the means of lying with impunity; and encourages mendacity and promise-breaking.

The arguments I have quoted show the absurdity of the case against secret ballots for Parliamentary elections. I think we all agree on this (even members opposite). I find the position of members opposite rather equivocal, but I think they would agree with me on this. The arguments adduced by the Minister and others in opposition to this Bill are equally absurd and will be seen to be absurd the longer we go on, because I believe the provisions in this Bill will inevitably be written into the law of this State and into the laws all over Australia. I believe that we will see the absurdity and the bankruptcy of the arguments adduced against the Bill. From the attitude of members opposite, I do not believe that this Bill will go through; they have shown their unflagging opposition to it, and we just do not have the numbers. However, although they may have the numbers in this House to defeat the Bill, the overwhelming number of people throughout the community will be on our side in this matter and will want this Bill to be passed.

Let me conclude on the same note as that taken up by the Leader of the Opposition last week when he referred to the Gallup poll results. I have already canvassed the opinions of unionists, but what was the result overall in this matter? Each of the 2,251 people interviewed throughout all six States was first asked whether the officials of a union should be allowed to call a strike, or the members decide by ballot, and 90 per cent said that the members of the union should decide by ballot.

Mr. Jennings: You'd have a lot more strikes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Ross Smith, in company with all the members of his Party, and echoing the philosophy of the Party, believes that he knows what is best for people.

Mr. Clark: Isn't that what you're saying?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are giving people a genuine opportunity. Only 5 per cent (7 per cent A.L.P. voters and 2 per cent L.C.P. voters) said that the officials of unions should be allowed to call strikes. The other 5 per cent had no opinion. People who favoured a ballot of members were then asked whether it should be by a show of hands or a secret ballot: those who said it should be secret accounted for 73 per cent of all those interviewed, including 81 per cent L.C.P. voters and 67 per cent Labor voters. In fact, two out of three Labor voters believe in secret ballots, and 90 per cent of those polled believe that their members should decide. We know that we will lose the vote in this House, but we will win the argument in the community, and I believe that sooner or later (the sooner the better) we will have this legislation; indeed, it will be in the interests of the whole community to have it.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I find this measure to be incongruous. If it were not for the insult to the trade union movement, and if it were not a fact that this measure has been brought down by the Opposition in collaboration with the discredited Commonwealth Liberal Government, I should find the matter laughable. There is no doubt in my mind that this measure has been introduced in an attempt to distract the attention of the people of this State (in fact, of the whole of Australia) from the inefficient muddling of the Commonwealth Government. As a result of the inefficient and muddling way the Commonwealth Government has handled matters in this country, we now have a shameful situation with regard to foreign affairs, rural communities and unemployment. That Government's

inefficiency has contributed towards the escalation in the number of unemployed to a point where we have the drastic position shown in the figures released yesterday. This is the aftermath of the inflationary trend that exists in the policies of the Commonwealth Liberal Government, so that there is now widespread unemployment, resulting in much industrial unrest.

Mr. Venning: You brought it on yourself.

Mr. WELLS: The section of the community represented so dogmatically by the honourable member also brought on itself the present situation with regard to rural policy. What this Bill seeks to do would be an unwarranted intrusion into the affairs of the trade union movement. This is an attempt to muzzle trade unions. Opposition members have made many scathing and insulting comments about the trade union movement. In view of that, let us consider what we would expect those members to know about the desires of trade unions. Apart from the member for Torrens, not one Opposition member has the slightest knowledge of the trade union movement. Yet they are attempting to muzzle trade unions, although the legislation must fail because—

Dr. Tonkin: You have the numbers.

Mr. WELLS: Yes. Was the Australian Medical Association prepared to have a secret ballot amongst doctors to decide whether medical fees in this country should be increased by 15 per cent? There was no secret ballot on that occasion.

Mr. Venning: Two wrongs don't make a right.

Mr. WELLS: So the honourable member admits that the increase in medical fees was wrong.

Mr. Venning: No.

Mr. WELLS: What the Opposition is trying to do is a presumptuous interference in the affairs of trade unions, and the Government will not tolerate it. If this Bill were passed, I can tell members opposite that there would be the most widespread industrial unrest that had ever been experienced in this State. Contrary to the views of the member for Mitcham, most people in this State do not want to see secret ballots. Opposition members show their ignorance of trade union affairs when they speak about leaders of unions imposing their will on the rank and file of the movement. Regarding the reference by the member for Mitcham to the situation in Tasmania, I want to know whether the wives that have

been referred to had a secret ballot or whether theirs was just a unilateral action. It would not be possible to implement the scheme envisaged in the Bill. A similar scheme tried out in New South Wales some years ago was found to be an abject failure.

The member for Mitcham cited a couple of cases. I will cite one case. Let us assume that shop stewards at General Motors-Holden's determined that a certain situation was unsafe and that they could not risk the lives of their members. If they had to have a secret ballot to decide whether to stop work, the lives of the members would be placed in jeopardy while that ballot was being held. It is better that they stop work until the conditions have been made safe. Surely such a case demonstrates that what is suggested in the Bill would be impracticable. Let us assume that a secret ballot were held and the majority of members decided to strike. Would that union then be exempted from penalties imposed by the Industrial Court? Would members opposite say that, because union members had democratically decided to go on strike, that was the end of the matter? Whether there was a secret ballot or a show of hands, Opposition members would still insist that the matter should go to the Industrial Court. Therefore, what is the point of this legislation?

The Leader spoke about intimidation, but I will not countenance that suggestion at all. Having been involved in the trade union movement all my life and having seen thousands of disputes, I can say that I have never seen members intimidated. The Leader referred to an official's saying, "In favour to the right; scabs to the left." The term "scab" is the most horrible term that can be applied to a worker, and it would not be used by any self-respecting trade union officer with regard to the members he controlled. I do not believe for one second that this would have been said. Irrespective of the organization to which these men belong, they are not rabbits; they do not run behind another man saying, "I won't vote for Tom, because Bill put his hand up." A worker speaks for himself at his trade union meeting or anywhere else. He stands up: he is not a rabbit as has been suggested. It is wrong to say that he hides behind the decisions made by other men and then says, "I have been intimidated." The workers speak for themselves, and I will give an example of that.

Recently, I attended a meeting at the Apollo Stadium about the trouble at General Motors-Holden's and Chrysler Australia Limited. I

went along, as Vice-President of the Trades and Labor Council, to support the recommendation that the men return to work. As each speaker rose representing a certain trade union, he was cheered by his own members and booed by other sections of the meeting. Similarly, as other speakers rose, they were either booed or cheered. That shows that there was no intimidation. To prove my point, when I rose to speak, they all booed, just to be on the safe side.

The member for Mitcham has said that 73 per cent of the persons interviewed in a Gallup poll wanted secret ballots. If that is so, they have an avenue for it through the organization. If provision is not made in the constitution for secret ballots, the members can seek an alteration of the constitution, and there would be no trouble whatsoever about that. Therefore, that argument advanced by the member for Mitcham is absolutely trite.

I refer also to the statement made by the member for Mitcham about interference by trade unions and other organizations. The honourable member referred to a management. The real position is that the union did not interfere with the management at all. The union officers went to the place concerned and sought to have a mouthpiece for the members employed there elected; in other words, they went there to have a shop steward appointed. There was conflict of opinion and no immediate action was taken, but the union had a perfect right (indeed, a duty) to see that there was a union spokesman at that shop, to be the focal point of the persons who worked there. The member for Mitcham said that there was interference by the union, but what about the interference by the manager? Off his own bat, the manager decided to have a secret ballot and to hold one on behalf of the union. How ridiculous can one get?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Who was the returning officer?

Mr. WELLS: The Managing Director was probably the returning officer! I say, in all seriousness, that trade unionists are honourable, hardworking, and responsible people. They will not tolerate interference in their affairs or with their democratically elected leaders. If a trade union leader is not satisfactory, he can be replaced after a specified period. In the case of my own organization, the period is three years. Every three years its officers must go to election and can be replaced, as they are if they have not been satisfactory.

This gives the workers their voice and, when workers elect representatives to management

committees and to act in an official capacity, the workers have every faith in their judgment. The elected officials are the only people who can lead the members into a strike—or out of one, for that matter. A secret ballot provision, if enforced, would not make one iota of difference so far as the membership or its affinity to its leadership was concerned. The member for Mitcham was rather caustic, perhaps facetious, when he said that, on looking at the members of the Government, he saw 15 former trade union officers or former leaders in the trade union movement. He could have gone further than that, but if there are 15 former trade union officers on this side of the House and none on the other side—

Mr. Ryan: One only!

Mr. WELLS: I do not accept him as a trade unionist in any circumstances, but I do not want to join issue on that. I will include that honourable member and say that the Opposition side has one. If there are 15 former trade union officers amongst Government members and one on the Opposition side, which Party is better equipped to determine what is best for the workers of this State and to determine what the unions want and need? Is it the Party with the union representatives, or the Opposition Party, containing representatives of other organizations?

I suggest that the Government side of the House is the informed side, and I conclude by saying that interference in trade union affairs, whether by the Government or any other body, will not be tolerated. The trade unions are a body unto themselves, dedicated to looking after their members and the welfare and living standards of those members, and no Party, whether Liberal, Labor, or any other, should try (I suggest it would not dare try) to muzzle the trade unions in this State, because if a Party did that, it alone would precipitate the widest industrial strikes and strife ever known in South Australia.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): In supporting the Bill, I want to say one or two things to rebut what the two speakers from the Government side have said. The Minister's speech was one of the most pitiful speeches in reply to a Bill that I have heard from a member, let alone from a responsible Minister, in this House. This statement is not personal but, frankly, the Minister's speech was one of the most pitiful defences that I have ever heard, and I am sure that the Minister's officers did not prepare the material for him. Obviously, it was his own material, because he did not deal at any length with the merits or otherwise

of the Bill. He set out to express hatred of members on this side and of their interest in the trade union movement.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What's the purpose—

Mr. COUMBE: Someone is chattering in the background.

The SPEAKER: The Minister must contain himself. He is out of order in interjecting.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister levelled at members on this side the charge that we had an inbuilt hatred of trade unions.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's dead right, and the member for Florey has just supported me.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister said that my Party was out to discredit the trade union movement. If that is all that he can rely on, pity help the Government. The Minister went on to talk about penal clauses, but there are no penal clauses in this Bill. Only one penalty is provided, and that is for anyone who obstructs the conduct of a ballot. That is not a penal clause. The Minister is getting the Bill mixed up with other provisions of the Industrial Code and some of the provisions of the Commonwealth legislation.

Then the Minister said, in a very interesting aside, that he was not opposed to unions holding secret ballots: that is what we are promoting. He said that it was entirely up to the unions: if they wanted to hold secret ballots, they were entitled to do so. The Minister then emphasized the present economic position, but these strikes have been going on for a long time. He talked about the Eureka Stockade and the shearers' strike in the 1890's. The Minister is living in the past, and his remarks are typical of a man who cannot look forward to an enlightened system of union rights, privileges and conduct, and to a more enlightened and progressive system of industrial legislation, in the interests of workers in this State. That is what the Minister of Labour and Industry in South Australia should be looking at, not at the past.

The member for Florey said nothing except fulminate against this Party. I correct myself: he did say one thing; he said that this Bill would muzzle the trade union movement. This was too much to accept. If he takes the trouble to read the Bill in detail he will realize that it gives greater and freer voice to the trade union movement and that it gives the rank and file members of unions a greater voice in its affairs and decisions. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CIGARETTES (LABELLING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2206.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I know that the member for Glenelg wants to get a vote on this matter today, and I know that the Attorney-General has an amendment to move and that one other member wants to speak to the Bill, so I will curtail my remarks. I have already mentioned that I support the Bill. I have already answered some questions posed by the honourable member in his admirable second reading explanation. When he asked whether I would like my children to smoke, I said that my children did not smoke, even though I had never tried to dissuade them. He knows that I smoke, and I rather regret it. I only hope that I am not an excessive smoker, although doctors tell me that anyone who smokes is smoking excessively. A well-known Adelaide pathologist says that if anyone should not smoke it is he, yet he smokes incessantly. I do not think that putting this little notice on the cigarette packet is going to mean very much, unfortunately. I hope it does influence the younger generation.

Mr. Venning: Are you supporting the Bill?

Mr. JENNINGS: If the honourable member was not so obtuse, he would realize I had said about six times already that I was supporting the Bill. However, I will try to contain my remarks: I will speak to the intelligent members of the House, and that will mean I do not have to address myself to the member for Rocky River. I believe we could perhaps go a little further in this, but that would mean an all-States operation. I believe that in Great Britain at the moment, the land where the member for Glenelg comes from—

Mr. Clark: He left his country for his country's own good.

Mr. JENNINGS: It may have been so at the time, but I believe his country is not going so well now under the Conservative Party. At the moment, British television channels are showing an advertisement of a young girl smoking and looking invitingly at two young men, one of whom says to the other, "You can have her, mate. I have been out with her, and kissing her was like kissing an ash can." In another advertisement two normal packets of cigarettes (a green pack and a yellow pack) are shown together with a wooden box. I am not too sure whether these things influence people. With our experience regarding the road toll, I do not know whether people are convinced one way or the other by these measures.

I want to speak now less kindly than I have done about the member for Glenelg. When he was giving his second reading explanation I got up, sadly, to have a smoke and as I went out I spoke to the member for Elizabeth, and the member for Glenelg said I was sniping at him because he happened to speak with an accent and that I was in this place only because of the many English people who gave me their vote.

Mr. Mathwin: That was right.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am well aware of the fact that a large proportion of English people in my district gave me their vote and, when the honourable member stood for election in virtually the same area a long time ago, the number of English people who gave him their vote was minimal, which indicates that the English migrants who voted on those two occasions were very discerning.

Mr. Payne: They were sagacious.

Mr. JENNINGS: Very sagacious, as my friend says. I categorically deny (and if members want me to be zoological, dogmatically deny) that I interjected at all on the honourable member on that occasion.

Mr. Slater: Did he make that up?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, he did not. He assumed because of something I said to the member for Elizabeth that I had interjected. Having had this in *Hansard*, the Leader of the *Hansard* Staff spoke to me and said, "What was the interjection that precipitated the reply by the member for Glenelg?" I said, "I did not make any interjection." He said, "We must put in an interjection if it is answered, otherwise it would look stupid." I agreed that the interjection should go in, namely, "Would you object if I went out and rolled one of my own?" I still deny that I made any interjection. The honourable member said that I was criticizing him because of his accent. I do not care how people speak. I do not mind the honourable member's accent; in fact, I barely notice it. I would be the last person to talk about accents, because only recently I was in the country from which the member for Glenelg comes and I was astonished that, on several occasions, I was given cider instead of soda.

The Hon. L. J. King: Whiskey and cider!

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and that's a very peculiar drink.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am doing that. I am answering the remark made by the member for

Glenelg in this debate. Likewise, I found it astonishing, not only in Britain but also in America, when I was asked what cars were made in Australia. When I mentioned the Holden, people said, "Hilden—never heard of it!" I am therefore the last person to complain about a person's accent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must return to the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS: I shall do that now, Sir. The member for Glenelg has made attacks of this nature on me before. I do not mind because, as honourable members know, I have a fairly thick skin. However, I thought it was time I mentioned this matter. I do not dislike the honourable gentleman. I regard him as a human being, which surely is the greatest concession that anyone could expect me to make. Even his pomposity is rather endearing, and he is as pompous as a performing dog. I do not dislike the honourable gentleman at all. I wonder why it is that he should have this effect on Government members and why he should take to some of us in the way he does. Is it associated with what we have heard about him recently: that he has been saying, "Government members do not interject when I speak because I am so swift in my repartee that I can cut them to ribbons"?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be ruled out of order if he persists in this vein: the honourable member must discuss the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Bill is a good but minor move: it will be about as useless as a snowflake in hell. I only hope that it will act as a slight warning to the younger people in the community of the evils of smoking. I support the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I, too, support the Bill and congratulate the member for Glenelg on introducing it. My only concern about the Bill is whether it goes far enough. I should like like to see such a warning displayed on all forms of advertising in all the media, not only on cigarette packages, to the extent that every time a cigarette commercial appeared on television the same warning was flashed across the screen for the duration of the commercial. I should like to see the warning published in every press advertisement for cigarettes. This has been done overseas, and in one case cigarette advertising has been abandoned by the manufacturer as a result. Another action open to the Government is the banning of cigarette advertising on television. I consider that the

former would achieve more because, whenever cigarettes were advertised, the warning would be given.

Without going into this question in any depth (unlike the member for Ross Smith, who said that he was not going to speak for long but who spent 11 minutes largely on rubbish), there is no doubt that there is a health hazard in smoking. Excellent publications have been issued by the Royal College of Physicians of England on the subject of smoking, and I commend them to honourable members who really want to find out what smoking is all about. Undoubtedly, significant changes in smoking habits have come about since these reports were first released. I think it is rather significant that the incidence of smoking in women is still increasing and that the incidence of lung cancer is increasing proportionately. The incidence of lung cancer in men remains relatively constant, as the rate of smoking also remains relatively constant.

Many reasons have been given for smoking, and these have been dealt with by other speakers. I think the most important reason is the rather juvenile attitude of young people who wish to appear grown up. Some of them find that smoking is a symbol of adulthood, and advertising in the media is a prime stimulus to this attitude in young people's minds. I condemn the attitude of cigarette advertisers who say that they are being very careful not to influence young people, because they have people who are obviously adults appearing in cigarette commercials. This is just the thing that will encourage juveniles to smoke cigarettes so as to identify themselves with adults and with those people who fly light aircraft, drive fast cars, ride horses, and generally lead what appears to be a jet-set life. I think this is trading on the susceptibilities of young people.

Other reasons given are that smoking is relaxing, that it gives people something to do, and that it covers their nervousness or soothes the nerves. However, it is generally accepted that nervous tension generally increases the consumption of cigarettes, or perhaps it could be said that the consumption of cigarettes increases with the degree of nervous tension. Whatever the reason is and why ever people start, the problem of physical dependence ensues quickly. Withdrawal symptoms relate to stopping smoking just as much as they do to the stopping of any other drug habit.

Mr. Hopgood: How many physical dependencies have you?

Dr. TONKIN: I am not sure of the sense of that interjection, but I have always had that difficulty with the member for Mawson. Nevertheless, I think that one of the problems we have (and I do not intend to waste time or allow Government members to waste time) is that the human being generally is rather arrogant by nature and tends to have the attitude: "It cannot happen to me." I am sure that all honourable members who smoke and persist in smoking have that attitude. This is predominantly why people continue to smoke. One of the characteristics of the cigarette dependant is that when he is asked about his consumption of cigarettes he always gives a figure (certainly to his doctor but frequently to his friends) that is considerably less than the number of cigarettes that he really consumes. This is at least some evidence of a certain degree of conscience in the matter.

There are many rationalizations, which tend to hide the normal attitude towards death and old age. It is a particularly unpleasant death to die of lung cancer. It is not particularly pleasant to die from heart disease, hardening of the arteries, or from emphysema or any of the other lung conditions, but death from carcinoma of the lung is a particularly cruel death. One of the common misconceptions is that if a person has been smoking there is nothing much he can do about it; the damage has been done. This is quite wrong, because recent research has shown that, if someone stops smoking, in 10 years' time his life expectancy will have returned to the average life expectancy, which in fact may be cut down by as much as five to 10 years by smoking. Therefore, it is worth while stopping smoking, because one's likelihood of dying from lung cancer will steadily decrease again, depending on the length of time that has elapsed since one stopped smoking. So there is hope for smokers, if only they will do something about it.

There are many reasons for giving up smoking. There is the expense, and this is a fairly potent reason. Then there is the effect on health, and I sincerely hope that this will affect the honourable members concerned. Also, there are social pressures now building up from friends and families. I think one of the most potent causes of people stopping smoking now is the attitude of their children, who say, "Why do you smoke? We don't want

to lose you. We don't want you to die. Why don't you stop smoking?" and a good thing that is, too. I believe that this warning should be more widely used. I think it must appear on cigarette packets and that it must be there for young people to see, because it is the young people who will especially be affected by this warning and who, I hope, will stop smoking as a result of always seeing it there. As I say, I should like to see the warning associated with all forms of cigarette advertising.

This is a serious subject, as it involves life and death for many people in our community, and treating it in such a light-hearted and facetious way does not do the member for Ross Smith much credit. I think he tried to treat the subject with some levity as a form of self-defence, because he is one of those who joins the procession out of this Chamber in order to have a cigarette periodically. It is a pretty miserable state of affairs when a habit such as cigarette smoking can so govern one's life that one is a servant, not the master, of the habit. I again congratulate the member for Glenelg and support the Bill.

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): I take pleasure in congratulating the member for Glenelg on introducing this Bill. I find myself in complete agreement with everything that has just been said by the member for Bragg, and that is not bad, coming from someone who has been a confirmed smoker for nearly 50 years. I must admit that I have made some sort of valiant effort and now smoke about half as much as I used to smoke. I know that the member for Bragg would tell me that that was not good enough, but at least it is something. Probably the reason why I have not given up smoking altogether is that I am afraid of getting too fat, having seen so many who seem to put on much surplus weight when they give up smoking. However, I suppose the real reason, of which the member for Bragg is no doubt already thinking, is that frankly I doubt that I could give up smoking, although I suppose I could if I had to try hard enough.

I sincerely support this measure, my only doubts being similar to those expressed by the member for Bragg. I am afraid that the measure will not be effective. When the measure was introduced, I recalled that I had been smoking the same brand of cigarette for about 10 years, but I could not remember the printing on the packet. I could recall the brand, but I will not mention any brands, because I do not think you would like my advertising in the House, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would be out of order.

Mr. CLARK: Although I could remember that the colour of the packet was red, I could not tell anyone what was on the packet.

Mr. Mathwin: What colour was the cigarette?

Mr. CLARK: I wish that, when I am supporting the honourable member for once, he would not interject and make me want to smack him down. However, my sympathy in this matter overcomes my natural habit of replying to interjections.

Mr. Wardle: Have you got a "craven" for one right now?

Mr. CLARK: No; at present I am perfectly satisfied. My system has apparently had sufficient nicotine today, but I do not want to make this a humorous matter. I am not sure that printing a warning against smoking on a cigarette packet will be of much use, and I am sorry that the honourable member has not stated specifically in the Bill just how the warning will be printed. I rather fancy that the only hope of much success is to adopt the American method whereby at the top of a packet one breaks a seal or little label before one can get at the cigarettes. A person can hardly avoid seeing a warning that is printed on the seal, which has to be broken before the packet can be opened. I agree with the member for Bragg that the measure does not go far enough.

Those who recently saw the excellent telecast of the football carnival in Perth would probably agree that it was spoilt because the same two or three advertisements were shown over and over again all afternoon. One advertisement, which may have been farcical when first seen, became obnoxious after it had been seen for about the fifteenth time. People watch advertisements on television because they cannot avoid seeing them. I think that cigarette advertisements should be to the effect that cigarettes are poison, and this would be similar to what applies in the United Kingdom. Although my doctor admits that cigarettes probably do the greatest harm, he tells me that all forms of tobacco are harmful. Indeed, when I smell some of the pipes used by certain of my colleagues, I am inclined to agree.

I believe that this warning should be printed on other things as well as on cigarette packets. I am snobbish enough to roll cigarettes only when I am home, but the members for Ross Smith and Adelaide roll their cigarettes

habitually. Therefore, if we are to have labels warning against smoking cigarettes, they should be placed on packets of ready-rubbed tobacco. Cigarette holders, lighters and boxes of matches should also be labelled. I suggest that, if we are to do our best to prevent people from beginning to smoke, everything to do with smoking should be labelled. Ashtrays, smokers' stands and cigar boxes should also be labelled. I am not being completely facetious; if I were being facetious, I would include chewing tobacco, for instance.

Pipes especially should be labelled, because some of those smoked around this place are fairly hard to put up with. If everything to do with smoking is labelled, the effect of the labelling will be much increased. Therefore, I suggest that the member for Glenelg should add to the provisions of his Bill, because I do not believe it goes far enough. Although I regret the need for it, I will support the amendment foreshadowed by the Attorney-General, for the legislation will be of little effect unless it is uniform. However, I am afraid that it is in respect of the two States where tobacco interests are strong that legislation of this type will run into its greatest snag.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I thank the Government, and those many members who have spoken, for supporting the Bill. Although the member for Ross Smith started his speech in a good vein, he went on to what I could term a personal attack on me. I intend to accept the Attorney-General's amendment, although I do not wholeheartedly support it; I am sorry that he has seen the need for it. I am pleased to know that some of the points in the Bill are in the little black book of the Labor Party. I hope that it will not be long before the wheels turn in the other States and the labelling of cigarette packets is adopted to the ultimate benefit of the health of the nation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

New clause 1a—"Commencement."

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move to insert the following new clause:

1a. (1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section, this Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

(2) A proclamation referred to in subsection (1) of this section shall not be made until the Governor is satisfied that—

(a) legislation similar in effect to this Act has been enacted in respect of not less than three of the other States of the Commonwealth;

and

- (b) the legislation referred to in paragraph (a) of this subsection has, or is likely to, come into operation.

As I said during the second reading debate, the Government agrees with the principle that a health hazard warning should be affixed to cigarette package labels, and it agrees with the points made by the member for Glenelg and other members who support this proposition. However, it seems impracticable to operate this scheme in any one State. As cigarette packages are not produced in South Australia, it will be extremely difficult for retailers of cigarettes to affix a label of this kind to a packet. Obviously, if this is to be done effectively, it must be done by those who actually distribute cigarette packages. If Australian law generally required that cigarette packages be labelled in this way, manufacturers would comply if they wanted the Australian market. Therefore, the amendment provides that the operation of this legislation will depend on similar law coming into force in three other States, so that South Australia will make a majority of the States and this will ensure what would then be a practical uniformity. I ask the Committee to accept the amendment.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What would happen if all the other States enacted similar legislation: would it not mean that it would never come into force?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No. If all States legislate to the same effect, no State will operate the legislation until at least four States have passed their measures and obviously, by arrangement, each State would know that the other States were about to bring the measure into operation. The significant words are "likely to come into operation." The Governor need only be satisfied that the legislation has been passed and is likely to come into operation in three other States. There would be no question of a stalemate. The law would come into operation when four States had passed the legislation and were ready to bring it into operation.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment, but I had hoped that the Government would take the initiative in this matter, as it likes to be first in the field and therefore to be a trendsetter. Apparently, Victoria has passed legislation, and New South Wales and Queensland are well advanced with their legislation. I do not know about Western Australia.

Mr. EVANS: I oppose the amendment. We are concerned about activities in this State and the difficulty of putting the law into practice is

a matter for the manufacturers and distributors. We are saying only that, when cigarettes are sold in this State, we request that the warning be on the packet. As a result of the amendment, the law may not come into operation here for a long time. The manufacturers would accept the responsibility if they wanted to sell their cigarettes here, and it would be better for one State to put the measure into operation. If we think something is right, we should do it.

The Hon. L. J. King: That's not what you said about the trade practices legislation.

Mr. EVANS: I did not speak on that. I support the Bill and oppose the amendment.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RURAL)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2203.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The matter of land tax has been debated at length during this session and previous sessions. This form of taxation is one of a series of capital taxes levied on the rural community and one that is causing great difficulty. The Treasurer, in asking us to reject the Bill, said that South Australia did not levy a poker machine tax as was done in New South Wales and that as a result much less revenue was obtained in this State. I could not help feeling that that reference was unfair. The inference is that we must penalize rural people to make amends for not having a poker machine tax.

The Treasurer's reference to the losses on country water supply was also unfair, because it would be impossible for country residents, whether on farms or in country towns, to pay the full cost of reticulation. The cost of that would be prohibitive. The supply of water and electricity to the remote areas has contributed significantly to the overall economy, and we should not try to isolate the rural areas from the metropolitan area. The economy depends on the inter-action of the two sections and one section depends on the other.

The metropolitan dwellers and, in fact, the whole economy depend on the rural community and it is fallacious for the Treasurer to say that the people in the country do not pay the full cost of water reticulation. If country people had to meet this cost, the city people would also be worse off. There is a precedent for removing land tax. It is fallacious

to compare per capita taxation in South Australia with that in the wealthier States. Obviously, capital investment in property and the like in New South Wales is far greater than it is in South Australia. Capital taxes levied in New South Wales work out at more per person in New South Wales than can be levied in South Australia; that, also, is an argument that is not valid in this connection.

The Treasurer's statement that we cannot afford the loss of \$1,000,000 from the Treasury is rather shallow when one considers the areas in which the Government can spend large sums without any apparent return to the citizens of the State. One has only to think of the kind of expenditure involved in setting up some of the new Government departments and instrumentalities. The Government intends to spend \$5,000,000 over the next five years on transportation in setting up the hierarchy to obtain some of the answers, and \$500,000 is to be spent on transport research. If they are the Government's priorities, I believe that the alleviation of this \$1,000,000 tax on rural industries is well justified.

The Treasurer's remarks are cold comfort to people in rural industries who in the future might be forced out of business. This is one of a series of capital taxes, together with water rates, succession duties, and land taxes—taxes on capital which make primary production difficult at present. The amount of capital needed to return a gross of \$5,000 on the land today is between \$50,000 and \$100,000, whereas people in the metropolitan area who earn \$5,000 a year require no capital investment at all. There is every indication that this tax should be removed. When one considers the Government's priorities for spending, there is no argument for the retention of this tax. One hears the statements which some economists advance today. This week, in the Commonwealth sphere, the economic spokesman for the Labor Opposition (Mr. Frank Crean) said he wanted to abolish the 2t per cent surcharge on income tax to stimulate the economy, yet the Minister of Education in this House wants to spend vastly increased sums. I cannot reconcile the thinking of the Labor Government in this State with that of its federal colleagues: on the one hand, the Labor Government here wants vastly increased expenditures whereas, on the other hand, their federal colleagues want reduced taxation. These two stands are incompatible and show how hypocritical are the South Australian Government's statements as to what it needs

and also the statements of the Labor Opposition in Canberra. I support the Bill.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support my colleague's remarks and compliment my Leader on introducing the legislation which, as we all know, is not the answer to the problems in rural industry but which is an indication, if the Government is prepared to support it, of its aid to and sympathy with rural industry. I think the Leader made an important point when he referred to the situation in the other States. Land tax is not paid in other States: it was discontinued when rural industries were in a better state than they are in now. The removal of land tax would be one way of showing primary producers that the Government sympathizes with them. In speaking to the Bill, the Treasurer said he realized that there were problems in rural industries. He said:

It is not that the Government lacks sympathy for the primary producer faced with the difficulty of selling his produce; it is not that the Government has set its face resolutely against concessions to the farmer; and it is not that the Government would deliberately refrain from doing more to help him in his present troubles. It is simply that funds of the magnitude required are not now available and are not likely to be available soon. The Government would like to give more help to all those engaged in agriculture—farmer and farm labourer.

The Treasurer is looking for more money from the Commonwealth Government. It is all very well for the Treasurer to tell that story to Opposition members who represent rural seats, but we know how the Government is able to find money for other purposes. The money involved in the purchase of the A.N.Z. Bank building has been mentioned; it now seems as though \$600,000 or \$700,000 will be spent on the building before it can be used. The other day I went to the bank to see what possibilities the building had for the purpose for which the Government bought it. I concluded that it was fit only for stacking baled hay, but who wants to stack baled hay in King William Street?

The help the Government has given to rural industries in their current problems is nil. Regarding wheat, the Government set up committees to handle appeals and to fix quotas, but it is the industry that is looking after itself. The Treasurer's views are contrary to the statements he made to the large group of farmers he addressed at Elder Park in July last year. It is significant that, before the last election, the Australian Labor Party issued a screed that has been referred to from time

to time. My opponent at the last election issued a statement, as follows: "If you need help, call me." It is interesting to note that he has been nominated again, and I hope he has something better to offer next time. Rural industries have been waiting for the Government to do something: they need an injection in the arm to lift them up. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ADMINISTRATION OF ACTS AND ACTS INTERPRETATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 2321.)

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister Assisting the Premier): I believe that last evening I had answered all the criticisms of this measure made by Opposition members. I pointed out that those members who criticized the Bill followed the lead set by the member for Mitcham. Broadly, their criticisms were based on the fact that a similar Bill, which had been introduced into this Parliament some years ago, had been rejected by the House. I have been able effectively to point out to members opposite that the member for Mitcham had made a mistake here and that the previous Bill did not, in fact—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is replying, and there is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I pointed out that the previous Bill, to which the honourable member referred and which he used as a criterion, did not have the same effect as this legislation has and that accordingly his opposition was unfounded. I believe that the Bill is a good one, and I certainly commend it to the House.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller), Brown, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (15)—Messrs. Allen, Carnie, Coumbe, Evans, Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Burdon. No—Mr. Ferguson.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.
Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Delegation of powers by Minister."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is the operative clause of the Bill. When he replied to the second reading debate yesterday, the Minister explained that the purpose of this Bill was to help himself, as Minister of Environment and Conservation—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's not true.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and was not to be used generally.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You had better get your facts right before you make such statements.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister said:

This legislation has been brought about by the changes that have taken place from time to time since the new department has been established—

and he is talking about his own department—and the department will probably grow in the future.

I then said, "Then this is in regard to your appointment, is it?", to which the Minister replied, "Not entirely." If that is taken in its literal sense, it means that is not entirely but mainly in relation to his own jurisdiction.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You put a gloss on everything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I invite the Premier, who likes to come in with a superior interjection from time to time, to tell me what it does mean if it does not mean that it is mainly to help the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There are other portfolios.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There may be other portfolios, but it is mainly to help the Minister of Environment and Conservation. That is entirely different from what was said in the second reading explanation, in which there was not a hint that this was meant to affect a particular Minister. The only example given in the second reading explanation was the Underground Waters Preservation Act, but when the Minister replied he did not even mention that Act. The Opposition would like to know what Acts the Government had in mind when introducing this Bill; whether it is to be of general application; whether it is because of the Underground Waters Preservation Act; or whether it is because of the Acts

that are now under the control of the Minister in the new portfolio, a Ministry which is to grow in the future.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister Assisting the Premier): I dealt with this matter adequately yesterday and I think the honourable member provided himself with the answer when he read from my statements on the matter. Whilst, in the second reading explanation, I referred particularly to the Underground Waters Preservation Act as an example—

Mr. Millhouse: Are you administering that Act?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No, I am not. In addition to that example, I also gave other examples. I referred to the Mining Bill, which did affect my portfolio and the areas that the Premier intends to place under my control in relation to the amenities clauses. There are several instances where this situation could apply and there are several comparable areas that we do not know of at this stage in which it could arise, affecting not only my portfolio but also the portfolio of any other Minister. For this reason, we consider that providing this power in the Act will avoid the need for constant amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hoped that the Premier would say something on this.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I don't see anything to reply to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have looked at the *Hansard* proof, and in the sentence after the one to which I have referred the Minister ended his speech by saying, "It is fair to say that, in most cases, it will help me, as Minister of Environment and Conservation." Luckily, I was able to check *Hansard* on the Minister's denial. He has not given specific examples of the Acts to which the Bill will apply. If the Bill is designed to help him in most cases, to use his words, surely he can give examples of where he will take a joint responsibility with one of his colleagues or of where he intends to delegate a joint responsibility to a colleague. The Government must have something in mind besides the Underground Waters Preservation Act, which does not come under the Minister's control, anyway. This is precisely the matter on which the then Opposition complained when I introduced an Acts Interpretation Act Amendment Bill. We were told that we were foreseeing difficulties that had not arisen. Now, members opposite, in Government, want to do the same thing, and surely the Minister can give us some idea of what

Acts will be affected by the Bill. Otherwise, one suspects that the Minister does not know anything about it, and it seemed that last evening he was spinning along until it was time to adjourn, so that he could further consider the matter. However, we did not hear much when he concluded his speech earlier.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think I told the honourable member that some broad principles were involved in this legislation. I have mentioned specifically at least two Acts.

Mr. Millhouse: Neither of which is within your administration.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That is correct.

Mr. Millhouse: But this is to help you in most cases, as Minister of Environment and Conservation.

Mr. Jennings: Do you want to make two speeches at once?

The CHAIRMAN: There will be only one speech at a time. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I would not mention these as specific instances where this legislation will be used, but they are areas in which it may well be used. I refer to the Health Act, where regulations affecting clean air could be delegated to me from the Minister of Health; the same situation could occur about tourist resorts; and some sections of the Local Government Act could be referred to me in future. I am not suggesting that this is certain to happen, but it could well be decided that there is some need for protection of the environment. This legislation is to take into account problems that may occur in future.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): One would imagine that the member for Mitcham has not read the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: I have done so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case all I can say is that the honourable member either does not understand it or is being deliberately pettifogging and obtuse. The honourable member first objects that when a completely different measure was before this Chamber, a measure that provided not for delegation to other Ministers but for Ministerial control to be delegated to public servants—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He said this is identical.

Mr. Millhouse: I never said that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a real distinction, because this Bill does not detract from Ministerial responsibility. In the instance

when delegation of Ministerial authority to public servants and not to Ministers was objected to, that was derogating from Ministerial responsibility, and that is not intended by this legislation. With the creation of the Ministry of Environment and Conservation, a whole series of present legislation must be co-ordinated for the purpose of preserving the environment, but it is not possible to take all these Acts out of the control of the Ministers to whom they are properly delegated under the Administration of Acts Act. Therefore, as parts of administration can properly be co-ordinated by the Minister of Environment and Conservation, specific responsibilities in certain areas of legislation should be delegated to him.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you give some examples?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Under the Mines and Works Inspection Act, the amenities provisions should be administered by the Minister of Environment and Conservation, because that is their specific purpose. As Minister of Mines, I have to see to the proper safety and workings of the mines provisions, but it is proper that the amenities section of the Act should be administered by the Minister responsible for environment. What is wrong with that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed at the Premier's effort to come to the aid of his assistant, but at least he has named one other Act.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You asked me for an example.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier has given one example in which there is to be a split of responsibility. By giving that example he has simply underlined the point I made yesterday in the second reading debate that this will cause the utmost confusion in the administration of Acts of Parliament. It means apparently that in future some provisions in an Act will be administered by one Minister and some provisions by another Minister, but both Ministers will, I presume, according to the tenor of this clause, have a dual responsibility for the lot. That is the way it is drafted. If that will not cause confusion, not only within the Government itself but among members of Parliament who are trying to pin down a Minister to see whether he is responsible, I do not know what will.

This is the crux of our complaint about this Bill: it will blur the lines of Ministerial responsibility and cause much confusion; the Premier, in the example he gave, showed that

very clearly. This confirms me in my opposition to this bad Bill. If the Government creates a new Ministry, it should be a Ministry that can take over Acts of Parliament. That is what has always happened before when there have been increases in the size of Cabinet; it has not been necessary in the past to split responsibility for Acts to find some work for the new Minister to do, yet that is what is happening in this rotten Bill.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FOREIGN JUDGMENTS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2111.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill and find it unnecessary to say anything about it in detail. I accept the Attorney-General's statement that it has been considered by Their Honours the Judges, the Law Society, and the Law Reform Committee.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What have I done now?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham has not done anything. I have called for order because there is too much audible conversation. I am endeavouring to ensure that the honourable member is heard in silence, as he is entitled to be. I was not attempting to blame the honourable member in any way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have studied the provisions of the Bill and can find no fault with them. I therefore support it.

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

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2069.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): The Bill, which I support with much pleasure, has the support of many members of the Medical Board and of the Australian Medical Association. The Bill is pleasing to me, because I understand that the Act, as it stands, has been out of print for about three years largely because of the number of amendments that have been passed. It is because of this, and because it is difficult to make sense of the Act as it stands, that there is such a number of clauses in the present Bill aimed at consolidating the legislation. I think it is high time that the Act was in a readable and printable whole. For that

reason alone, I welcome the introduction of the Bill; I also welcome it for its more specific clauses and the purposes, for which I believe some precedent has been set. I think it is worth continuing that precedent.

The first Act, passed in 1919, resulted in the setting up of the Medical Board. We are fortunate in that medical practice in South Australia has been of the very highest standard. I say that with pride, as I am a graduate of the Adelaide Medical School which, together with the University of Adelaide, is recognized as being of the highest standard throughout the world. We are also fortunate that we have had many highly skilled and dedicated teachers in Adelaide. One can recall many stories of some of the more eccentric gentlemen who were on the teaching staff at the Adelaide Medical School. I think Professor Watson would probably be the best known, he being a Professor of Anatomy many years ago who owned one of the first motor cycles in Adelaide. Professor Watson used to carry his homework with him in a bag so that he might dissect his pathological specimens at home, and he created quite a stir on the occasion when the bundle he was carrying fell open. I could refer to many others, but with this degree of eccentricity was also a tremendous degree of skill and a great ability to impart information. We have been fortunate indeed in South Australia in this regard.

I hope that when the Flinders Medical School is finally operating (we hope it will be operating in 1975 or 1976) its standard, too, will be equally high. However, we will be getting from Flinders a new form of graduate, that is, a graduate in community medicine. Once again, in South Australia, we will be leading the world in regard to a new form of medical graduate, one trained to exclude disease and to minister to people in the community. The overall aim of the establishment of a Medical Board has been to recognize and register qualified medical practitioners; in other words, it is not only necessary to be qualified but also one must be registered before one can practise (one's qualifications must be recognized).

In the establishment of the Foreign Practitioners Assessment Committee we have had the position wherein people graduating in other medical schools who do not have reciprocal registration in Australia may be granted registration in South Australia, provided they satisfy the requirements of that committee.

I believe that this assessment committee, which has been set up since 1966, has been instrumental in admitting to practice many practitioners from foreign schools who have been a tremendous asset to our community. The term of office of this committee will expire in June next year, and I believe it is necessary that it should be made a permanent committee. Indeed, I welcome the provision for this in the Bill. As I have said before in this House, I recall the difficulties that many foreign practitioners had in having to pass the third-year examination and then complete three more years of medical studies before being allowed to practise again. That applied to highly qualified specialists from other countries, and this requirement was really most unnecessary and often unfair.

The assessment committee has worked well: it takes into account, first, language because this is, of course, a most commonsense approach, for people have to be able to communicate. The committee also takes into account qualifications, experience gained in obtaining qualifications, and experience since qualifying. It has considered many applications and, as I have said, it has approved many practitioners as being suitable for practice in our community. The Medical Board has done a wonderful job in this respect in not only establishing but also guarding our standards.

Clause 6 is of importance in regard to clarifying the position of the young medical graduate, and there is a strange situation here. For example, I passed my final examination in December of one year but, in fact, was not awarded my degree until April of the next year at the annual commemoration ceremony. Therefore, my degree is officially recognized as being Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (M.B., B.S.) Adelaide, 1953, whereas, in fact, I qualified in 1952. That does not worry me very much, and I do not think it worries many other people.

However, if a young graduate is trying to look ahead and arrange for a job in a hospital, not necessarily here but in other States or in New Zealand, as I did, it is difficult for him to do so if he has not been granted his degree. This clause will make it possible for professional registration to be given from the date of qualification, thereby enabling a young doctor to satisfy the requirements of hospitals in relation to resident physicians from that time, and he can thus serve his 12-months pre-registration service in a hospital from the date of his qualification. Such a doctor can qualify

for full registration in December of the following year, which, to the young and impatient mind, is an important matter.

Clause 8 provides for the payment of the initial and annual registration fees. I first came across this practice in New Zealand, when I thought it was a great imposition to have to pay a registration fee and then an annual fee for the privilege of practising medicine. However, this has become fairly standard practice throughout the world, and I suppose it is necessary here.

Mr. McAnaney: Accountants have to pay those fees.

Dr. TONKIN: I often suspect that the sums paid for the annual practising fee are used purely to pay additional staff necessary to send out statements for the annual practising fee. However, perhaps I am being a little cynical in this regard. Clause 12 relates to conduct which is unethical or improper in any professional respect. Much depends on the interpretation that the members of the Medical Board place on these words. In the past, the penalty for being found guilty of one of these offences was to be struck off the register, which was a fairly important, far-reaching and permanent step because, once one was struck off the register, although there was ample opportunity for one to appeal, rarely was such an appeal successful.

Mr. Coumbe: Does a person ever get back on the register?

Dr. TONKIN: It is possible for one to appeal and to be reinstated after a certain length of time, having satisfied the members of the Medical Board that one's conduct in the meantime has been such that one is worthy of reinstatement. Under the Bill, it is possible for a medical practitioner to be censured and to be required to give an undertaking to abstain from offending behaviour in the future without his actually being struck off the register. The same clause gives the Medical Board the power to require witnesses, and particularly the medical practitioner concerned, to appear before it and give evidence or an explanation, if necessary. In spite of the remarks made by the member for Florey earlier today, the medical profession is generally held in very high esteem and, although he is not in the Chamber, I take this opportunity of pointing out to the honourable member that the medical profession does not go on strike and that it elects officers by secret ballot.

The measure of the responsibility that lies on a medical practitioner can be gauged by the degree of public outcry and the degree

of interest that the press shows whenever a practitioner is charged with or found guilty of unprofessional conduct. Considering the number of medical practitioners in our community, the number being charged with unprofessional conduct is extremely small. That says much for the very high standards of responsibility of medical practice.

I think that, in the matter of professional confidence, the doctor-patient relationship and the issuing of certificates, the profession enjoys the complete confidence of the community. In fact, trust and confidence are the very bases on which much treatment is designed. Occasionally the responsibility to respect the patient's confidence conflicts with the practitioner's responsibility to the community, and I think evidence of this is increasing.

I refer particularly to the suggestion that the Minister of Roads and Transport made recently that doctors should disclose their patients' disabilities to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. There is something to be said for this: it is something that must be sorted out, but I hope that the day never comes when any Government authority can compel a doctor to breach his patient's confidence, because this would destroy entirely the very basis on which medical practice is founded.

Mr. Harrison: Only in the interests of the patient.

Dr. TONKIN: I think the member for Albert Park has probably hit the nail on the head for the first time since he has been in the House.

Mr. Evans: The only time.

Dr. TONKIN: Well, I said it was the first time. Nevertheless, in the interests of the patient and of the community one must make this decision, and it is not an easy decision to make. There are one or two other aspects of this Bill, such as restoration to the register of medical practitioners or to the register of specialists. There are people who have not been practising for a time. For instance, a married woman who is having a family may not keep up her registration and, when the family is old enough, she may want to return to the profession and may apply for re-registration. If she does this, she or any other graduate in a similar position must satisfy the board that she has kept up to date with medical advances (and they are coming thick and fast now, as most people know) by completing a refresher course or otherwise satisfying the board that she has kept abreast of modern developments.

Clause 24 is a sensible one, and I am pleased to see it included. When one comes to the scene of a road accident while travelling to another State, for instance, it is always difficult to know where one stands when rendering emergency treatment. No-one, because of lack of registration, would deny emergency treatment to an injured person on the roadside, but there has always been a slight doubt where responsibility lies if the doctor is not registered. Clause 24 will enable doctors travelling in South Australia to give emergency treatment in cases such as car accidents, drownings, and sudden collapse. Perhaps, if the doctor was in a country town, he could give more detailed treatment without contravening the Act.

Finally, I think the Bill brings uniform legislation closer. Not only will it consolidate the present Act and, I say with respect, make sense of it again, but it will lead to uniform legislation throughout Australia. We in this country suffer from having separate State registration. If I want to practise in Victoria or New South Wales I must obtain a separate registration for the particular State. I believe that as soon as we have uniform requirements for registration throughout Australia we can make progress toward reciprocity of registration with other English-speaking countries. The registration of medical practitioners is a State responsibility not only in Australia but also in the United States of America and Canada, and if we can find the necessary formula for uniform registration not only in Australia but also in North America and other English-speaking countries, I believe we will see a much more sensible situation where doctors of approved standards can apply and can receive reciprocal registration in all these countries.

Not only is it the ability to practise that matters, but also the ability to send post-graduate students to these countries to learn, and to have lecturers from these countries come into our country to teach us and impart their knowledge and skill to us. As I believe that this Bill is a real step in that direction, I have much pleasure in supporting it.

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

ACTION FOR BREACH OF PROMISE OF MARRIAGE (ABOLITION) BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to abolish the action for breach of promise of marriage. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to abolish the common law action for damages for breach of promise of marriage. Before the seventeenth century the promise of marriage was regarded exclusively as an ecclesiastical matter and damages for breach of the promise were not obtainable. It was not until the reign of Charles I that breach of a promise to marry became actionable in the temporal courts. The action for breach of promise, as it has evolved, reflects the refusal of the common law to draw any distinction between commercial and other types of agreement. Hence mutual promises to marry fulfil all the conditions of a legally binding contract and can be enforced in much the same way as, for example, a contract of employment. The action for breach of promise is open to either party to a proposed marriage. The remedy lies in an action for damages, but the damages are not confined to compensation for loss, financial or otherwise; damages may also be awarded for injury to the plaintiff's feeling, reputation and matrimonial prospects.

The present law is objectionable for several reasons: first, it gives opportunity for claims of a "gold-digging" nature. Secondly, the existence of the action creates the danger that a person will prefer to enter into an unsuitable marriage rather than face court proceedings and perhaps not inconsiderable financial loss. The stability of marriage is so important to society that the law should not countenance a right of action, the threat of which may push people into marriages they would not otherwise undertake. Thirdly, it is hardly logical to award damages on the termination of an agreement to marry and not on the termination of a marriage itself. Finally, it involves the court in the well-nigh impossible task of fixing the responsibility for a broken engagement. Breach of promise cases are always unsatisfactory. The factors which operate on the minds of engaged couples and which lead to a breakdown in the relationship are usually complex. Factors and influences incapable of proof are often decisive in producing the rupture of the relationship. It is seldom that it is possible to feel satisfied that justice has been done. I recognize, of course, that this task must still be faced where there is a dispute over the return of gifts by one party to the engagement to the other; this is probably unavoidable. There is no justification under modern conditions for the continued existence of a cause of action which makes liability for

damages depend on the attempt of a court to decide whether a party to an engagement is responsible for its breakdown.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation: The Minister can expect to be heard in silence.

The Hon. L. J. KING: No doubt this action, with all its difficulties and unsatisfactory features, served a purpose in a state of society in which the harm to a party (particularly the woman) of a broken engagement might be irreparable. Contemporary attitudes do not produce this result. Generally speaking, both parties to a broken engagement can be regarded as fortunate to have ascertained the mistake before contracting a potentially disastrous marriage. Whatever former justification for the action might have existed in other days has long since disappeared. The matter has been fully investigated by the United Kingdom Law Reform Commission, which recommended the abolition of the action. The New Zealand Law Reform Commission took the same view. Most of the members of Law Reform Committee of South Australia have also recommended abolition.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2(1) abolishes the action for breach of promise to marry, but preserves any rights the parties to the agreement may have against each other by virtue of any other law. Clause 2 (2) preserves the rights of parties who have commenced an action before the Act comes into operation. Clause 2 (3) preserves the common law provisions that gifts given to engaged couples as such are presumed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to be conditional on the marriage taking place and must be returned to the donor if the marriage does not take place, for whatever reason, and that conditional gifts between the parties are returnable unless

$$P = \left[\frac{(65 \times 936)}{100} \times \frac{(Z - 20)}{100} \right] \times R + \left[\frac{(460 - 3Z)}{1,000} \times \frac{65}{100} \times S \right]$$

One can imagine the member for Elizabeth writing all these things on the board when he was a schoolmaster and explaining what they mean, but we are left to understand these things, unless we give the Treasurer the required notice. This is not good enough and, if I may venture to make the general point, I am disappointed at the way the Treasurer is running the House. We have been obliged week after week to sit late at night (1 o'clock,

the engagement was unjustifiably broken by the donor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE PENSIONS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 2311.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the second reading, but I protest at the haste with which it has been brought on after it was introduced only yesterday. The Treasurer said many times in his second reading explanation that this was a most complex matter, yet we are asked to debate it on the following day. Literally, under Standing Orders, I cannot complain at all about this, but the conventions of the House are to allow a longer time for debate than we are getting. When one considers that not only is the Bill a most complex one but it also goes on to, I think, 37 pages and 57 clauses, one sees that there is something in what I say. Of course, as soon as one opens the Bill, one sees even more forcibly what I mean. The Bill is studded with formulae, and the Treasurer himself said that he would require notice of any queries or explanations of the formulae. We see what this means when we see, for example (and this is one of the simpler ones), the following formula in clause 14:

$$LS = \left(\frac{60 - X}{40} \right) \times S$$

where—

LS = the lump sum expressed in dollars;
X = the entry age of the contributor;
and

S = the average annual salary of the contributor expressed in dollars.

But when we look at, say, clause 24 of the Bill, we see far more complicated examples; for example:

2 o'clock and 3 o'clock in the morning). I was told by the Treasurer, in reply to a question some weeks ago, that the Government had a heavy legislative programme and that it would be necessary for us to sit late every night. Then, suddenly yesterday afternoon, we were told that we would not be sitting at all last evening. Obviously, there is now little business to do, but I wish the Government would organize its business better for the convenience of members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks to the Bill. The honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He's got nothing to say about the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Works says that I have nothing to say about the Bill—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Well, get on with it if you have.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will make my speech on the Bill in my own way. The comments I have made so far about the short time that has elapsed since the second reading explanation was given are relevant and appropriate in the circumstances. I do protest about this; it should not have happened, and I hope that the Government does not intend to push the Bill right through this evening because it has nothing else to do.

I support the general provisions and principles of the Bill, including the increases in the pensions of serving members of the Police Force. I do not think any member could do otherwise. Indeed, the only criticism I can offer is that the Bill has not been introduced before. However, there is one matter about which I protest most vigorously: the shoddy treatment of the older retired commissioned police officers. The Treasurer has had representations from me and from other members about this matter, but he has refused to do anything. I should now like to read to the House a letter about this matter dated September 20, which I received some weeks ago from former Superintendent Symes and Mr. Allen, who was previously Comptroller of Prisons, as follows:

We, the undersigned, are making an approach to you in the matter of pensions now paid to retired commissioned officers of police. The ex-officers we represent are those retired up to June 30, 1964, and are all now in receipt of a pension.

So these are old men. The letter continues:

We understand that within a short period the new Police Pensions Act will be submitted to Parliament and all amendments now in operation will be repealed.

Obviously, they meant that the previous Act would be repealed. The letter continues:

Therefore, it is a matter of urgency that the following anomalies should be placed before the Government before the Act comes into operation:

New Act, proposed pension for serving commissioned officers: Superintendent—approximately \$9,000 a year and, according to age, would receive \$127 a fortnight, plus a lump sum of \$8,500.

I have not had a chance to check that that is precisely what the Bill does. However, I think it is substantially accurate. This is the rub:

Comparison presently paid to retired members: Superintendents—high—ex-Superintendent Chamberlain, \$100.80 a fortnight.

That is high, but is substantially less than will be paid. However, the following is the scandalous one, about which the Government is willing to do nothing:

Low—former Commissioner Johns—not a Superintendent but a former Commissioner of Police—

\$53.54 a fortnight.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: When did he retire?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Many years ago, but is that his fault?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It isn't yours either, is it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You mean so-and-so. Will you not do anything for a man in this position?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I am just thinking—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. You are trying to justify a situation that you know is completely unjustifiable. To ask a man who has been a Commissioner of Police, and who was respected, admired and liked, to live on \$53.54 a fortnight, and the only relief this Bill gives him is 81 per cent—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And you—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the position under this Bill.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: —an ex-member of a Government which was in power in this State for so many years but which did nothing and never even looked at the matter, stand up there and complain about the little this Government is giving.

Mr. Jennings: Hypocrite!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Liberal Government was in office for only two years.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about the Playford Government?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What rubbish!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and when honourable members are out of their places and interject they are definitely out of order. If the honourable member persists he will have to be dealt with. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Works obviously realizes the injustice of this position and thinks the best method of defence is offence, so he has decided to attack me—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Rubbish! You don't care about it and you never have.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —for what the Liberal Government did not do between 1968 and 1970—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And before that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and to attack what the previous Government, of which I was not even a member, did not do before 1965. It is absolutely absurd.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What do you mean, you weren't a member of it? You were a back-bencher in that Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was a back-bench member of the Government Party but—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You had no responsibility?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For the sake of the argument, let me accept the strictures of members opposite. If I do that, will they accept the responsibility now to do more? Let them answer that. Will they accept the responsibility now to do more?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's an easy argument, isn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Government members are the ones who have the opportunity to do something. Are they willing to do it now? I will gladly accept those strictures if Government members will take some action now. Will any member on the Government side take me up on that offer? No, of course not. Government members do not intend to do a thing about this disgraceful situation, and that is what they are asking this House to accept. Of course, as they know very well, Opposition members are powerless to do anything by way of amendment to increase this amount. Let me go on with the letter. It states:

Average—\$83.57 per fortnight.
Proposed raise—8¼ per cent—\$6.42 per fortnight.

This is the Party that says it is interested in people, in individuals, yet when the chance comes to look after some individuals who happen to be old and who finished their service in the Police Force many years ago, the Government Party will not do it. The letter continues:

The comparison of proposed Pensions to Pensions now paid: Serving members (Superintendents) —\$127 per fortnight; retired members average (Superintendents) \$89.99 per

fortnight Difference—\$38 per fortnight. There are at present 19 retired Commissioned Officers, the average age is 73 years with an average number of 39 years of service. The majority have been members of the Police Pension Fund within three to five years of its inception. Social service pensions are not applicable to majority of retired commissioned officers, owing to the application of means test on pensions received. Other retired members, including non-commissioned officers, can apply and are in receipt of the social service pension, together with fringe benefits, and will still be in receipt of same if proposed 8¼ per cent raise comes into force. The existing rate of pension plus proposed increase of 8¼ per cent in comparison to rise in the cost of living since the last raise in pensions in 1968 would in no way compensate the retired commissioned officer who retired prior to 1964.

The Government knows that. The letter continues:

We submit that the new Police Pensions Act should be based on the present pensions paid to commissioned officers who retired after 1964, plus 8¼ per cent proposed in new Act. The reason for this request is that all retired commissioned officers would be on the same basic pension according to rank and the anomaly which has been in operation for years would be overcome. The pensions would then be as follows:

Superintendent—\$100.80 per fortnight plus 8¼% proposed.

Senior Inspector—\$92.20 per fortnight plus 8¼% proposed.

Inspector 1st Class—\$84.00 per fortnight plus 8¼% proposed.

Inspector 2nd Class—\$79.20 per fortnight plus 8¼% proposed.

Inspector 3rd Class—\$74.40 per fortnight plus 8¼% proposed.

Ex-commissioner Johns and Mr. James Hurtle Allan to be classed as ex-superintendents

That is lower than their rank on retirement.

The letter concludes:

We would be pleased to provide any further information you require.

I sent a copy of that letter to the Treasurer, with a covering letter dated October 8, so there can be no question of his not being aware of it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I haven't seen it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the Treasurer signed a reply to me. If the Premier has not seen my letter, I will read it out to him.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I haven't seen it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The letter states:

Dear Mr. Treasurer—

I presume they are one and the same person still—

I have been approached on behalf of a number of retired commissioned officers of police by one of them concerning their pensions. I

enclose herewith a copy of the letter which I have received. I should be most appreciative of your comments and, in particular, when it is likely that amending legislation will be put before Parliament.

I signed it myself. Does the honourable gentleman say he has not seen the letter?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have no recollection of it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable Treasurer has so much interest in the matter that he has no recollection of having received the letter. Let me remind him of the answer that he gave me dated yesterday and signed by him. I thought that I recognized the signature. It certainly purports to be his.

Mr. Carnie: As recently as yesterday?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; he has so little interest in this matter that he cannot remember getting the letter. I will read it to remind him of the reply he sent only yesterday but which he cannot remember. The letter states:

Dear Mr. Millhouse, I refer to your letter of October 8, 1971, regarding police pensions. Notice already has been given of an amending Bill which will be presented very shortly. The two primary objectives of the Bill are to permit existing members of the force to contribute for higher pensions than hitherto and to provide for the increase of existing pensions to maintain their purchasing power.

With those objections, no member on this side would quarrel. Here is the increase to which I referred and which the honourable gentleman has forgotten, even though he signed the letter only yesterday. The reply continues:

The request that certain longer standing pensions be increased in line with the most recent pensions, and by much more than the increases in living costs, cannot be approved. This could not be supported by the fund as those retiring earlier were not called upon for rates of contributions comparable with those retiring later. Yours faithfully, Don Dunstan Premier and Treasurer.

That was dated yesterday, but he does not even remember it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes, I remember that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Oh, I see. The Treasurer remembers the letter he sent to me in reply, but he does not remember the letter to which it was a reply. Well, well, well! One wonders sometimes about the Treasurer and his sincerity in the discharge of his duties.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There's no need for that.

Mr. Langley: You have done nothing about it, and you know it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You cannot make a speech in this House without making imputations of insincerity, dishonesty, impropriety, and the like, about anyone on this side of whom you are talking. This is your standard practice.

Mr. Jennings: And you read the Bible when there is a photographer there, yet you would sell your grandmother for shark bait yourself.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I seem to be unpopular with Government members.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We know the sort of character you are.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Come now! Both the Treasurer and the member for Ross Smith who have interjected know me better than that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We know very well the sort of character you are from your conduct in the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The only reason that I am getting abused is that members opposite have no argument to rebut what I have said or to refute my strictures on the Government.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What nonsense.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have noticed repeatedly that when Government members have no argument with which to rebut the arguments put forward by us they resort to abuse, and the Treasurer does it constantly.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You never get up without abusing people on this side, and the whole trouble that occurs in the conduct of this House is the result of your conduct of that kind.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You had better ask the member for Florey about that, after what happened yesterday in the House. I saw a transcript of remarks to that effect by the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They were not used.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refute them and I refute the aspersions which the honourable gentleman has just cast on me and which were cast on me by the member for Ross Smith. I do not intend to take any more notice of them than that. I am here to try and persuade the Government to have a little charity towards a small group of old men—

Mr. Langley: What did you do when you were in Government?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —who have been very unjustly treated. I point out to the member for Unley that, with every day that passes, the situation of those men worsens. If the previous

Government is to be blamed for what it failed to do before May 30, 1970, the present Government is to be blamed far more for what it is failing to do on October 20, 1971.

Mr. Langley: The present Government is doing much more than the previous Government ever did.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not doing enough. For the Treasurer to say that he does not even remember the representations I made to him less than a fortnight ago on this matter is disgraceful, and it would justify my making the strictures that he complains I have made. I hope that even now the Government will be willing to do something for ex-Commissioner Johns, or "Mulga Bill" as he was called, because it is a disgrace that we should ask a man who has been a Commissioner of Police, no matter how old he now is and no matter how long ago it is since he retired, to live on \$53.54 a fortnight, which will, I suppose, be increased by something under \$6 a fortnight. So, we will be asking him to live on less than \$60 a fortnight. It is absolutely absurd to say that the Police Pensions Fund would go broke if ex-Commissioner Johns were given an increased pension, and the Treasurer knows it; yet that is all he could say in his letter of yesterday.

Mr. Langley: What did he get when you were in Government?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is an asinine interjection; if it had any sense, there would be some point in my answering it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I will deal with the member for Mitcham in a moment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that, when the Treasurer deals with me, he will say something that will give some hope to the men I have referred to and that he will not persist in the mean and miserable attitude which he has so far shown in the House and which he showed in the letter he wrote to me.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson) moved:
That this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE seconded the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs. Allen, Becker (teller), Carnie, Coumbe, Evans, Goldsworthy, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill and Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth,

Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Ferguson. No—Mr. Burdon.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Langley: What did your Government do when in office?

Dr. TONKIN: I support the Deputy Leader for his condemnation of the asinine remarks and interjections of the member for Unley, who shows a complete and utter disregard for order and common sense.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Langley: Keep going.

Dr. TONKIN: We were subjected to a speech by the Treasurer while seated, and this is totally out of order. The Treasurer accused members—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg knows that Standing Orders provide that points of order must be taken at the time they arise. He must refrain from continuing in that strain, because it does not comply with Standing Orders.

Dr. TONKIN: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I know, and have always known, that interjections are out of order, but I allowed myself to be carried away. Nevertheless, in the debate the Treasurer accused Opposition members of resorting to smear tactics and of abusing Government members. He said that the member for Mitcham was the cause of all the poor behaviour in the House. It has not been a very good week for the Government. Always, when the Government is under attack, as it is on this issue, it resorts to attack and abuse. It is laughable to hear members opposite accuse us of poor behaviour and abuse.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What's this got to do with the Bill?

Dr. TONKIN: I did not raise the matter; it was raised previously.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Let's get on with the Bill.

Mr. Clark: Address the Chair and not the gallery.

Dr. TONKIN: As a member of this side, I refute entirely the accusation that has been made by the Treasurer and other Government members. I believe the member for Mitcham

has been singled out for attack by Government members, who are trying to make him the scapegoat for their own reprehensible activities in this House. It is disgusting behaviour.

Mr. Curren: Who wrote that speech?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not have my speeches written for me.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I take a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that the number of people in the gallery may have something to do with all this, but, after all, there is a Bill before the House and I suggest that the honourable member confine his remarks to that Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: This arises out of what happened when I was speaking.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members in this Chamber have an obligation to conduct themselves in accordance with Standing Orders. The Treasurer indicated that he wanted to take a point of order, and the member for Bragg courteously resumed his seat. I am not going to tolerate interjections from the member for Mitcham when the Treasurer is on his feet taking a point of order. The honourable the Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that all we should be doing at the moment is debating the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not a point of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My point of order is that the honourable member was not doing so.

The SPEAKER: I will have to uphold the point of order raised by the Treasurer because there is nothing in this Bill relating to the member for Mitcham. Members are required to speak to the Bill. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling, and I think enough has been said. I agree with the Treasurer's point of order; it is a shame that it was necessary for him to take a point of order. I agree with the member for Mitcham when he said, subject to much abuse from the other side, that this Bill was poorly managed and poorly introduced. The measure was introduced yesterday and, as the member for Mitcham says, we are faced with what appear to be many complex mathematical equations. I make quite clear here and now to the Treasurer that I should be grateful for a dissertation on the total principle that underlines all these formulae and their computations,

or perhaps the Treasurer would prefer to give us a detailed explanation of each formula, clause by clause, as we go through the Bill. Although I have been in the House only a short time, I have not seen a Bill containing formulae such as these. I do not know whether it is the first time that such a Bill has come into the House—

Mrs. Steele: It's a complete departure.

Dr. TONKIN: I am told by the member for Davenport that it is a complete departure. We have had another Bill on the Notice Paper for some weeks now because of its complex nature, and the debate on that measure has been postponed so that we can examine the Bill, inquire about it and understand it. After all, that is one of the things we are expected to do in this House. I do not see, from the Treasurer's explanation, how we can hope to understand the formulae in this Bill. I have no doubt that they are properly and correctly based, for I trust the actuarial skilled advice that the Treasurer has had. I even trust the computer at times although, as we all know, computers go wrong and come up with wrong answers. I should like to understand just how these formulae have been arrived at. What is the overall principle behind the Bill? It is grossly unfair that members should be expected to make inquiries. No explanation was offered, so presumably we are expected to get some expert mathematical and actuarial advice within 24 hours.

Mr. Evans: Or less.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, I think it is less. I question the Treasurer's sincerity. He has allowed us time on one Bill which is complex but which can at least be understood because it is in the English language. I acknowledge that mathematics is a form of language, although it is not one that I am skilled at understanding, and I am sure that this applies to other honourable members. It is absurd that we should be allowed weeks to consider another Bill but only 24 hours to examine this one and to come up with some answers.

Mrs. Steele: It is such an important Bill, too.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. I shall be happy to hear what the Treasurer has to say to justify his actions, that is, if he does not take steps to adjourn further consideration of the Bill, as I think he should. I agree with the member for Mitcham that this is good legislation as far as it goes, and as far as I can understand it. However, it does not go far enough in

caring for those senior members of the Police Force who are at present living under difficulties because of their reduced rate of pension. I have spoken with two of them, and I know that they are experiencing difficulties; there is no doubt about that.

Although he was out of order, the member for Unley by interjection got his point across: he asked us what the Liberal Government did about it. Because I was not a member of the previous Government, I did nothing about it. However, I do not think it matters one little bit what anyone did not do about it in the past; it is a matter of what is going to be done about it now. That is all that matters, so let us forget the past. Apparently, nothing is going to be done for these senior police officers who have served this State in the past. That is the impression I got, and it is a great shame. However, there is still time to help these retired officers. I suggest that the Treasurer adjourn further consideration of the Bill so that amendments can be introduced to help these unfortunate senior police officers. If the Treasurer sincerely wants to assist them, there is still time to enable him to do so. I support the Bill as far as it goes, although I will require explanations (as will all other honourable members) regarding the formulae expressed in the Bill. It is a complete departure from the normal practice, and members are entitled to these explanations until they understand the Bill.

Mr. Evans: In fairness to the people it affects as well.

Dr. TONKIN: Exactly. Something must be done about the senior police officers, who are not being helped by this Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the Bill, which is a comparatively sweeping type of measure, introducing as it does a new pension scheme for police officers in this State. When introducing the Bill, the Treasurer said:

Although this Bill has been long in contemplation by the Government, its introduction has been necessarily delayed because of the complexities and the problems involved.

In view of that statement, I am surprised that the Treasurer has seen fit to force the Opposition to debate this Bill so soon after its introduction. Because of the complexities that the Treasurer has admitted exist and because of certain of the Bill's provisions, it has been difficult for Opposition members to ensure that the recipients under the Bill will be adequately protected. Statements have been made about what has been done, but

I refer to questions I have asked in this House, including one asked on September 2, about the Police Pensions Fund. I was always seeking information about when legislation would be introduced to improve the Police Pensions Fund in South Australia and, of course, to obtain a better deal for retired commissioned officers. On March 30 I asked a question of the Treasurer, and in his reply he stated:

Legislation to amend the Police Pensions Act will not be introduced during the present session, as the drafting of amendments cannot be completed within the time remaining. However, the amendments will be made retrospective to May 1 to ensure that the delay will not adversely affect any prospective pensioner.

Earlier, on February 24, in reply to a similar question, the Treasurer stated:

When the alterations to the Superannuation Act were announced and enacted last year, I said that the Police Pensions Fund was under review and that I intended, during this part of the session, to introduce a Bill relating to that fund and to back-date the pension increases to the dates that applied to other Government pensions.

Nothing in this Bill provides that the increase in pensions will be back-dated to the beginning of this year. When we dealt with other Government superannuation funds, we extended retrospectivity of certain increases to January 1 of this year, yet for some unknown reason recipients under this pension scheme will not receive the increase from that date. That is discrimination. I consider that the increase in this Bill, which amount to $8\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, should be retrospective to January 1 this year, in line with increases in all Government superannuation schemes.

If the Public Actuary claims that the fund cannot stand that, the Government should seriously consider subsidizing the fund or paying all of the increase. I cannot see why one section of those employed by the State should be treated so differently by the Government. Therefore, I contend that this is one area in which the Bill is completely out of step. Because of the complexity of the measure, we should have had the opportunity to check the formulae and get information. The Treasurer stated in his second reading explanation that, if we wanted information, we could obtain it, but he said that he required a certain amount of notice if we wanted this information.

I think that the Government has done a disservice to those who will receive benefits under the Bill. On studying the measure, I find that the scheme as proposed is quite good. It is

quite a good pension scheme, and there is little that one could say was not attractive. I understand that it has been agreed to by the parties and, therefore, I assume that the Police Officers Association has agreed to it. The association would have been consulted and, if it is pleased about the measure, I find no fault.

However, when introducing a new pension fund scheme, whether for police officers, public servants, or any other section, we ought to consider new steps to give officers the opportunity to transfer from one pension fund to another. I knew that this suggestion has been considered, and I understand that there are many problems associated with it. One of the last things I did when I was President of the Bank Officials Association was consider the possibility of bank officials who contributed to the pensions fund being able to transfer their pensions and superannuation benefits from one bank to another or from one career to another.

What was the basic principle behind superannuation schemes or pension funds when they were first established? They were simply a means of offering something to an employee as an attraction to retain him, and as another benefit. When such schemes were first introduced only a small number operated, but now it is the accepted practice for a worthwhile career to have a superannuation or pension scheme. I should have thought that this would have been the chance for the Government to introduce a revolutionary pension scheme, which would have been completely new, on behalf of the employees who would benefit under the scheme. That is why we would have liked a greater opportunity to study the Bill, to consider the actuarial reports and review the contents of the Bill in order to compare them with superannuation schemes that now operate in some private enterprises.

I am astonished that the Government has not given us this chance, because perhaps we could have made suggestions that would benefit members of the Police Force. The South Australian force is a service which we have come to depend on and to respect. Here would have been the chance for us to offer them something. I should not think that its members are overpaid: it is a job that has a risk factor, and a good pension scheme is important to the recruiting of officers to the force. We deplore the slaying of policemen, as happened recently in New South Wales, and we do not want similar incidents in this State, but we must have some protection for

the widows and families of such unfortunate members of the Police Force. This would have been a chance to present a scheme that would help recruiting and keep the recruits in the force. When introducing the Bill, the Treasurer said:

Accordingly, it seems desirable that the whole scheme should be reviewed and a pension scheme more in keeping with the times be enacted.

We have to introduce a more modern scheme: I have long believed that its introduction was overdue, because I have often raised this issue. The Treasurer also stated:

On the face of it, this measure is a complicated one; for instance, it is liberally sprinkled with tables comprised of lengthy formulae.

There must be formulae and they must be spelled out in the Bill so that we can make calculations, because under any superannuation scheme, no matter how one tries to cover all future eventualities, there must be formulae set out. We should have had a better opportunity to check the formulae to ensure that the recipients of the pension would not be at a disadvantage. I am sure that the Police Association would have checked these formulae, and I accept that they would be correct. However, for my benefit I would have liked to have the chance to check them to ensure that they were correct: mistakes can be made, and someone may have overlooked something. It is not an unrealistic attitude to want this extra time. I was surprised when the Treasurer, in his second reading explanation, stated:

I do not apologize for its complexity, as it is a legislative attempt to solve some complex actuarial problems and, while any given formula can be worked out by the application of simple arithmetic, the actuarial basis of the formula would require considerable explanation.

We have been asked to debate a Bill that we have not had sufficient opportunity to study; I believe the Opposition deserves a little more respect in this regard. The Treasurer continued:

Should any honourable member wish to be apprised of the actuarial basis of the formula, I will, of course, arrange for it to be provided.

We simply have not had a chance to have the information that the Treasurer referred to. We do not sit around all day doing nothing. Clause 7 empowers the investment of the fund in named securities; that is a good provision. The earning ratio of some Government superannuation schemes should be increased. I know

that it has been advantageous to the Government to have the bulk of the funds in those schemes invested in State securities, but the Government should realize that private enterprise superannuation schemes invest their funds in good securities at 8½ per cent per annum. Why does the Government not similarly invest superannuation funds so that the earning ratio is increased? I am pleased that that ratio will be increased through clause 7. The Treasurer said:

Clause 31 provides for an increase of all clause 30 pensions of 8¼ per cent to, in some measure, counteract the erosion of the purchasing power of these pensions. Again in the case of prescribed pensioners referred to earlier, this increase is based on the notional pension of that pensioner.

Earlier this evening references were made to the 19 retired commissioned police officers in South Australia. I believe that at least three of those officers were contributing to the Police Pensions Fund about three years after it started. I estimate that the total of the pensions paid to those 19 officers is \$1,064.28 a fortnight. The Victorian Government, having realized the plight of retired commissioned police officers in that State, increased their pensions by 24 per cent. If the South Australian Government granted a similar increase to retired commissioned officers here, it would cost the State about \$328 a fortnight, or \$8,528 a year. That is not a large sum when we remember that the average age of the 19 retired commissioned officers is 71 years, and it is reasonable to assume that very few of them will still be living in 10 years' time. So the maximum cost of that increase to the State over 10 years would be \$85,000. I would have thought that the Government would consider this. If the existing pension fund cannot stand this increase to these men, the State could subsidize it. The fund is not the only fund that has this problem: private enterprise pension funds do, too. Some companies make up the contributions of their retired officers; the officers receive so much from the pension fund and the company makes a grant to them so that they receive a reasonable pension. The sum of \$8,528 a year for people whose average age is 71 years is little when one considers that it was said, when Parliamentary salaries were discussed recently, that the ability of the State to pay did not enter into the argument. Therefore, I contend that the inability of the State to afford \$8,528 in the coming financial year is no valid argument: we can pay it if we want to.

It is a matter whether Parliament believes that we should help these people who have given a lifetime of service to the State, people such as the former sheriff, inspectors, superintendents and commissioners, and who have been prepared to devote their life to the cause of law and order and the rights and freedom of people. Why should they now be on the breadline after so many years of service? It could be argued that it is not our fault or their fault that inflation has eroded their pensions. Surely we should be willing to do the same as the Victorian Government has done, that is, to award them a 24 per cent increase. The Government would have little argument against doing this and should reconsider the whole issue. It is for that reason. I believe, that Opposition members should have been given more opportunity to consider the Bill. All we can do now is to consider the Bill further and probe certain new innovations in Committee.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I strongly support what other honourable members have said regarding the pensions for older members of the Police Force. If the sum involved is as the member for Hanson has said, I see no reason why the fund could not stand this extra amount. It has been pointed out to me that the investment fund is more limited in what it can invest in than is the Public Service Superannuation Fund. The Treasurer should explain this difference, because if the fund were allowed to invest in a wider range of investments it would soon make up the additional sum required to pay the higher pensions, which appear to be necessary. The Treasurer should tell us what rate of interest he would pay on these funds invested on deposit with the Treasury, compared with what could be obtained from other sources with equal security. I should like to know why the permitted securities are not the same as those permitted in the case of superannuation funds for the general Public Service.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I listened with care to what members opposite said on this matter. The complaints that have been made are really twofold. The first is that members have not had time to examine the nature of the actuarial formulae which the Bill contains. I have sent for the Public Actuary, and he has been available to honourable members since this Bill was explained. If any honourable member had a query concerning the way in which any one of the actuarial formulae was worked, I should

have expected to hear from him, but I have not. In fact, during the second reading debate not one query has been raised concerning any specific one of these formulae, and that is not surprising. The actuarial formulae have been carefully worked by the Public Actuary, checked by the Treasury and other officers, and discussed with contributors to the fund over a period of months. The formulae are technical, but they have been checked, and I really do not know that we in this House are in a position to check them ourselves.

Which one of us, in fact, is an expert in this field? It is difficult for members of Parliament, most of whom are laymen in actuarial matters, to check the details of actuarial work. On this matter, frankly, I think we have to accept the advice of the experts. I would not pretend that I could work any one of these actuarial formulae adequately; I am not qualified to do so; and, frankly, I do not think that that is our job. The formulae have been thoroughly checked by the Public Actuary, who is an acknowledged expert in this field. The working has been checked through with the association and the contributors to the pension fund and widely discussed with them. No objection has been raised; indeed, the contributors to the fund want this Bill to go through as early as possible. The second objection raised is a novel one. The Government has been abused this evening for being mean, miserable, despicable, insincere—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We hear the sort of thing that comes from members opposite (again from the member for Kavel). When we protest at this kind of abuse, we are told that we are abusing members opposite, because we are not prepared to do something which no Government in this State has ever been prepared to do; that is, alter the basis of a contributory pension fund to something entirely novel, so that we will give a benefit to pensioners far beyond their contribution to the pension and the State's much larger contribution to their pension, and give them a special benefit to which they have contributed not at all.

Mr. Clark: Even if they retired 30 years ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is right.

Mr. Becker: They contributed in a different way.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: These funds, which are contributory pension funds, are worked out on an actuarial basis. The extra

benefit not contributed to, which the State is giving to existing pensioners, is that we are making cost-of-living adjustments for which they have not contributed but which in all justice they should get, because of the erosion of the purchasing power of the pensions to which they contributed and for which they contracted. They are getting it under this Government in a way that has not previously been provided by any other Government in this State, because this Government has been more generous to Government superannuants than any previous Government in this State. Yet having done that, the Government is called mean, miserable and despicable by members opposite and, when Government members protest, they are told that they are abusing Opposition members.

Honourable members opposite are asking us to make available (and this is what the member for Mitcham has demanded of the Government) an extra benefit to previous contributors for pension which was noncontributory and which is not an adjustment to provide for the erosion of the purchasing power of the pension to which they have contributed. The Government is being asked to give to these people a noncontributory benefit that is not being given to other superannuants.

Mr. Clark: Go back for a generation!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, for something for which they have never contributed. The member for Mitcham said that, if the Government does what he asks, it will cost this State only \$85,000 over the next 10 years. If this is done in this case, what about the superannuants of the Government superannuation fund? Are we going to provide the same sort of benefit for them? Are we going to provide a noncontributory extra benefit beyond cost of living adjustments for every superannuant in South Australia? Honourable members opposite have protested about the present level of South Australia's Budget deficit. Where do they think the Government will find the money for this?

Mr. Becker: What about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson has already spoken in this debate, and the member for Rocky River elected not to do so. He cannot now speak while the Treasurer is replying. Interjections are out of order, and I warn honourable members that they must cease forthwith.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government superannuants with whom I have had many discussions have not asked for a benefit

of this kind because they would not contend that it could be justified. The member for Mitcham has read a letter that was sent to him, not to me, by two superannuants of the Police Pension Fund. That contention was examined, and the honourable member got in the letter which I sent to him and which he read to the House a proper reply: that no contributory pension fund worked on an actuarial basis and with an extremely heavy Government contribution (and the major contribution to this fund is the Government contribution and not that of contributors) can afford to pay a noncontributory benefit of the kind requested.

I never heard it contended at any time when the Liberal and Country League Government was in office in this State that what one did for superannuants under any superannuation scheme in South Australia was to provide an entirely noncontributory benefit other than some sort of adjustment to cope with cost of living increases. The adjustments that were made in those circumstances were far less than those which this Government is making in relation to this fund and which it has made in relation to the Government superannuation fund. I do not believe for one moment that honourable members opposite can sincerely contend that the Government is being mean, miserable, and lacking in sympathy or consideration for the pensioners under this fund. We are not, and members opposite know it very well.

The proposals in this Bill are generous indeed. This Government believes in being generous to the people who have contributed to the service of this State and to the fund, whether they are superannuants or present contributors. The provisions made by this proposal are for an increase in payments by the State towards an increase in benefits. Anything that we do that is in any way generous to people who give service to this State never satisfies honourable members opposite, because it is something that we do.

However, I do know that this measure has been discussed widely with the contributors to this scheme. It has the most widespread agreement and support. The police and the pensioners want this measure to pass as soon as possible. I regret that it has taken so long, because of the complications of the transition provisions, to prepare the measure. They are not complicated in explanation, but they were complicated to work out, and that is why it has taken such a time to ensure that everybody possible was covered, as honourable members would see. This has been done

adequately. The measure has the agreement and support of the contributors and I ask honourable members to give it the support that they would ask for it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Investment of Fund."

Mr. McANANEY: It seems that the investments that the fund may make are more limited than the investments applying to the Public Service Superannuation Fund. Can the Treasurer explain this, and also the rate of interest on deposits with the Treasury?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I think that, as to 15 per cent of the money in the Public Service Superannuation Fund, it may be invested in other than trustee securities with the consent of the Treasurer and with extremely stringent limitations. There has not been much investment of that kind undertaken by the Public Service Superannuation Fund. So far that fund has been an investment in trustee securities, largely in mortgages. We have not provided for 15 per cent of the Police Pension Fund to go into other securities, because this fund is much smaller and is not likely to provide any great sum to invest in such securities. This is a departure in the investment of the Public Service Superannuation Fund, because it was only as a result of an amendment last year that this sort of investment had become possible. Since it has not been proceeding for a long time, we do not intend to do anything like that with this fund. On deposits with the Treasury we pay the interest rate that is the same as bank interest on deposits that are lodged from trustee funds of this kind. The deposit with the Treasury is a convenience for the sake of the fund. Generally speaking, moneys will be invested in trustee securities, because that benefits the fund as a higher interest rate is paid.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Contributions by the Government."

Mr. BECKER: What will be the Government's contribution to the fund: will it be on a 70:30 basis?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Pension on retirement."

Dr. TONKIN: I reassure the Treasurer that the formula in this and the succeeding clauses is fairly easily understood, even by me. I will not ask him to explain it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Lump sum to widow on death of a contributor."

Dr. TONKIN: Would the Treasurer explain the formula in paragraph (b)?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member reads the explanation of the symbols in the formula that is shown at the end of the clause, he will realize how it is worked.

Dr. TONKIN: I have read it, but I cannot really understand exactly how the formula works. I think all members are entitled to an explanation from the Treasurer.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You are the only one that can't understand it.

Dr. TONKIN: I would like the Minister to explain it to me.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 to 20 passed.

Clause 21—"Pension on retirement."

Dr. TONKIN: The situation in which the Opposition has been placed is far from satisfactory. I would be very surprised if any member, except perhaps the Treasurer, could understand the formula in this clause. Will the Treasurer kindly explain the formula in sub-clause (1)? Why is the annual pension for life calculated according to the formula in sub-clause (1)? Exactly what is the Committee being asked to pass?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Is the honourable member querying the figure 936 in the formula?

Dr. Tonkin: I am querying the whole formula. How is it arrived at?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am willing for the consideration of this clause to be deferred until after clause 57. This will accommodate the honourable member. If he talks with the Public Actuary, who is in the Speaker's Gallery, I am sure he will receive all the help he requires.

Consideration of clause 21 deferred.

Clause 22—"Lump sum on retirement on attaining the age of retirement."

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Treasurer provide the same service in connection with this clause and the following clauses that contain formulae? Will he defer consideration of those clauses, too?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am willing to defer consideration of clauses 22 to 25 so that the honourable member can satisfy himself about them. I find it difficult to answer the honourable member because during the second reading debate no query or objection was raised in connection with the remaining clauses. The only query related to the nature of the formulae. I have provided the services of the Public Actuary for the honourable member, and I suggest that he takes advantage of the presence of that officer and obtains the information he requires.

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Chairman, can I move that progress be reported?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I would not agree to that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is not a satisfactory way of putting a Bill through the Committee. It is not appropriate for the Treasurer to suggest that a member should leave the Committee and speak to a public servant in the gallery, thus getting rid of him for the remainder of the Committee stage.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Are you really trying to do any work?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish the Treasurer would not be so bad tempered. Every member is entitled to an explanation of every piece of legislation that comes before us, and I do not think that any member would deny that. In introducing the Bill yesterday the Treasurer said that if he were asked he would provide information, but he is not doing that now. I am not surprised that he is not doing it, because I do not suppose that any of us could give a rational off-the-cuff explanation of these formulae, but members are entitled to have them explained. The Treasurer is treating the Committee in a cavalier fashion, particularly the member for Bragg, who is entitled to the information from the Minister in charge of the Bill. The Minister should give the information and not shuffle the responsibility off on to the Public Actuary. The Government can do what it likes: it has the numbers. If the Government likes to abuse the processes of Parliament in this way I will protest about it and support the member for Bragg in his request for information. What I suggest the Treasurer should do is to report progress and obtain the information himself so that we can all have it publicly.

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously the Treasurer does not have the information. I appreciate his offer of the Public Actuary's services but not

while we are in Committee and while I have to absent myself. I think honourable members are entitled to an explanation of these matters.

I move:

That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill and Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Dr. Eastick. No—Mr. Burdon.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Chairman, I take a point of order. I understand that the Treasurer has offered me the services of the Public Actuary if I leave this Committee and go outside the Chamber to consult that officer. I think this is an offer with conditions, and I think the Treasurer himself should be explaining these details.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot accept that as a point of order.

Clause passed.

Clause 23—"Lump sum on invalidity retirement of transferred contributor."

Dr. TONKIN: Once again, I ask the Treasurer whether he is willing to give me this information, or is he directing me to leave this Committee to seek it elsewhere?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is asking for details concerning the reasons for the numbers appearing in these formulae.

Dr. Tonkin: I'm asking about the formulae.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, I am sorry; that in itself is an absurd question. What the honourable member needs to do, if he has any sensible question at all, is to question some part of the formulae and to ask why it is there. The explanation of the working of the formulae is already in the second reading explanation dealing with each clause. If the honourable member wants to know why certain numbers appear, he can swiftly obtain that information from the Public Actuary, whom I have made available for members. In the meantime, the Committee

can proceed with the other clauses of the Bill about which no member has raised a single query.

Mr. Millhouse: Does that mean that you resent anyone's raising a query?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but can the member for Bragg say that he has a query on any other clause?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Of course he can't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is right, and this is only a piece of gallery play on his part. Time and time again in this Chamber during Committee debate members have been asked to consult with the Parliamentary Draftsman or some other public servant in order to get the Committee's work done. I have often done so at the request of Sir Thomas Playford, and it is standard practice in this Chamber to do so. When the honourable member refuses assistance, it merely shows how much he wants that assistance.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not refuse assistance when it is offered. Indeed, I am happy to receive it. I seem to remember that, in his second reading explanation, the Treasurer offered to give a full explanation of the formulae if notice of such request was given. This conduct illustrates that this Bill has been introduced and is being pushed through hurriedly. The Treasurer is backing out of the promise he made.

Clause passed.

Consideration of clauses 24 and 25 deferred.

Clauses 26 to 30 passed.

Clause 31—"Increase in pensions under repealed Acts."

Mr. BECKER: On September 2 (at page 1338 of *Hansard*) I asked the Treasurer a question which referred to two previous questions I had asked regarding the Police Pensions Fund. In reply to a question on February 24 the Treasurer said:

When the alterations to the Superannuation Act were announced and enacted last year, I said that the Police Pensions Fund was under review and that I intended, during this part of the session, to introduce a Bill relating to that fund and to back-date the pension increases to the dates that applied to other Government pensions.

On March 30, the Treasurer said:

Legislation to amend the Police Pensions Act will not be introduced during the present session, as the drafting of amendments cannot be completed within the time remaining. However, the amendments will be made retrospective to May 1 to ensure that the delay will not adversely affect any prospective pensioner.

By this clause, the increase will not be paid until the Bill has been assented to. Those who have retired since preparation of the Bill, I understand, will enjoy some retrospectivity, and there are two or three persons involved there. However, most of the police pensioners will not enjoy retrospectivity, yet the Treasurer assured me that they would. I ask why the Treasurer will not honour the assurance that there would be retrospectivity.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The explanation lies in clauses 30 and 31. This Bill changes over from the old Police Pensions Fund to the new arrangements under a new Act and because of this, and as we must have certain transitional provisions, we have simply continued the old arrangements to existing pensioners and upgraded that amount. This was the most effective way to get the transition. Under the Public Service Superannuation Fund, the increases were $8\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, and $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, according to length of service. In this case, these are all at $8\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, to take up the slack of the period and to provide, in effect, some retrospectivity.

Mr. BECKER: If there are the three rates the Treasurer has mentioned in the Public Service scheme, why does the Government not consider taking action similar to that which the Victorian Government has taken in granting retired commissioned officers a 24 per cent increase, because this relates to length of service and devotion to duty?

Clause passed.

Clauses 32 to 57 passed.

Clause 21—"Pension on retirement"—reconsidered.

Dr. TONKIN: I am most grateful to the Public Actuary, who has in clear language explained these formulae to me. I wish I were capable of explaining them to members, but the Public Actuary has satisfied me completely that they are satisfactory and well based, and that is more than the Treasurer did in spite of his undertaking. I have no further objections to these formulae.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not join the queue to question the Public Actuary because I did not want to be absent from the Committee during consideration of the clauses. Since there appears to be only one member who knows anything about the formulae, will he kindly explain them?

Clause passed.

Clauses 24 and 25 passed.

Schedules and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I am extremely disappointed that the Treasurer has not been able to explain the fundamental details of the Bill. We have been told that this legislation introduces an entirely new concept; the formulae, which are a great credit to the Public Actuary (I admire him tremendously), should have been explained by the Treasurer. I would have thought that the Treasurer was sufficiently familiar with the details of the formulae to explain them to all members. I deprecate the fact that the Bill is to pass through all stages in about 24 hours. It is another example of what we have come to expect from this Government.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The new police pensions scheme will be a great improvement on the existing one and will benefit all officers who come under it. I am disappointed, however, that the retired commissioned officers will not receive an increase of more than $8\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. They are close to being the foundation members of the old fund and it is no fault of theirs that, because of inflation, they are now receiving a pittance.

Mr. RYAN: I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We are dealing with the third reading of the Bill as it came out of Committee; therefore, nothing other than the Bill as it came out of Committee can be discussed at the third reading stage.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. The honourable member must discuss the Bill as it came out of Committee.

Mr. BECKER: The Bill is an improvement on the present pension scheme of members of the force.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The member for Bragg this evening has been making several speeches not so much for the benefit of the members as for persons seated elsewhere.

Mr. McANANEY: The Treasurer is making a third reading speech, yet he criticized the member for Bragg.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Bragg has protested that I have not explained to him the formulae contained in the Bill, but I do not apologize for not going into the details of the formulae. What members had to determine was whether the principles of the Bill were those that they would approve. I have never known any member to explain technical and mathematical

formulae, in the details of their workings, to the House and I do not pretend that I have sufficient expertise to be able to do so. I note that the honourable member, having had an explanation of the formulae, could not comply with the request of one of his fellow members to do just that. It is absurd for him to suggest that it is part of my function as Treasurer to do what is actually the detailed and expert work of the Public Actuary. It is a perfectly normal thing that we should make public servants who are experts in a field of technical work available to members. It is a courtesy shown to them, and it has been shown to them on this occasion. I was in no way discourteous to the honourable member or to any other honourable member by proceeding to explain the nature and effect of the measures which were before the House, and I did that. I cannot but think that what we have seen this evening was not so much a request for information as a political exercise.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. TONKIN: The Treasurer has accused me of making speeches, I presume to another portion of the Chamber to which we are not allowed to refer: this is far from the truth and without foundation. I am interested in what goes on in this Chamber and what legislation is passed here. I wish to understand, before casting my vote, what is done here, and I resent the imputation the Treasurer has made concerning my actions in this regard. I have acted as I have purely and simply for the benefit of the members of this House and for the benefit of the people of South Australia.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 21, at 2 p.m.