

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Thursday, March 28, 1974

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

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

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

Harbors Act Amendment (Property),  
South-Eastern Drainage Act Amendment,  
Supreme Court Act Amendment.

**PETITION: SODOMY**

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 20 persons objecting to the introduction of legislation to legalize sodomy between consenting adults until Parliament had a clear mandate from the people to do so by way of referendum to be held at the next periodic South Australian election.

Petition received.

**PETITION: MASLIN BEACH LAND**

Mr. CHAPMAN presented a petition signed by 1 108 persons stating that 85 acres (34 ha) of land at Maslin Beach was threatened by subdivision and praying that the House would ask the Government to acquire the land as subdivision would spoil the panorama of the south coast for all time.

Petition received and read.

**STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION  
ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

**CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BILL**

At 2.14 pm. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

*As to amendments Nos. 1 and 2:*

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.  
*As to amendment No. 3:*

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

Clause 5, page 2, lines 22 and 23—Leave out subclause (2) and insert subclause as follows:

- (2) The Board shall consist of six members appointed by the Governor of whom—
  - (a) one shall be a legal practitioner;
  - (b) one shall be a person skilled in the field of child psychology;
  - (c) one shall be a person with wide experience in education; and
  - (d) the three remaining members shall be persons who possess, in the opinion of the Governor, other proper qualifications to participate in the deliberations and functions of the Board.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to amendment No. 4:*

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

Clause 12, page 5, line 16—Leave out "in private or public".

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to amendment No. 5:*

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

Clause 12, page 5—Line 26—After "shall" insert "—

(a)"

After line 29 insert paragraph as follows:

and

(b) have due regard to the nature of the publication under consideration and to all other relevant factors that bear upon the classification or conditions that should be assigned to, or imposed in respect of, the publication.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to amendment No. 6:*

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment  
*As to amendment No. 7:*

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

Clause 13, page 6, lines 15 and 16—Leave out subclause (5).

After clause 14 insert a new clause as follows:

14a. (1) The Board may, of its own motion, or shall on the application of any person, review any classification or conditions assigned to, or imposed in respect of a publication and may vary that classification or those conditions in such manner as it considers appropriate.

(2) Where an application is made under subsection (1) of this section, and the Board has within the preceding three months reviewed the classification or conditions assigned to, or imposed in respect of the publication to which the application relates, the Board shall not be obliged to proceed with the review until the expiration of three months from that previous review.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to amendments Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11:*

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.  
*As to amendments Nos 12, 13 and 14:*

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

Clause 19, page 8—After line 35 insert subclause as follows:

(2) In any proceedings in respect of an offence relating to obscenity or indecency constituted by the sale, distribution, delivery, exhibition or display of a publication, it shall be a defence for the person charged with the offence to prove—

- (a) that the publication has been classified under this Act;
  - (b) that the circumstances alleged to constitute the offence took place before the date on which the classification came into force;
- and
- (c) that the defendant exercised restraints, or observed conditions, upon or in relation to the sale, distribution, delivery, exhibition or display of the publication that were not less stringent than the conditions (if any) imposed by the Board.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to amendment No. 15:*

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out all words after "amended" in new clause 22 and inserting in lieu thereof the following passage "by inserting after subsection (4) the following subsection:

(4a) In deciding whether to consent to a prosecution under this section, the Minister shall take into consideration any relevant decision of the Classification of Publications Board."

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend to outline the recommendations until a message is received from the Legislative Council. Before then, members will have an opportunity to examine the recommendations, which are being circulated.

*Later:*

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

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to. I will explain the recommendations *in globo*. The first matter that was dealt with by the conference was that of the qualifications of a member of the classification tribunal. It was recommended that one should be a legal practitioner; one should be a person skilled in the field of child psychology; one should be a person with wide experience in education; and the three remaining members should be persons who possess, in the opinion of the Governor, other proper qualifications to participate in deliberations and functions of the board. It is not now specified that a representative of the major churches shall be a member, because it was difficult to find any one churchman that would have a representative view of the major churches in this area. It was also decided to delete the provision for the appointment of a person nominated by the National Council of Women.

Mr. Mathwin: What was wrong with that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A number of things. It was pointed out that it was undesirable to include in the Bill a sex qualification when women would probably serve on the tribunal anyway. What is more, it is not desirable to specify a group in the community that is not representative of the whole body of opinion of a certain sex. Consequently, it was agreed that the qualification should be at large. The Legislative Council intended to cut out the words "or public" from the Bill. I recommend the acceptance of the recommendations of the conference. They have already been accepted by the Legislative Council.

Mr. Millhouse: What difference does that make to us?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Either the managers' report is accepted, or the Bill is laid aside.

Mr. Millhouse: It's unusual for you to rely on the Legislative Council.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: It's just as well the L.C.L. doesn't mean anything to us.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Legislative Council originally proposed to leave out "or public" from the statement of principles that the board must regard. The Government did not agree to that elision, because it would confine people's rights to read what they wished to read in private. Finally, it was agreed that we should delete "in private or public" as surplusage and leave the principle as the right of people to read, see and hear what they wished without the qualification of "in private or public". It comes to the same thing. The Legislative Council did not insist on its amendment that required that priority be given to the principle of protecting people or minors from unsolicited material over the view that people should be able to read, see, and hear what they wished. The original Bill required the board to balance these two principles.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's tricky.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think so, but the Legislative Council acceded to the view that it would create difficulties in the old common law, and it was agreed that the board should have due regard to the nature of the publication under consideration and to all other relevant factors that bear upon the classification or condition that should be assigned to or imposed in respect of the publication. The Legislative Council managers pointed out that they were concerned with the ability of the board to differentiate between types of publication. Amendment No. 6 was a requirement on the board in

relation to refusing to classify a publication. This was a necessary and sensible amendment and we acceded to it.

As to amendment No. 7, the Legislative Council did not insist on its amendment requiring the right of appeal to the Minister from a decision of the tribunal, but suggested that a new clause be inserted. The point is that, if a classification has been assigned and members of the public are not satisfied, the board may be asked to review it on the basis of submissions made by members of the public. That was the conclusion reached by the conference in place of a suggestion that the Minister should become, in effect, a court of appeal from the decisions of the tribunal. Amendments Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11 were largely consequential amendments to which we did not further insist on our disagreement.

As to amendments Nos. 12, 13, and 14, a provision was made by the Legislative Council for an interim coverage of publications that had been submitted for classification, and this is an agreement that will slightly amend the conditions to make them workable. As to amendment No. 15, the Legislative Council amended its provisions in relation to section 33 of the Police Offences Act, but the Government was not willing to withdraw the necessity of the certification of a prosecution by the Minister under that Act. However, it agreed to a provision in that Act that, in deciding whether to consent to a prosecution under section 33, the Minister shall take into consideration any relevant decision of the Classification of Publications Board. That, in effect, was the result of the conference which I think was good and workmanlike. Matters were considered in detail, and I think we have reached a satisfactory and workable conclusion.

Dr. TONKIN: When discussing the Bill, it seemed that an important question concerned members of the board. I am pleased that this matter has been clarified, and I believe that the present membership of the board will reassure people in the community. There seems to be a belief in the community that there has been a great upsurge in the number of offensive publications available, particularly of the periodical type. There is disquiet (which may or may not be entirely justified) in the community, and it is a tremendous improvement that the board members are to be specified, namely, a legal practitioner, a child psychologist, and a person experienced in education. It almost seems to be a form of inverse discrimination to have a woman referred to in the Bill, but I understand the Premier will give an undertaking that at least one woman will be appointed to the board.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I expect more.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear that, and I accept the Premier's undertaking. We are still somewhat disturbed that there is no right of appeal other than back to the board, but it is pleasing to know that the board may reconsider decisions, following an application by members of the public or, if necessary, of its own volition. I take the point again that it is not always right for politicians to have the last say when matters of emotional appeal are being considered. It is not a bad thing that politics are kept out of this matter but, in divorcing a Minister from the political aspect and the emotional pressures that could be brought to bear on him, we are, to some extent, absolving him of any responsibility. This aspect must be considered. Because this legislation will enable more control over the present situation in this State and is a tremendous improvement on the present position, I accept these amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I agree that the composition of the board has been improved, but I believe that clause 12

was a key provision. It provided the criteria that had to be applied by the board, but it was on this aspect that conflict existed. The criteria which have been set out and which have been amended are that adult persons are entitled to read and view what they wish in private or public, and members of the community are entitled to protection extending both to themselves and to those in their care from exposure to unsolicited material that they find offensive. There is an area of conflict in that criteria, and there will be a continuing controversy. The Premier has no right to label those who raise the matter as being involved in "porn" politics. I believe people hold legitimate views—

Mr. Mathwin: Rightly so, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: —at each end of the two extremes in the criteria, and others hold views somewhere in between. Most of us on this side hold a view somewhere in between but our views are not identical. My own view tends towards protecting those members of the community who find some material offensive to their sense of modesty and propriety. I think it is a question of balancing these conflicting criteria. I think the benefit that accrues to one section is not as great as the damage that can occur to those whom we are seeking to protect. Having stated my personal view, I hope the Premier will not indulge in this sort of nonsense and say we are involved in "porn" politics because we happen to place a bit more emphasis on one of the criteria, whereas he and the Attorney-General may place more emphasis on other criteria. It would be completely dictatorial for the Premier to try to push any specific point of view. The matter has been discussed and a reasonable compromise has been reached, although it does not go far enough for those of us interested in the protective aspects of the criteria.

Dr. Tonkin: It has achieved some sort of balance.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it has achieved some balance on the board. Much will depend on who are the members of the board, including the three nominated by the Governor, because obviously their opinions will vary as much as do those of the whole community. I am getting a bit sick and tired of the Premier, the big champion of freedom, saying that those of us who may be more reserved in our approach to some of these matters are indulging in "porn" politics.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am speaking to the amendment affecting clause 12, which is the vital clause in this Bill. I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot share the congratulations which have been showered upon themselves by the three managers of the conference, because I find it very difficult to understand the purport of some of the things that have been done. We all know that strange things are done at conferences and normally, when the reports of the managers come back to the two Chambers, nobody has the slightest interest in having a look at the actual amendments that have been drawn. Those amendments have always been drawn in haste, and they are often utterly incomprehensible when they are looked at later and at leisure. I believe the same thing may happen here.

Both the member for Bragg and the member for Kavel have gone on at some length about the composition of the board, and the member for Bragg said how wonderful it was that this, that and the other thing had prevailed and that we now had a balanced board, and so on. When one looks at the wording of the new subclause (2) of

clause 5 one sees that it means hardly anything at all, and it is entirely in the hands of the Government as to who is appointed, except that a lawyer and a child psychologist have to be on the board. Apart from those two people, anyone at all can be appointed. I do not know where the member for Bragg finds comfort in that. New paragraph (a) provides that one member shall be a legal practitioner. The Government will not be in any difficulty finding someone of its own persuasion in the legal profession to go on the board, and I do not necessarily criticize that. Paragraph (b) provides that one member shall be a person skilled in the field of child psychology. I do not know what "skilled in the field of child psychology" means. I doubt that it has a precise meaning at all.

Paragraph (c) provides that one member shall be a person with wide experience in education. What in heaven's name does that mean? Does it mean a person has been to school, or that he has been a schoolmaster for 30 years, or has a university degree? It could even be, by a stretch of the imagination, the member for Rocky River. Why do we put such damn gobbledegook in an Act of Parliament? And the managers come back and say how wonderful it is. The member for Bragg was not able to be precise as to what that meant. I do not believe it has any meaning at all. It means for the Government just any member at large. Paragraph (d) provides for the three remaining members to be persons who possess, in the opinion of the Governor (of course, that is the Government of the day), other proper qualifications to participate in the deliberations and functions of the board. What on earth can that mean? It means anyone can go on the board. Why did not the managers say, if they wanted to be honest, that of six members of the board one had to be a member of the legal profession and the other had to be a child psychologist (if in fact, paragraph (b) goes as far as that) and leave it at that?

If the member for Bragg thinks that his Party has had some sort of victory in the composition of this board, I want to disabuse him absolutely of that, because it is absolute nonsense. It is the sort of face-saving garbage that gets into an Act of Parliament so that old people in the other place and members of the Liberal and Country League Opposition down here can congratulate themselves on the fact that they have had some influence on the legislation. The Liberal Movement, by and large, agrees with the approach set out in the Bill although I think there should be more precision in the membership of the board. But let not the L.C.L. think that in the last hours of the session it has had any victory on that. These amendments bear all the marks of hasty drafting. The copy that I have has been duplicated, and then it has been altered in biro in about 12 places. This is not the best way to legislate, and I shall not be surprised if the Bill has to be reconsidered because of mistakes that cannot be covered up.

On page 3 of the document reference is made to clause 19 (2). The original draft referred to "an offence against any Act or law", but this has been changed to "an offence relating to obscenity or indecency". I heard the Premier explain that this provision referred to section 33 of the Police Offences Act, but what is an offence relating to obscenity or indecency? I do not know, and I doubt that the court will have any hick in interpreting that. Is the Premier telling us that the agreement reached with the Legislative Council was that the term be "an offence relating to indecency or obscenity", or were the managers considering an offence against any Act or law?

I suppose we are considering the same amendments. We may have to do a cover up, or it may be that the Bill will lapse if we are not talking about the same thing. It is not fair to the Parliamentary Counsel to give him the task of going to a conference and sitting through the discussions for four hours, and then being told to draft the results in about an hour. That is what we do when we have conferences in the morning, with Parliament sitting in the afternoon. This is a prime example of what happens, and the Parliamentary Counsel has put in a phrase that will be extremely difficult to interpret. I am not pleased about that.

I will not vote against the motion, because if we do not accept it the Bill will lapse. We have some advance on what we had previously, but I do not like to hear Opposition managers congratulate themselves and the Government. On what we have before us, there is no reason to think that Parliament has done a good job.

Motion carried.

### QUESTIONS

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

### OIL RECLAMATION

In reply to Mr. VENNING (March 5).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As a result of oil industry agreement, facilities are being installed at Birkenhead (due for completion at the end of this month) to enable waste oil collected from all metropolitan service stations to be blended into fuel oil distributed by all oil companies in South Australia. Already half the used sump oil from sendee stations is being treated in this way and the balance, representing about 375 000 gallons, (1.68 Ml) will be collected when the new facility is provided. The proportions of waste oil in fuel oil will be adjusted so that ultimate flue gas emissions will be well within any known legislation or regulations existing in Australia, and accordingly the industry sees no problems with the method of disposal, at least in the foreseeable future.

### PERPETUAL LEASES

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (March 5).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Irrigation has provided me with a report in which he states that approvals given to private subdivisions of areas adjacent to townships, for residential purposes if such land were irrigable, have been on the basis that the land remained ratable and subject to water and drainage rating. In the past, rentals for such residential sites were fixed at a minimum level, and the combined charge for rent and water and drainage rates did not represent the true rental value. At present the Land Board is fixing a more realistic rental for residential sites created in this way and a special purpose lease is being issued. Therefore, the Minister is willing to grant excision from water and drainage rating of all such subdivisions where a double rating applies, the adjustment to apply from July 1, 1973.

### DOG FENCE

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (March 13).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At a meeting held on March 12, 1974, the Dog Fence Board resolved to contact major local suppliers of fencing materials to seek their co-operation in granting priority in the supply of fencing materials to owners of the various sections of the dog fence damaged by recent flooding. The suppliers were

subsequently contacted, but stated that, in fact, priority was already being granted to orders for fencing materials received from owners of the dog fence but actual delivery was severely limited by availability of stocks. This was due to the greater demand for these materials in the Eastern States, where recent flood damage far exceeded that in South Australia. Despite these difficulties, however, the suppliers are making every effort to meet South Australian demand from flood-damaged areas, and priorities are being granted accordingly, with special emphasis being placed on orders from owners of the dog fence.

### GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (March 5).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During consideration of the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) (1974), the honourable member made the following statement:

Within the last four years, at least three companies have collapsed within 21 years of a Government guarantee having been given or renewed. In July, 1970, the Dunstan Government granted David Shearer Limited a guarantee of \$950 000; that company has now been placed in receivership and the guarantee has been executed. In January, 1972, the Dunstan Government renewed the guarantee of Rare Earth Corporation of Australia Limited to the value of \$500 000; in the same year that company was placed in the hands of a receiver. In both cases the guarantees were made against the advice of Treasury officials. The Government lost \$1 450 000 of public funds, through blatant financial mismanagement. Similarly, in 1970-71, the Government more than doubled the existing \$200 000 guarantee in respect of South Australian Barytes Limited, which is now in receivership.

The Government gives guarantees to industries seeking them after receiving a report from the Industries Development Committee. Section 14 (2) of the Industries Development Act provides that no such guarantee shall be given unless:

- (a) the committee has first inquired into the business or proposed business in connection with which the guarantee is to be given, and
- (b) the committee has reported to the Treasurer that in its opinion there is a reasonable prospect that the business or proposed business in connection with which the guarantee is to be given will be profitable. . . .

The committee includes members from both Houses of Parliament and includes representation from both the Government and the major Opposition Parties. Regarding Rare Earth Corporation of Australia Limited, guarantees in respect of advances totalling \$800 000 to be provided by Partnership Pacific Limited and the Bank of New South Wales were approved in September, 1971. At no time were the guarantees renewed by the Government and at no time was the amount involved \$500 000. An earlier guarantee was given to another bank on the application of the private company, Rare Earth Corporation of Australia Proprietary Limited, but this was discharged when that company converted to public company status in the first half of 1970.

Regarding David Shearer Limited, a guarantee in respect of \$950 000 of advances from the Bank of Adelaide was given in 1970. The recommendation of the Industries Development Committee upon which that decision was based was approved by the Hall Government in May, 1970. Other assistance has been given to the company at various times, including a further guarantee of \$200 000 in 1972. This Government recognizes, as have previous Governments, the importance of the farm implement and general engineering industry at Mannum regarding employment and decentralization.

Regarding S.A. Barytes Limited, the original guarantee of \$452 000 was approved by the Playford Government in 1956. The present liability of \$200 000 (plus an amount not exceeding \$10 000, which is related to guarantees given by the bank itself) is part of the original advance. At no time has the Government doubled the guarantee.

#### **STRATA TITLES**

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (November 29).

The Hon. L. J. KING: On November 29, 1973, the honourable member asked me a question about the purchase by a constituent of a home unit from a company named Armour Coating Marketing Proprietary Limited. I have had the matter investigated by the Senior Inspector of the Companies Branch, and the books of the selling agent have been inspected. The main matter for concern seems to be the delay involved in issuing a strata title to the constituent. This woman paid over the purchase moneys to the agent by May 2, 1973, at which date settlement was made and occupation taken, but no strata title was produced. The strata title was not handed over to the complainant until January 9, 1974, about eight months later. There seems little justification for most of the delay, although it has been difficult to establish the true reasons for such delay. It does seem likely, however, that one of the reasons was that the remaining three units were not completed until August, 1973, which prevented the issue of a strata title to the complainant, as the consent of the Burnside corporation for separate council rating for each unit could not be obtained until all the units were completed. This corporation consent was given on September 21, 1973. Contracts of sale with the other three unit owners were signed in late July and early August, 1973, and strata titles were handed over early in 1974. It seems likely that the moneys paid for the home unit by the woman who first took occupancy were used to complete the units. No evidence has been disclosed by the investigation of this matter that would warrant any action being taken.

#### **DRUGS**

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (March 6).

The Hon. L. J. KING: Since December 12, 1968, 80 charges have been laid for unlawfully supplying drugs. Of this number, 20 were detected during the period July 1, 1973, to March 10, 1974. There is no evidence available to suggest that any of these offenders was dependent on drugs. Reliable information coming to the notice of the Drug Squad confirms that the drug scene activity is increasing in this State. In recent months known drug traffickers from this State have been arrested in New South Wales. Three were arrested at Moree in possession of a large sum. When questioned they admitted their sole purpose for being in the area was to purchase drugs for the South Australian market. Two others were arrested in Sydney in possession of 21 000 L.S.D. tickets, and earlier this month, also in Sydney, a 23 year old South Australian was arrested in possession of \$20 000 worth of heroin. It is reliably believed that the latter offender had posted 900 one ounce (28.3 g) packets of heroin to Victoria and South Australia before his arrest. It is obvious that the South Australian market is being well supplied, and whenever reliable evidence is available, the persons concerned will be charged.

#### **BIKIE GANGS**

In reply to Mr. BECKER (March 12).

The Hon. L. J. KING: As indicated in my initial reply, I discussed the matter with the Chief Secretary and he has now stated that he can add nothing further to the reply

given by me, except that if the honourable member can supply details of the incidents to which he refers, they will be investigated and action taken according to the evidence available.

#### **RICHMOND SCHOOL**

In reply to Mr. WRIGHT (March 14).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A schedule of requirements for the replacement of the Richmond Primary School has been prepared, and it is hoped that the funds position will be such that we will be able to accelerate this project. In the meantime, three properties have been acquired as part of the proposal for the redevelopment of the school site, and negotiations are proceeding for a section of another property. Where noise created by traffic on South Road is troublesome, transportable classrooms have been provided and sited away from the main road. The Public Buildings Department has been asked to give attention to the toilets at the existing school and to maintain them at a satisfactory standard until new ones are provided as part of the general improvements.

#### **SCHOOL TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES**

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (March 21).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have considered the honourable member's proposal that travelling allowances should be extended to cover children in country areas who, under the present regulations, do not qualify because they reside within 48 kilometres of a school. However, this would be too costly for our present finances to bear, and therefore I am not able to agree to the honourable member's proposal.

#### **SEX DISCRIMINATION**

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (March 21).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is no discrimination between boys and girls at Woodville High School. Limitations on the kinds of course offered to boys and girls are basically those of accommodation. Some boys were given the opportunity to attend a photography class at Croydon High School, as there are insufficient places in the woodwork and metalwork classes, which they normally could have expected to attend. The department is not willing to prevent boys from studying craft subjects in order to admit girls. As the accommodation situation improves girls can be admitted to woodwork, metalwork, and photography. As art and craft accommodation is limited at Woodville High School, this is the reason for our sending some pupils to Croydon High and Port Adelaide Girls Technical High Schools.

#### **WHYALLA EMPLOYMENT**

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (March 7).

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Following the honourable member's question, officers of my department have interviewed company representatives, union officials, some of the women employed, and other interested persons. In the opinion of all persons interviewed, the venture can be regarded as successful. Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited now employs more than 360 women on work that was previously exclusively performed by men and there is no doubt that the women are equally as effective on those jobs. They are now employed in such areas as the rolling mill, the brick plant, in stores, and in other such work places.

There have been no problems in the work places because of the presence of women and they have been accepted by the men. Most of the women are being paid the same rates as men are paid when they are performing the same

work. As there are still a few areas where this has not yet applied, negotiations are proceeding to rectify that situation. I agree with the principle that the employment of women in heavy industry is quite sound and socially acceptable. Women employed by B.H.P. are satisfied with their conditions and the type of work upon which they are employed, but some doubts have been expressed within the general community about the sociological effect of married women entering the work force. I am not now referring only to the B.H.P. situation, but making what can be regarded as a general observation on this matter. It has been suggested by some sociologists, welfare officers, and others that this could lead to problems in the home and problems with unsupervised children. Naturally this aspect is being kept under close surveillance.

#### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier acknowledge that his continued failure to bring to the House a detailed report on the implementation of workmen's compensation in the building industry clearly highlights the fact that the Government has created a Dracula, the full ramifications of which even the Government does not understand? For a long time people in the community, particularly those in the building and insurance industries, have clearly indicated that the ramifications of the workmen's compensation legislation relating to subcontractors have brought about a situation that requires, and indeed demands, a massive increase in the cost of workmen's compensation and that, naturally, this increase will be passed on to house owners, as has already happened. The Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry have appeared on television and advanced varying views on this matter. Two weeks ago today, the Premier said that within a couple of days he would give the House a clear picture of the true position. However, when challenged a week ago he said that he could not do so, and the fact that now, two weeks later, the House is still waiting for a report illustrates without doubt that it is impossible for the Premier, the Minister of Labour and Industry or any other Government member to say what the effects of this legislation will be. I believe that members have not seen the report because the reports so far received by the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry support the claims which have been made by the building and insurance industries and which have been voiced by members on this side many times.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader asked me if I would acknowledge something, and the short answer to the question is "No". I will not acknowledge it because what the Leader ascribed to me was false.

Dr. Eastick: But you know—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader had the exact situation explained to him last week: the Government was waiting on a report from the special committee operating under the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs and set up by the Attorney-General regarding the effect of increases in workmen's compensation premiums. We now have the preliminary report, and a statement, which I will make early next week and which will be widely publicized, is now being prepared. The contents of that report make clear that the statements made by the Minister of Labour and Industry and me are entirely correct and supportable.

Mr. Mathwin: They are different.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are not different in any way and, what is more, the claims made by the

industry regarding an approximate increase of \$1 700 in the price of a \$20 000 house are absolute fabrications and completely without basis.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. Eastick: Do you have the figures?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have them.

Dr. Eastick: When?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They will be available early next week.

Mr. Millhouse: When the House is up!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will have an opportunity of seeing them if he monitors television programmes as he normally does.

#### ALDERMAN'S STATEMENT

Mr. WRIGHT: Does the Minister of Local Government intend to take action following the report in today's *Advertiser* alleging that an alderman named Spencer has said that night meetings of councils would allow riff-raff, workers—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WRIGHT: —and aspiring Labor politicians to participate in council elections?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have taken action. Indeed, I have called publicly for Mr. Spencer's immediate resignation as an alderman of the Adelaide City Council, as the Senior Vice-President of the Local Government Association, and as a member of the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board, because I do not believe that a person who has such narrow-minded views is capable of representing the whole of the people. Indeed, Alderman Spencer would never have been appointed (by the Governor on my recommendation) to the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board had he made this statement prior to that appointment. I think it is absolutely disgraceful that any person can hold such narrow-minded views, and I think that to engender the class distinction that he has engendered is also an absolute disgrace. I give full credit to those members of the Adelaide City Council who have this morning contacted me and completely dissociated themselves from the views expressed and who have said that under no conditions do they hold similar views.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am interested to see the nods of approval and to hear members opposite saying "Hear, hear!". I see in the press that Mr. Spencer has been a member of Adelaide City Council for about 18 years and that for well over half that time he was the Liberal and Country League endorsed candidate; as such, I assume he expressed L.C.L. views.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you like the truth?

Mr. Mathwin: Lies!

Mr. Millhouse: It's true: he's a pillar of the L.C.L.

Mr. Mathwin: You speak for yourselves.

Mr. Millhouse: I see: you're abandoning him now.

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Mitcham for the first time today. At this stage, I ask the honourable Minister when replying to a question of some importance concerning State activities not to make provocative statements. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Mr. Speaker, I am not attempting to provoke anyone: I am simply stating a fact, and the best way of denying or giving the lie to what I

have said is for the Leader to get up and publicly rebuke Alderman Spencer, as I have done, and join with me in calling for his resignation not only from the three bodies I have named but also from the L.C.L.

### HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Development and Mines, in his capacity as Minister in charge of housing, seen the report published today stating that the number of house-building approvals in South Australia has slumped sharply and, in fact, indicating that the present number of new house approvals is the lowest since December, 1972, which incidentally is a rather significant date? The figures published disclose a serious defect in the Government's overall policy in this matter, and I suggest that the position is compounded by the information supplied by the Minister in a reply that he gave last Tuesday to a question I asked about the Housing Trust's building programme. The Minister said:

... there will be fewer new houses completed during this financial year than originally contemplated, but to some extent this will be offset by the purchase of older dwellings and more use of industrialized housing. The purchasing of older houses, in addition to the fact that the number of approvals for new houses has slumped, means that more people will be crowding into older houses, and fewer new houses will be built. Will the Minister therefore say what positive action he or his Government has in mind to reverse this trend and to encourage the budding of more new houses in South Australia?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As a result of his study of my reply given earlier in the week, the honourable member will be aware of the constraints that have been operating on the Housing Trust. Private building is in no way exempt from those constraints, which have operated in all States and will continue to operate for some time. There are problems in relation to the supply of raw materials and the availability of skilled labour, and these problems will continue for some time. My answer earlier this week referred to the use of industrialized housing. We are investigating thoroughly this concept, particularly the modular building concept pioneered by a subsidiary of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited in the Eastern States. Officers of the Housing Trust have seen the project and reported on it enthusiastically. We believe that this is an avenue we should pursue in the future. The Housing Trust is having success with its home park concept in country areas with which members will be familiar as a result, I hope, of their close reading of the report of the Housing Trust I tabled some time ago. I appeal to members to examine this concept closely, to give it a fair go and not, as some members opposite did last year, condemn it before examining it closely. I am referring now to the proposal to place one of these home park developments in the Salisbury area. Had it been possible for this development to proceed there would now be 50 more families living in the Salisbury area and they would have been there since Christmas, whereas they are probably still on the waiting list of the trust. The decision not to allow the development was made by the Salisbury council, but I remember adverse comments being made by certain members opposite who, I believe, had not studied the project as thoroughly as they should have. I am happy, as Minister in charge of housing, to make the plans available to members so that they may see where the houses are located with respect to each other in these home parks and also the designs and the materials that will go into them. We have started building them in certain country areas and they are being received enthusiastically.

### APPRENTICES

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry comment on the success or otherwise of the appeal to employers to make more apprenticeships available in 1974? I understand that early last December the Minister advised most employers in this State of the generous subsidy payments that were available from the Australian Government to offset the cost of training first-year apprentices. The Minister appealed to employers to make more apprenticeships available in an attempt to provide more skilled workers.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Being aware of the member for Florey's interest in the training of apprentices, I expected to receive this question from him. I am pleased to be able to announce that first-year apprentice enrolments in technical colleges for 1974 are up 33 per cent on the 1973 figures. The total enrolment was 3 671, which was an increase of 901 over the intake last year and 1 380 over the 1972 intake. Although this was a satisfactory result, I consider there must be a continuing effort by all sections of industry and commerce to train increasing numbers of young men and women to meet future demands for fully-trained tradesmen. The increased intake this year does, however, reflect the progressive policies of the Australian and State Labor Governments in encouraging employers to recruit and train more people in the crafts. This encouragement—

Mr. Gunn: Is this—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre knows the consequences of continual interjections and, in accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As I was saying, this encouragement is given an added boost by subsidy payments of \$16 a week for each eligible apprentice to employers who either provide satisfactory training under their own arrangements or release their first-year apprentices for a similar standard of full-time external instruction. Further details of the scheme may be obtained from the Apprenticeship Commission in the Labour and Industry Department.

Major trade group enrolments for this year, with the figures for last year shown in brackets are: automotive 767 (492), building 443 (338), electrical 405 (334), electronics 44 (44), engineering 798 (600), food 169 (154), furnishing 262 (169), hairdressing 380 (349), para-medical 32 (11), plumbing and sheet metal 246 (204), and printing 125 (75).

### RECREATION FACILITIES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when land will be made available for scramble motor cycle enthusiasts, to give them the opportunity to take part in their sport without using wild life reserves for the purpose? It has been brought to my notice that the Government acquired about 358 acres (145 ha) in Cherry Gardens for a wild life reserve, and the Minister said that the area was to be preserved in its original state. However, I have been told that as many as 20 motor cyclists go there on Sundays and use the area for scrambles. Some kangaroos are still in the area in their original habitat, not having been brought there by the white man. Further, the bird life is much as it was in its native state. Animals and birds have been frightened by this activity and the area has been cut to pieces. As the motor cyclists have nowhere else to go for their sport, I ask the Minister what he will do, first, to prevent destruction

of the wild life park and, secondly, to provide an area for motor cycle enthusiasts so that they can take part in their sport without interfering with other people.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This matter has been raised several times previously and I have said that I am concerned about it, because we have in the community responsible groups who use motor cycles for scrambles, racing, or general pleasure riding. We have a similar difficulty in relation to dune buggies. The people in some areas are organized into groups and clubs. They conduct themselves properly and do not undertake the sort of activity to which the honourable member has referred, namely, using the area without considering the rest of the community or the countryside. Accordingly, I referred this matter to the Environmental Protection Council for a report. That report has been made available to me and it indicates two things. The first is that this problem is increasing, with people using dune buggies and motor cycles becoming involved in these activities, and there is a need for rigid control of their activities. It has also been pointed out to me that, where possible, these people should be required to join a club and conduct their activities in areas specially set aside for that purpose. However, it is difficult to establish areas that satisfy the needs of all these people. We have a noise problem, councils being reluctant to make available land for activities of this kind because of the noise and the difficulties created for residents in the area. Regarding motor cycle scramble activities, the persons concerned are particular about the kind of land they want: it must be undulating. That problem is in addition to the other problem of having sites where the noise will not create difficulty. Accordingly, I have asked the Chief Environmental Officer of my department to consider where land may be made available so as not to cause community discomfort while at the same time allowing those persons willing to do so to use the land set aside in a proper way. However, the honourable member will appreciate from what I have said that it is particularly difficult for us to find land of the type required, and we are discussing the matter at departmental level and with the help of the State Planning Authority. I had not heard complaints of large numbers of bike riders improperly using the Cherry Gardens area.

Mr. Evans: It's just started.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will certainly ask the police to co-operate and take action if what the honourable member has stated is found to be correct.

#### **HOLDEN HILL BUS SERVICE**

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport have included in the review of the whole system of bus operation the extension of the Clearview and Valley View bus services to the intersection of North East Road and Grand Junction Road, Holden Hill? Previously Morphett's Bus Service operated this service, and it has been transferred to the Municipal Tramways Trust. I understand at present the Clearview bus terminates on Grand Junction Road outside Yatala gaol and that about every third bus terminates about two miles (3.2 km) farther on at the shopping centre in Paul's Drive, Valley View. This extension, if agreed to, would provide a service by inter-connecting two bus routes, and a private school on the route is attended by many children from the Tea Tree Gully district.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be delighted to ask the Director-General's staff, which is reviewing the whole matter with the M.T.T., to include the route to which the honourable member has referred.

#### **LIBRARIES**

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education say what plans have been developed to establish joint school-community libraries? I think the Minister made a statement some time ago about this matter. One large high school in my district could develop a school library and also service a wider section of the community if the library was built up as a major reference one, complementing the services of institute libraries and similar libraries in the district.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Recently I have received a report from a special committee that I established, comprising representatives of the Institutes Association, the Libraries Department, and the Education Department, to deal with the establishment of joint school-community libraries, principally in area schools initially. The committee has recommended the establishment of such libraries but only where the population of the area served is fewer than 3 000. The committee took the view that the purpose of the joint school-community library was a means of getting community library facilities, particularly when the local community did not have the resources to establish a fully subsidized public library. The view of the committee is that, where a fully subsidized library can be established, it should be. Therefore, largely, with two exceptions, to which I will refer, it is not intended that joint school-community libraries should be established in areas of significant population. The exceptions at this stage are, first, in relation to the community centre high schools planned for Angle Park and Thebarton, where a joint school-community library is part of the overall community centre complex. The honourable member will appreciate that in those situations the existence of community centre high schools will be a source of attraction to the local population; it could provide a separate justification for a joint effort. Further, the likely readership level in communities such as Angle Park and Thebarton, without some special efforts being made, is likely to be fairly low on the normal subsidized library basis.

I should add that those two schemes will be treated as pilot schemes to ascertain the kind of difficulty we may have to resolve in establishing joint school-community libraries in larger areas. This is not an easy problem to solve. The problems of possible divided control and divided lines of responsibility could create difficulties that might well detract from the purpose of the library in serving both the school and the community. The other exception relates to the proposal for the Noarlunga regional centre, where the public library will also serve the technical college. That is a different type of proposition. The problems arising in that case from joint use will not be of such a magnitude as to render that project unworkable. That is the situation at present. In other areas, we would expect the local community to support the establishment of a subsidized library under the Libraries Board.

#### **ARTERIOSCLEROSIS**

Mr. OLSON: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether he will seek from the Australian Government financial assistance to permit a team of doctors to visit Germany to learn the system of the oxygen treatment of vascular disease, as administered by Dr. Moler? The March edition of the *Australian Nurses Journal* contains an article written by Sister Binns, who is a sufferer of a vascular disease in her left foot arising from arteriosclerosis. She visited Dr. Moler's clinic for six weeks, receiving three treatments a week. The treatment was highly successful, preventing the possible amputation of her



foot. Several Australians whose diseases have been diagnosed as incurable and who have then visited Dr. Moler's clinic for this treatment now live a normal life, retaining their limbs. Will the Attorney ask his colleague whether he will adopt the proposal of the Premier of Western Australia (Mr. Tonkin) of appealing to the Australian Government for financial assistance to enable doctors to study this oxygen treatment method at Dr. Moler's clinic?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain the views of my colleague on the matter raised by the honourable member.

#### ALLEGED RAPE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Police Department has refused to give details of the report of the police doctor who examined the girl alleged to have been repeatedly raped and indecently assaulted, as reported in this morning's newspaper? No doubt the Attorney has seen the report (one of the leading stories) on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser* concerning allegations that a white man indecently assaulted and repeatedly raped an 11-year-old part-Aboriginal girl. The solicitor (Mr. S. W. Tilmouth) is quoted as saying that he has been frustrated by the Police Department's refusal to give details of the report of the police doctor who examined the girl. The article states, in effect, that the Attorney-General has examined the matter, concluding that no prosecution could succeed. I emphasize that I make no comment on that: it may well be a perfectly proper conclusion to come to regarding a prosecution. The point of my question is to ascertain whether information has been withheld from the legal advisers to the girl that would enable civil proceedings to be taken. I think that is the purport of the article. I hope that, if the report is accurate, the Attorney-General in his reply will be able to clear up what is a fairly serious matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Of course, I saw the report in this morning's newspaper. I recall the matter fairly clearly. The facts are that in, I think, October, 1972, a report was made to the police of an alleged series of sexual acts committed by a certain person on a girl. The police investigated the matter, concluding that there was insufficient evidence to justify a prosecution against any person. Therefore, no action was taken in the matter. I may say that the police investigated the matter thoroughly; I have personally inspected the report of the police investigation. Subsequently, I received a communication from solicitors who had been instructed in the matter by the Aboriginal legal rights movement. Following receipt of that letter, I agreed to refer the police file to the Crown Solicitor to obtain from the Crown law authorities an opinion whether or not there should be a prosecution. The opinion given by the Crown law officers was that there was insufficient evidence to justify a prosecution, because a prosecution against the person implicated in the report would be unlikely to succeed. In view of the representations made to me, I then personally examined the file, concluding that the advice of my Crown law officers was correct. That conclusion has been communicated to the solicitors acting on behalf of the Aboriginal legal rights movement.

Subsequently, I received a letter from a solicitor who asked that the police report be made available. After consulting the police, I advised that it would be contrary to public policy to disclose a police report of a criminal investigation: it has been the invariable practice of the Police Department not to disclose such reports. As that practice is dictated by obvious reasons concerned with law enforcement and the administration of justice, I entirely

concur in the necessity for it. To my knowledge, at no time (and I would have to personally check the file to be sure) had anyone suggested that the information was sought for the purpose of instituting civil proceedings. In addition, to my knowledge no-one has sought a report of a police doctor, as distinct from the police file on the matter. I have no knowledge of any application of that sort or of any decisions having been made with regard to such an application. I have simply not applied my mind to the question whether any information from this file could or should be made available to the solicitors of the girl concerned, with a view to instituting civil proceedings. That would be an entirely new question that would have to be considered on the basis of the principles that would apply to such an application. I can only say that, if solicitors for the girl's parents have in mind civil proceedings and desire to have information from the police file for that purpose, their application will be considered on the principles that apply to an application for information for the purpose of instituting civil proceedings, and that is an entirely different matter from what was considered previously.

#### NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Development and Mines provide the House with information regarding the extent of uranium deposits in this State and say whether his department is at present investigating or is likely to investigate the possibility of using those deposits in relation to nuclear power, particularly in the propulsion of ships? The Minister may be aware that a world study is currently being initiated into the possibilities to which I have just referred. The *Financial Review* of Wednesday, March 27, outlines the study, pointing out that, at this time, as far as ships are concerned, oil fuel is cheaper than nuclear power but that, because of the state of the oil market and the possibility of increases in costs of oil, nuclear energy might become a viable proposition. I believe that South Australia should keep itself up to date on this matter, and I would certainly be interested to know of any likely future developments that may occur.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Members would be aware that late last year the Government set up a State energy committee, and the honourable member's question would come within the ambit of that committee's study. I expect to receive detailed information from the committee within a month or so regarding nuclear power. The use of nuclear power in ships is obviously a matter for the future. At present, however, problems would be experienced with our shipping regulations, and it may well be that certain nuclear-powered ships would not be allowed in our ports because of the possible dangers associated with radiation. However, with improving technologies in relation to radiation safeguards, this aspect could certainly be fixed up. As the honourable member told me yesterday that he would be seeking information about reserves, I have some round figures regarding uranium reserves with which I can supply him. Such reserves occur in two regions in the North of the State, first, in the crystalline basement rocks in the Mount Painter area, and, secondly, as sedimentary rocks as in the Frome Embayment. The figures are as follows (I am referring to uranium oxide U3O8 and in the Mount Painter area I list four deposits): the Armchair and Streitberg deposit, where the proven reserves are 1 814 000 kg at a grade of 0.9 kilograms a metric tonne; at Mount Gee, where the proven reserve is 2 720 000 kilograms at a grade of 0.9 kilograms a metric tonne; at Hodgkinson, where the proven reserve is 454 000 kilograms at 2 kilograms a metric tonne; and

at Radium Ridge, where the proven reserve is 2 815 000 kilograms at a grade of 0.5 kilograms a metric tonne. The one significant deposit in the Frome Embayment is at Beverley, where there appears to be 15 876 000 kilograms at a grade of 2 to 2.75 kilograms a metric tonne. The Mount Painter deposits have been tested by Oilmin N.L. and Transoil N.L., while the sedimentary uranium deposits under the Lake Frome plains, to the east, are being investigated by Western Nuclear Limited, Oilmin N.L., Petromin N.L. and Transoil N.L. Explorations are being carried out in other areas, and certain concentrations have been located in the Yaramba area, but proven reserves have not yet been accurately estimated.

#### STURT HIGHWAY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me a report from the Highways Department setting out its plans, if it has any, for upgrading the section of Sturt Highway between the Paringa bridge and the border at Yamba, which forms part of the major interstate highway? The Paringa District Council has raised this matter many times, as this part of the highway runs through its district. That council has been concerned about the standard of maintenance of the road and its low-grade structure. This would be one of the oldest sections of the Sturt Highway, and probably one of the remaining sections that has not been upgraded since it was originally constructed. As this section of road is virtually the gateway to South Australia for people coming from New South Wales through Mildura, I ask the Minister to take up the matter with his department seriously because of the bad first impression of South Australia that this section of road creates.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: They aren't coming here any more.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On the contrary, they are coming here in droves, and I take this matter seriously. I should certainly be pleased to discuss this road with the Commissioner of Highways and see what plans he has for it. However, I should warn the honourable member that the information I may be able to provide at present may not have much value until the terms of the new Commonwealth Act are known. If the emphasis of that Act is as suggested by the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads, the lion's share of road money will have to be spent on interstate highways. This road may therefore, be one of the sections of highways that will benefit. If that is so, I hope the honourable member will be so pleased that the road is being upgraded that he will explain to the other councils in his district why money will not be available for normal work on rural roads. However, I will obtain what information I can, although I stress that any information I obtain will be tentative. I would prefer, if the honourable member would agree that I do so, to wait for, say, four to six weeks, when I will know what is the exact position and give the honourable member a more positive reply.

#### UNION MEMBERSHIP

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry investigate the position of Port Noarlunga council employees who have been subjected to demands that they join the Australian Workers Union, to ensure that those employees have received fair treatment? If they have not, will the Minister take some action to protect these employees? About 70 persons are employed by this council, and last week the A.W.U. organizer attended an employees' meeting and requested, in strong terms, that they join the union. About

20 employees were not members, and those persons would neither join the union nor sign membership forms. However, they did pay to the organizer the amount of union dues and were given a receipt, although they refused to sign what is, I am told, a membership form. Three persons refused to pay any money or sign a membership form, and I understand that their case is to be taken up through the arbitration system. I am concerned (as are these people) that they have paid money. I understand that technically, because they have not signed a membership form, they are not members. It would be a most anomalous situation if they were forced to pay the union dues even though they did not join the union. If there is any native justice in the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Older!

Mr. HALL: —he will understand the objections of those concerned. Will the Minister therefore shed his generally antagonistic attitude on this matter and act to protect the employees concerned?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Having heard the member for Goyder's explanation and detail of the information that he has received in this matter, I can only take it as hearsay, but I am willing to hear the other side of the story. Although most members opposite probably will not agree, I know some will agree that where an award applies, as it does in most cases, especially in relation to district councils, conditions have been fought for by the trade union movement, and members have taken out union tickets to help the unions fight their case before the court for better wages and conditions. I am sure that the honourable member would not expect the people to whom he refers to be able to put out their hands and accept these privileges without making some contribution to the *organization that fought for those privileges* on their behalf. I will examine the situation, but in doing so I know that I shall find the situation different from that outlined by the honourable member.

#### HOUSING TRUST

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister in charge of housing, now reply to a series of questions I submitted last week about the Housing Trust? I understand that because of a mistake that occurred last week this reply was not given, but the Minister has now offered to supply it. I would point out, however, that, as indicated by the question asked earlier by the member for Torrens, there is a housing shortage in South Australia at present. I have heard that the delay in obtaining Housing Trust houses is increasing.

The SPEAKER: Older! The honourable member is now offering a comment, not an explanation, prior to receiving a reply to a question previously asked. The honourable Minister of Development and Mines.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As details of the question reached my office only last Friday, it was not possible to prepare the detailed information requested by the honourable member for Tuesday's sitting. However, the series of replies is now available and, as it is lengthy and predominantly statistical, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### HOUSING

1. *Question:* How many applications does the Housing Trust have before it at present?

*Answer:* The Housing Trust currently has 10 404 rental and 5 429 purchase applications on file. This is a corrected figure to allow for expected wastage.

2. *Question:* What proportions of the applications relate to the type of housing and purchase plans offered?

*Answer:* Rental applications can be broken down as follows:

Area	Cottage			Totals
	Houses	Flats	Flats	
Metropolitan.....	4 348	1 175	782	6 305
Elizabeth and Salisbury .	1 100	233	162	1 495
Christies.....	310	—	70	380
Whyalla.....	441	5	31	477
Other country areas . .	1 624	30	93	1 747
Total.....	7 823	1 443	1 138	10 404

From the above figures it will be seen that rental applications approximately double those of purchase.

3. *Question:* On average, how many applications are received weekly?

*Answer:* The average number of applications received each week is—rental 225, purchase 124.

4. *Question:* How many houses were built by the Housing Trust during 1973?

*Answer:* During 1973 the trust completed 1 440 dwellings. It should be noted, however, that the completion of 1 440 dwellings does not mean that that was the total people housed by the trust during 1973. The trust also housed a substantial number of people in buildings that were purchased and renovated and also houses that were vacated by tenants who were moving to private accommodation.

5. *Question:* Is there a delay in fulfilling applications, and if so, what is the cause of this delay?

*Answer:* Waiting List—There are varieties of reasons why the waiting list has increased rather than diminished and although these are listed, it should not be assumed that they are in order of importance. The analysis, however, should taken note of both demand and supply.

Demand—Budding costs have increased quite rapidly over the last few years, with the result that many young couples have become afraid of the size of the commitment they might have to enter into in the private sector, and therefore, have made application to the South Australian Housing Trust. As there has been an increase in interest rates with its resultant effect on the weekly payments, there has been a reduced capacity of families to purchase a house; this has resulted in families endeavouring to obtain public housing rather than go to the private industry. Consequently, applications to purchase houses from the trust have nearly doubled this financial year.

Since Housing Trust rents for existing tenants are low relative to the private sector, the vacancy rate has been dropping quite markedly. With prices of loans dearer outside and Housing Trust rents cheap, naturally more families stay where they are, even though they could well afford to move. An increasing social pressure on the Housing Trust to house socially disadvantaged families has had an effect on the waiting time. All these factors have increased the demand.

Supply—1. Shortage of labour and materials—The entire building industry has been active which means that tradesmen who are sub-contractors can negotiate higher remuneration in the speculative building field. It is still very difficult for the Housing Trust contractors to hold labour in spite of the reported shortage of finance in the private domestic market. It is significant that only this week, one of the Housing Trust's long-term contractors relinquished a contract of 52 houses at Ingle Farm on the ground that he could not get labour to fulfil the contract. During the last 12 months in particular, there have been small, but irritating, delays of material.

2. Delays in planning procedures outside the trust—The Housing Trust estimates that it takes about 132 weeks to turn raw land into usable blocks. However, it should be pointed out that the Housing Trust believes that this process is no slower in South Australia than in any other State, and indeed some New Zealand housing officers recently in Adelaide said that in their country the time span is three to five years.

3. Planning difficulties internal to the South Australian Housing Trust—It has been Government and trust policy to turn to some extent to innovative medium density type development. The traditional subdivision uses the road as a sort of service duct, down which pipes and wires are

taken, generally by the Engineering and Water Supply Department or other utilities, by mechanical means, and each house is hooked on to this service duct. In a medium density type development, the entire area must be planned in great detail from an engineering and architectural point of view, and the internal utility connections take on what can be described as a "tailor-made" arrangement. The internal plan for this type of building is very much more complicated than straightforward subdivisions. The greater social awareness of the importance of planning has meant that local government, public participation groups, and many planning criteria, must all be taken into account at great length before work can commence.

4. Finance—The South Australian Housing Trust is financed through two types of money: (i) cheap money—this is used for rental and rental purchase type houses; and (ii) dearer money—which is used for commercial and industrial projects, some developmental work and as an extra with some of the cheaper money. The South Australian Housing Trust, each financial year, has spent every dollar of cheap interest money allocated to it, and probably has spent more of the high interest money on rental and rental purchase accommodation than it should have, given the level of its rents. This financial year again, the total allocation of Commonwealth-State agreement money will be spent, and I believe that the South Australian Housing Trust will probably be the only Australian housing authority to achieve this. It should be added, however, that the new agreement has permitted part of the money to be spent on purchasing and upgrading of existing houses, but these are being added to the public sector stock. The South Australian Housing Trust is already mixing high interest money in some of its walk-up flats and medium density areas and to dilute the cheap money any further would result in very high rents indeed. It can be said, therefore, that the trust cannot go any faster within the present financial constraints.

#### CLARE WELFARE CENTRE

Mr. VENNING. Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether he intends to establish a community welfare centre at Clare? I had previously received correspondence from the Minister stating that his department would be represented at meetings in the country, at such places as Kadina and Port Pirie, where it was contemplated that community welfare consultation councils would be established. As Clare is in the Port Pirie area as regards servicing, I ask this question of the Minister.

The Hon. L. I KING. That is not intended on the present planning. The maximum number of community welfare centres that we are at present able to plan for, construct, equip, staff and service is 21, and to provide even that number will take a few years. It has been necessary to divide the State into 21 districts for that purpose and, consequently, we have had to select the centres that are most conveniently situated to service the whole of the State. In some instances, of course, this means that a community welfare centre will be situated some distance from the people whose needs are sought to be served by its operations. So on the present planning there is no proposal to establish a community welfare centre at Clare. Of course, I am not saying that at some future time that may not be possible. I hope that as the plan gains its full momentum and as further funds become available it will be possible to increase the number of centres, and districts will become correspondingly smaller. However, with the resources available at present, that will not happen for a considerable time. What may happen before then is the establishment of a branch office because, in areas where especially a town is remote from the community welfare centre, we are seeking to establish a smaller branch office that will make the services of the department more accessible to the residents of that locality, so that through the branch office they can gain easy

access to the full facilities of the community welfare centre. Therefore, one can hope that in Clare and other towns similarly situated it will be possible in the future to establish a branch office, but I cannot tell the honourable member that there are immediate plans to that end.

### OLD LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BUILDING

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: Thank you very much indeed, Mr. Speaker. I have just scored a century, having waited for over 100 minutes to ask a question.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot make comments such as that. There is no set procedure for calling members to ask questions except for the long-standing practice that the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy receive the call to ask the first two questions on the Opposition side. The call then alternates, and I try to give every member the opportunity to ask at least one question each day if time permits. However, in most cases, I have no control over the length of questions asked or replies given. The honourable member for Heysen.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. McANANEY: I sat through Question Time yesterday without receiving a call. I politely approached you afterwards, Mr. Speaker, and you assured me that I would have the opportunity to ask the third question today. However, it is because I was not given that opportunity that I have referred to this matter as I have.

Will the Premier say what plans the Government has in relation to the old Legislative Council building? Does it intend to renovate the building or remove part of it at the rear when the Railways Institute transfers to other premises? This building is one of the biggest eyesores in Adelaide at present: although it is in a good position with lovely surroundings, it is in a shocking state. I consider that the old square room at the rear, where the first South Australian Parliament met, could be transferred to the Botanic Garden and maintained as a place of historical interest. In any event, something must be done as soon as the Railways Institute vacates this building.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the honourable member will be aware that this building has a National Trust "A" classification, and the Government intends to preserve the structure and use it, I understand, as a Parliamentary museum. Perhaps we could even put the honourable member in it! I think that if the Government intended to do anything with the building other than use it as a Parliamentary museum the announcement would be met with howls of protest.

### FRUIT FLY

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Premier say whether the Government will establish forthwith temporary road blocks on all major roads entering Riverland from the metropolitan area? The threat of fruit fly from the metropolitan area of Adelaide being introduced into Riverland is probably far more serious now than the threat of its coming from other States. It is considered that temporary road blocks should be established for at least two months, until the crisis passes in Adelaide. The consensus of opinion is that unless road blocks are established west of Riverland it will be farcical to maintain the road block on the eastern

side of the river. Will the Premier initiate a move to have road blocks established in order to ensure that fruit fly does not become established in Riverland?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the matter with my colleague in order to ascertain whether it is practicable to introduce such road blocks.

### BUILDING TRADESMEN

Mr. MATHWIN: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Labour and Industry, can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government is trying to interest or encourage tradesmen to migrate from other countries to South Australia? The Minister should be aware of the lack of journeymen, particularly in the building industry, and the extreme shortage of bricklayers. Although the new apprenticeship scheme is now operating, it will be a slow process (and I am sure the Minister would agree with that statement) and for many years the flow of tradesmen from this scheme will never overtake the existing demand in this industry.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: With the advent of the Australian Labor Government the situation changed, and there is now a shortage of skilled and unskilled workmen in most areas of the work force. I know that the Minister is aware of these shortages, but, as I am not sure what action he may be taking to encourage skilled and unskilled workmen to migrate, I will refer the question to him and ask him to reply to the honourable member.

### HOSPITAL PROJECTS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Treasurer say what terms and conditions have been placed on the recently announced grant of \$650 000 for urgent State hospital projects made by the Commonwealth Government, and is the "sympathetic consideration" for the granting of a further \$700 000 for the completion of the Hillcrest project dependent on the fulfilling of these or other terms and conditions? We know that many special grants have been made to the State at the expense of the customary grant for general revenue. Usually conditions have been attached by the Commonwealth Government, and the latest grant includes \$150 000 for initiating a project to help relieve the situation at Hillcrest, work at which will cost \$700 000. It is being asked in the community what guarantee has the State Government that this sum will be forthcoming and to what extent the Commonwealth Government will be allowed to intrude into State hospital affairs as a result of this State's acceptance of the grant. In other words, is this part of the Commonwealth Government's plan to achieve nationalization via the back door?

The SPEAKER: Order! The latter part of the honourable member's question is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only conditions of which I am aware that have been imposed on the grant is that we spend the money before June 30. The Commonwealth Government was apprised of the fact that these were urgent projects, and it wanted the money to be spent immediately. I know of no other conditions. There is no question of centralization or nationalization, because the aim of the Commonwealth Government is to help: it has done this and we should be grateful for the help.

*At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ALDERMAN'S STATEMENT**

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow the Leader of the Opposition to make a personal explanation.

Mr. Millhouse: What's this about?

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not necessary to suspend Standing Orders, provided that the honourable Leader seeks leave to make a personal explanation.

Dr EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. EASTICK: Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Transport said that he would like an assurance from me in relation to a matter that is of current interest. I point out that the statement of Alderman Spencer, referred to by the Minister of Transport, is his and his alone, and its validity must be his responsibility. I go further and say that it does not reflect the views of either my Party or me. Regarding the inference that can be drawn from the statement of the Minister of Transport that Alderman Spencer is a member of the Party of which I am the Parliamentary Leader, Alderman Spencer has not been a financial member of this Party for some time. He withdrew when the Party saw fit to cease a practice that had been in vogue for some time; that is, of nominating persons as candidates in elections for the Adelaide City Council. This procedure no longer applies, and I believe the Minister is fully aware of that situation. I want it to be recorded so that there can be no misunderstanding of the facts.

**JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 34—After clause 33 insert new clause 33a as follows:

33a. *Amendment of third schedule to the principal Act.* The third schedule to the principal Act is amended by inserting after the passage—

“University professors and lecturers, and the Registrar of.”

the passage—

“Academic staff of any college of advanced education, and the director or the Registrar of.”

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to. It is a simple amendment relating to exemption from jury service. It has been observed that the present Act provides for an exemption for university professors, lecturers, and school teachers, but does not provide exemption for academic staff of colleges of advanced education. When the Act was passed, no such institution existed, and the deficiency is now remedied by this amendment. As it was adopted by the Council, I recommend that it be accepted by the Committee.

Mr. RODDA: I welcome the Attorney's acceptance of this sensible amendment. It pleases Opposition members that someone on the Government side can see some good coming from the other place, which, in all cases, justifies its existence.

Motion carried.

**GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 27. Page 2803.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): This short Bill has some interesting connotations. First it seeks to put into modern parlance some of the technical terms used in the principal Act. Gas was originally sold in multiples of 1 000 cub. ft., and more recently it has been sold by the therm. Instead of referring to the calorific value, we are now to refer to the heating value. The South Australian Gas Company, which operates under a private Act, has to produce a product that is checked and tested several times a week by the gas examiner of the Chemistry Department to ensure that the gas is of a certain standard. Instead of using the British thermal unit we will be using megajoules to indicate the heating value. Under the principal Act a rental was charged for a meter if less than 300 cub. ft. of gas was used. This is now going to be 10 cub. metres, which is about 353 cub. ft., so the consumer is going to get the better of the bargain.

The financial responsibilities and control regarding the bonds and shares in the Gas Company have been controlled by the Treasurer of the State, under the provisions of section 27 of the principal Act, which has been amended several times. The Treasurer has the final say in two aspects of the financial operation of the company. An upper limit is imposed on the dividends that can be paid on the shares, which are held by many thousands of South Australians. If the company makes a profit, the dividend is controlled by the Treasurer. The rate of interest paid on bonds issued to the public and guaranteed by the Government is controlled by the Treasurer in the same way as he controls the rate of interest on debentures or bond issues made by the Electricity Trust of South Australia. The dividends being paid on shares have fallen behind what is regarded as the normal rate, especially in relation to bond issues. The shares are not guaranteed by the Government but the bonds issued to the public on a public float are guaranteed by the Government. This Bill removes the upper limit applying to the interest rate so that it will not be necessary to change the Act whenever the rate becomes outmoded. I believe this will be an easier way of undertaking this financial control. Since this Act was last considered the company has expanded its operations to Whyalla and Mount Gambier. These places, together with Adelaide and Port Pirie, supply bottled gas, which is now being used in many motor vehicles. I believe this is a machinery matter that can only operate to the benefit of a South Australian company in which many thousands of ordinary citizens are participating either by way of a shareholding or the holding of bonds. The Mount Gambier plant is operated by the Colonial Gas Company and not the Victorian Gas and Fuel Company. The reference to Mount Gambier in the speech of the Minister was to ensure that the standard of gas is uniform. The Bill offers protection to the consumer, and I support it.

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

**LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL  
(GENERAL)**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 27. Page 2804.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I have carefully considered these amendments to the Act, and I support the Bill.

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

# **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 27. Page 2804.)

Mr RODDA (Victoria): This short Bill consolidates the Act regarding the metropolitan abattoirs, which are controlled by the South Australian Meat Corporation. Our colleague in another place (Hon. Mr. Story) has referred to the publicity that the abattoirs have received recently, and I am sure it is of interest to all landholders that the Minister of Agriculture has said that he will consider the matters raised and inform the Hon. Mr. Story by letter on them.

The Opposition supports this Bill. It is interesting that clause 2 includes "buffaloes" in the definition section. These animals are being treated at the metropolitan abattoirs, and I am sure that all producers will applaud the action that will be taken to control tuberculosis and brucellosis. If we are to value and extend this work (and we should extend it by market research), we should include buffaloes in the definitions. Clause 3 redefines the metropolitan abattoirs area, and other clauses make metric conversions and deal with superannuation. We and our colleagues in another place have considered the Bill, and I have pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): Whilst this Bill has not wide ramifications regarding the South Australian Meat Corporation, it raises the question of the extension of the corporation's authority and the clearer definition of that authority. The member for Victoria merely alluded to the recent controversy about the corporation: he did not elaborate. I believe that we must consider more carefully the operation of this corporation. We know the criticism that was made of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, and we in this Parliament as well as other people in the community know of the rapidly escalating charges made by the new corporation for killing and slaughtering stock at the abattoirs. Many people consider that these charges are exorbitant and far beyond what they ought to be in comparison with charges in other States. Some people say that they can export live animals from this State, have them killed in another State, bring them back here, pay the inspection charge, and still incur a lower charge than the corporation charges at Cavan.

It seems to me that the Government's move to revamp the management of these abattoirs has not succeeded, certainly not from the point of view of the producers, who must now pay significantly increased charges. I expect that, because of the continual move for increased wages at the abattoirs, charges will increase in future. Whilst a producer must expect to pay increased charges, the charges are getting significantly out of step compared to charges, in other parts of Australia.

As recently as March 19 an export study showed that the Gepps Cross abattoir would face significant losses because of extended slaughtering facilities that would not be needed. That is a matter of significance to the corporation. The Chairman of the corporation replied to that report, stating that the savings to be made from operating two new chains, designed with all the latest equipment and techniques, alone economically justified their construction. He also said that the Government works should have substantial excess capacity to provide slaughter facilities

during exceptional peaks of production. Since then, the originator of the study has again entered the discussion. He maintains that his arguments in his report are correct. He supports this by saying that the new chains are not needed, as there will not be sufficient stock available to ensure that they are fully used. Mr. Lindner states:

The study mentioned did, in fact, take account of all relevant factors affecting profitability, including the lower operating costs of the more efficient new plant, but still found that large losses would result from operating two additional chains.

This is a matter of great significance, when one considers the rather extreme rate of charging that already exists under the South Australian Meat Corporation at Gepps Cross. Mr. Lindner also states:

In particular, it should be noted that it will be possible to reduce total operating costs only if two of the existing sheep killing chains are scrapped and replaced by the two new chains.

However, if as has been claimed, the two new chains are, instead, part of an expansion programme to create "substantial excess capacity to provide slaughter facilities during exceptional peak loads" then it is inevitable that operating costs will increase.

This is not the time or the place to develop a long debate on the basic problems at Gepps Cross. However, when I move amongst producers at the Gepps Cross abattoir and read this expert report by a person who has no axe to grind, I find evidence of general disquiet about charges at the abattoir and some alarm that they may increase in the way indicated in this expert study.

It is up to the Minister and the Government to be more frank about the future activities of the abattoir and about what is happening now. More detailed reports should be given of the operations of the new corporation, which is not automatically doing a good job simply because it is there and was created by the Government. Apparently, there is still an inevitable "giving in" in relation to industrial disputes at the abattoir. I ask the Minister to pay regard to this expert study. I believe it is up to the Minister to answer questions relating to the abattoir. The Chairman of the corporation should not be left to defend his own vested interest. I hope that the Minister will report impartially to Parliament on what is an important matter to consumers and producers.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. There is disquiet in the community about certain activities at the abattoir, but much misunderstanding has occurred. It has been a problem of communication. I do not want to imply that I accept that all is well; I will need proof before I accept that. Yesterday I asked the Premier a question about meat prices, having regard to the fact that the price increase in South Australia has been 2.2 per cent, which is well above the national average of 1.3 per cent. In reply, the Premier said that charges for killing meat in South Australia were no higher than those anywhere else in Australia, but that is not so. Many people in the industry are interested in this matter, a survey of the costs having been undertaken. I have statistics of comparisons of slaughtering costs in the various States. As this is statistical information, I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: I point out that the Bill does not deal with the general activities of the South Australian Meat Corporation, but contains specific provisions

Leave granted.

## COMPARISON OF BEEF SLAUGHTERING AND HANDLING CHARGES BASED ON BEEF OF 350 LB. (158.78 KG) DRESSED WEIGHT

Charges for:	Gepps Cross S.A. \$	Richmond Vic. \$	Derwent Park Tas. \$	Midland Junction W.A. \$	Cannon Hill Qld. \$	Homebush N.S.W. \$
Branding at Saleyards—Droving or carting—						
Works.....	1.00	—	—	—	0.08	—
Contract.....	—	0.08	—	0.25	—	—
Killing a head.....	14.50	5.60	7.96	13.33	11.10	13.69
Delivery charges—Works.....	3.10	—	—	—	0.35	—
Delivery charges—Contract.....	—	3.50	1.85	2.00	2.62	3.10
Other charges—Offal.....	—	2.65	—	—	—	—
Total charges a head.....	18.60	12.55	9.81	15.58	14.15	16.79
Cost a pound.....	.05.314	.03.586	.02.803	.04.451	.04.043	.04.797

N.B.—Additional charges may be levied in some cases if slaughtering of stock does not take place on the day following delivery to the works, e.g., Gepps Cross 50c/head a day; Midland Junction 30c/head a day.

## COMPARISON OF MUTTON SLAUGHTERING AND HANDLING CHARGES BASED ON MUTTON OF 44 LB. (19.94 KG) DRESSED WEIGHT

Charges for:	Gepps Cross S.A. \$	Richmond Vic. \$	Derwent Park Tas. \$	Midland Junction W.A. \$	Cannon Hill Qld. \$	Homebush N.S.W. \$
Branding at Saleyards—Droving or carting—						
Works.....	0.10	—	—	—	0.05	—
Contract.....	—	0.10	—	0.02	—	—
Killing a head.....	1.90	0.84	1.27	1.90	1.84	1.77
Delivery charges—						
Works.....	0.30	—	—	—	0.09	—
Contract.....	—	0.44	0.22-5	0.22	0.33	0.26
Other charges—Offal.....	—	0.53	—	—	—	—
Total charges a head.....	2.30	1.91	1.49-5	2.14	2.31	2.03
Cost a pound.....	.05.227	.04.341	.03.398	.04.864	.05.25	.04.614

N.B.—Additional charges may be levied in some cases if slaughtering of stock does not take place on the day following delivery to the works, e.g., Gepps Cross and Midland Junction 8c/head a day.

## COMPARISON OF LAMB SLAUGHTERING AND HANDLING CHARGES BASED ON LAMB AT 32 LB. (14.51 KG) DRESSED WEIGHT

Charges for:	Gepps Cross S.A. \$	Richmond Vic. \$	Derwent Park Tas. \$	Midland Junction W.A. \$	Cannon Hill Qld. \$	Homebush N.S.W. \$
Branding at Saleyards—Droving or carting—						
Works.....	0.10	—	—	—	0.05	—
Contract.....	—	0.10	—	0.02	—	—
Killing a head.....	1.90	0.68	1.27	1.77	1.84	1.77
Delivery charges—						
Works.....	0.30	—	—	—	0.09	—
Contract.....	—	0.32	0.22-5	0.22	0.24	0.26
Other charges—Offal.....	—	0.53	—	—	—	—
Total charges a head.....	2.30	1.63	1.49.5	2.01	2.22	2.03
Cost a pound.....	.07.188	.05.094	.04.672	.06.563	.06.938	.06.344

N.B.—Additional charges may be levied in some cases if slaughtering of stock does not take place on the day following delivery to the works, e.g., Gepps Cross and Midland Junction 8c/head a day.

## COMPARISON OF PIG SLAUGHTERING AND HANDLING CHARGES BASED ON PIGS OF 75 LB. (34.01 KG) DRESSED WEIGHT

Charges for:	Gepps Cross S.A. \$	Richmond Vic. \$	Derwent Park Tas. \$	Midland Junction W.A. \$	Cannon Hill Qld. \$	Homebush N.S.W. \$
Branding at Saleyards—Droving or carting—						
Works.....	0.30	—	—	—	0.05	—
Contract.....	—	0.30	—	0.20	—	—
Killing a head.....	3.70	2.00	3.80	4.31	2.60	3.26
Delivery charges—						
Works.....	0.60	—	—	—	0.09	—
Contract.....	—	0.75	0.44	0.38	0.56	0.65
Other charges—Offal.....	—	0.70	—	—	—	—
Total charges a head.....	4.60	3.75	4.24	4.89	3.30	3.91
Cost a pound.....	.06.133	.05.000	.05.653	.06.520	.04.400	.05.213

N.B.—Additional charges may be levied in some cases if slaughtering of stock does not take place on the day following delivery to the works, e.g., Gepps Cross 32c/head a day; Midland Junction 8c/head a day.

Dr. EASTICK: To obtain comparable charges to the Gepps Cross charges, in the case of some States that do not provide a service that lines up with the Gepps Cross service, it has been necessary to include outside contract charges. The following information relating to the comparison tables was supplied on February 21 by Mr. G. B. Hooper:

In the case of the Richmond abattoir in Victoria, the owner of the livestock does not receive the offal from the particular animal as is the case in other States, so I have added in the charges for that works the cost of the offal at ruling wholesale rates. At the Derwent Park abattoir in Tasmania, drafting and branding costs do not apply as these are charged back to the owner of livestock prior to the sale, and at Homebush in New South Wales the killing charge includes the costs of droving and branding. In the Case of the killing charge for a 350lb. body of beef at Gepps Cross, I have taken an average charge between \$13.50 for a body of beef weighing 251 to 350lb. and \$15.50 for a body of beef weighing 351 to 450lb., because I think it is fair enough to assume that if a butcher is intending to trade using a 350 lb. average body of beef that 50 per cent would come under the higher per head rate and 50 per cent under the lower rate.

The cost of killing has been based on charges which were levied through January, 1974, so it is quite possible that some increases may have taken place in some areas at the date of writing, but the exercise will still serve to show the variation between the States. It is obvious that the private works, in the instance of Victoria and Tasmania, levy a much lower charge than the works run by Government authorities in other States. If you draw a comparison between South Australia and Victoria, it will be said that Gepps Cross has to maintain a facility to provide a service to the industry, but if you take into account the killing capacity of export registered works in South Australia and export registered works in Victoria in relation to the livestock numbers within the two States, I would think that this claim could be disproved.

In connection with the upgrading of the abattoir, the question of an outside authority must be raised. If we want to maintain the proportion of export trade, which is an essential part of this State's meat industry, the requirements regarding the abattoir will be determined by the United States Agriculture Department and the overseas countries that purchase meat from us.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): In supporting the Bill, I refer to the survey conducted by the university experts. I do not think they examined the situation over a sufficiently long period. Admittedly, South Australia's sheep population has decreased considerably in the last one or two years. However, the abattoirs has been unable for many years to kill sheep or lambs for all months of the year without excessive overtime being worked. This matter can therefore be examined from two angles: first, the workmen become dissatisfied under the stress and strain of working long hours (and it is therefore unsatisfactory from that viewpoint); secondly, it is unsatisfactory in relation to killing costs, as overtime rates are making sheep and lamb killing much more expensive. With the two extra chains, overtime will not have to be worked, and this will involve a major saving in costs.

Mr. Nankivell: I'll bet that doesn't happen.

Mr. McANANEY: I am merely advancing an argument in favour of what is being done. I am also coming around to the argument against it. One wonders what will happen to the men working on the extra two chains during the eight or nine months when those chains are not needed. The university experts conducting the survey would not have had sufficient information as to what was happening on the land or, indeed, of future prospects. Even in the past, the facilities at the abattoir have not been sufficient to enable it to cope with the normal seasonal flush of

sheep killing (we have about 15 000 000 sheep in this State) without excessive overtime having to be worked and without strain being placed on the workers.

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

#### DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 27. Page 2804.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): This Bill is similar to others that have been introduced relating to people who have obtained qualifications in their profession or speciality in other countries or centres. It highlights that, throughout the world, standards of professional ability, training and teaching do vary. The same position has applied to the registration of medical graduates from overseas.

If this Bill passes, provision will be made regarding the registration of foreign dentists. A committee has been established to examine the qualifications of medical practitioners, and registration may be granted. Provisional registration also may be granted if the experience of these people is in doubt, or if the validity of their qualifications is in doubt. It is possible for people from overseas to satisfy the board and be registered fully, without any strings attached. However, those who cannot satisfy the board may be granted provisional registration so that they may work and practise, usually in a dental hospital, under the supervision of qualified dentists. On receipt of a report on their skills and activities, the board may grant full registration.

The whole matter of reciprocity of qualifications, as I have said previously in this House, should be examined far more deeply than has been the case until now. It seems absurd that some sort of general standard should not be agreed on between countries to cover people who have trained in English-speaking countries and have fulfilled the requirements of their course. The difficulty in Australia and the United States is that registration is a State matter in each country, and it is necessary for each State authority to agree with another State authority, but I do not consider this agreement is impossible to achieve, and general agreement should be reached.

Therefore, I should like the Health Department to examine the possibility of arranging reciprocity especially with the States in the U.S. (we already have reciprocity with the United Kingdom) so that graduates from America may register in South Australia without doing more than going through the formality of proving their qualifications. Otherwise, there is nothing more in the Bill to which I object, and I support it.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): Whilst the original second reading explanation deals with five clauses, the Bill as received from the other place contains 12 clauses. Except for clause 6, the other seven clauses seem to refer mainly to changes from the specified set fee in certain areas (such as the licence fee for a dental clinic) so as to allow the matters to be dealt with by regulation in future. It is sensible to make that change, and we often provide for it in Bills. Therefore, I have no hesitation in supporting those clauses. I do not suggest that I will enter the area dealt with in clause 11, which refers to where appeals shall lie. There are sufficient members on both sides with the necessary expertise and skill to examine that clause and make any comments that are necessary. Clause 6 refers to dental auxiliaries and this part of the Act was last altered in 1971.



When the legislation was previously before the House to amend this Act ("dental operatives" then became "dental auxiliaries"), I submitted that it was the aim of dental technicians, as a recognized body, to achieve chair-side status in this profession in South Australia, as similar bodies have already achieved it in Tasmania, and as it is likely to be achieved in Victoria. The aims of this body have not changed. These people would like their aim achieved under this legislation or under a separate Act. From recent discussions I have had with the President and Secretary of this organization, I understand that there is no dissatisfaction in the ranks at present about what is being achieved. I sympathize with the aims of this body. In total this Bill has only 12 clauses. I have examined the latter seven clauses fairly closely, making use of the second reading explanation. I find nothing in the first five clauses with which I am in conflict. Therefore, I support the Bill.

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

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day (Other Business), lapsed from Wednesday, March 27, 1974, to be considered before Order of the Day (Government Business) No. 5.

I point out that it is customary, when private members' time has elapsed for the session, to allow at the end of the session a vote on the matters, without further debate. I am making provision now for members to vote, without further debate, on the private members' business that lapsed from the earlier part of the session (in other words, Orders of the Day, Other Business, that are listed on the Notice Paper).

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I oppose the motion. This is a trick by the Government to get out of considering Notices of Motion (Other Business) Nos. 1 and 2, which are standing on the Notice Paper in my name, and Notices of Motion (Other Business) Nos. 1 and 2 which are standing in the names of the members for Goyder and Playford. I believe this is a shabby trick by the Government. On Tuesday, I tried to suspend Standing Orders to enable me to move a motion of censure against the Government. For my pains, I was sent out of the House. This is the first time in my experience that the Government has ducked a censure motion. To add insult to injury, on Tuesday this week the circumstances were precisely the same as those applying the previous Wednesday, when the Government said that it always gave time for a censure motion to be moved. Probably I need not remind members of what the Premier said on that occasion when a motion was moved not by the Leader of the so-called Opposition but by the member for Goyder, a private member. On that occasion, the Premier said that the Government always accepted such a motion. He said:

I support the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders, and I do so in accordance with the constant tradition of Governments in this State, always observed by this Government, that if any motion of no confidence is proposed an immediate way will be made for it to be moved and debated.

That is what the Premier said when the member for Goyder moved to suspend Standing Orders so that he could move a no-confidence motion. Yet last Tuesday, when I did precisely the same thing, I was told that I was abusing the processes of the House, and I was slung out. The Government ducked the issue because it did not like some of the things to which my motion referred.

The next day, I gave notice of the motion, in accordance with Standing Orders. There was no question of suspending Standing Orders. I gave notice for today of a censure motion. No doubt the Government is trying by a snide trick (and I believe dishonestly) to avoid any debate on this matter. This is very bad. Why does the Government want to avoid the censure motion that I have on the Notice Paper, and also the introduction of a Bill to amend the Wrongs Act that is designed to do something which the Premier himself tried to do 14 years ago? Why will the Government not allow these matters to be dealt with? If Parliament prorogues today, we will be doing so about a fortnight earlier than was the case in 1972. There is no earthly reason of which I know why we should not sit next week. I was amazed to hear the Premier say that he was not going overseas until April 6, although I point out that I never suggested that he was going overseas at the end of this week.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You didn't?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I never suggested that, but there has been much comment since last Tuesday about the Premier's holiday of eight weeks.

Mr. Harrison: What about the holiday you had this week?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suggest to the honourable member that his Party made a rather bad political blunder in throwing me out, because it drew attention to the whole matter. However, I guess they have raked over that matter amongst themselves. Of course, there has been much comment about the eight-week holiday that the Premier is to have on the Riviera, in the South of France, beginning on April 6, and being broken only by his return to South Australia (at the taxpayer's expense) because of so-called urgent business, which is undoubtedly no more than the Senate election campaign. If he can do that, why cannot this House sit for another week and deal with the business on the Notice Paper, and let the old gentlemen upstairs deal with the Bills that we have rushed through this afternoon? What has happened this afternoon is an absolute farce: we have passed a number of Bills that will have to go into limbo unless they are passed by another place today.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Those Bills came from another place, and you haven't been following them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have made a mistake, then.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You aren't here long enough to know what's going on.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Now I have given the Premier the opening he needed. I made a mistake, and I take back what I said. But why cannot we go on and deal with the matters that I have enumerated in the motion, on which, I must say, I am looking for a bit of support from Liberal and Country League members? I am amazed that during this week, the last week of the session, they have sat there supine the whole time and done nothing. On second thoughts, one cannot sit supine: they have sat there like suet pudding and done absolutely nothing to disturb the even tenor of the Government, except perhaps for the member for Davenport's attempt regarding the fruit fly infestation (he did not persist even with that).

Mr. Goldsworthy: The trouble is that you aren't here long enough to know what goes on.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Kavel has shown this afternoon how content he is to play junior partner to the Government. He got up and talked about how well he went at the conference that he attended.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He wasn't even at the conference.

The SPEAKER: Order! I fully realize that this is the last day of the session, but—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope it is not!

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member for Mitcham, as I have done many times, that in a motion to suspend Standing Orders two members are permitted to advance their views on the motion. However, this is not an open debate on any matter at all, and the honourable member for Mitcham can refer only to the motion. He must confine his remarks to the reason for suspension.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He ought to attend a bit more often.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is little more that I can say.

Mr. Venning: Say something!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently the member for Rocky River is also happy to play junior partner to the Government.

Mr. Venning: No, I just want you to say something.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It will be interesting to see how the honourable member votes. This is the first time that I can recall the Government ducking a censure motion, and there is no reason why it should do so. We have time to deal with this matter, just as we have time next week to sit in this place and deal with the matters of business that I have enumerated in the motion. I refer to such things as the boating legislation, which may be said to have gone by the board because the Upper House has appointed a Select Committee on it. I noticed the pathetic glee of the Minister of Labour and Industry when I cited in my motion the meat strike at the abattoirs. If that is the only sort of glee that he can show, it is time we did a bit of debating and dealt with a few of these issues such as, for instance, the rocketing cost of living, and so on.

If the Government will not do this, it shows that it is frightened of the issue. I believe that it is frightened, above all, of the issue to which I referred last Tuesday: the matter of press officers and what happens on the eleventh floor of the State Administration Centre building. The Government realizes that, if this motion succeeds, these matters will be debated, just as Government members have debated them amongst themselves. I promise the Government that, if those matters are not debated today, they will be debated in due course, in any case.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the whole House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question "That Standing Orders be suspended." For the question say "Aye", against "No".

Mr. Millhouse: No!

The SPEAKER: As there is a dissentient voice, a division is necessary. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Langley No—Mr. Russack.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.  
Motion thus carried.

## VAUGHAN HOUSE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That in the opinion of this House, particularly because of the happenings of the last fortnight, there should be a full and independent inquiry into the administration of Vaughan House and the methods of rehabilitation being used there.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2119.)

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

That the question be now put.

Motion carried.

The House divided on Mr. Millhouse's motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Russack. No—Mr. Langley.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

## NATIONAL HEALTH SCHEME

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hall:

That in view of the provocative statements made by Mr. Hayden, Commonwealth Minister for Social Security, and the apparent determination of the Commonwealth Labor Government to proceed with fundamental and authoritarian alterations to our medical and health services, the Government of South Australia should request the Prime Minister to re-evaluate his plans and arrange a working conference with State Ministers, members of the medical profession, and representatives of private hospital managements before proceeding,

which Dr. Tonkin had moved to amend by leaving out all words after "Prime Minister" and inserting the following:

to arrange a working conference with State Ministers, members of the nursing and medical professions, representatives of hospital funds, representatives of private hospitals, and other interested parties with a view to improving the present health scheme, by covering all low-income earners, while still preserving the advantages of the present scheme in maintaining the highest standards of health care.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1427.)

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

That the question be now put.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I wished to exercise my right of reply, but I cannot hear what the Premier has said.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You can't do that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has moved "That the question be now put", and that motion supercedes all other motions that can be moved.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is "That the amendment be agreed to." Those in favour say "Aye", against "No". The "Noes" have it.

Dr. Tonkin: Divide!

The House divided on Dr. Tonkin's amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr Russack. No—Mr. Langley.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Arnold, Beckei, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allen. No—Mr. Langley.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

#### **FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Order of the Day, Other Business No. 3: Mr. Mathwin to move:

That he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Film Classification Act, 1971.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): As the subject matter of this Order of the Day was the subject of another Bill, I move:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

#### **CASINO**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Evans:

That in the opinion of this House a casino should not be built in South Australia.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1033.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

#### **POSTAL CHARGES**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Blacker:

That in view of the sharp increases of postal charges proposed in the Commonwealth Budget, this House requests the Government to intervene with the Prime Minister requesting him not to proceed with those increases which will adversely affect newspapers and periodicals, especially as they affect country newspapers serving country people.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1434.)

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

That the question be now put.

Motion carried.

Mr. Blacker's motion negated.

#### **CONSUMER CREDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 26. Page 964.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That this Bill be read and discharged.

The Attorney-General has already accepted the idea embodied in the Bill and has made it the subject of a regulation.

Bill read and discharged.

#### **PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hall:

That in view of the confusion surrounding the proposal to build a petro-chemical plant at Redcliffs on Spencer Gulf and the possible conflict that may arise with the Commonwealth Government concerning the export of petroleum liquids, the Government should inform the House:

- (a) whether it has a legally binding letter of intent from every company required to participate in the construction;
- (b) whether it has the unqualified approval of the Commonwealth Government for the export of liquid petroleum from South Australia; and
- (c) whether it will give an absolute assurance that the environment and ecology of Spencer Gulf and its surroundings will be fully protected before any constructions commence.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1037.)

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker,—

The SPEAKER: The honourable Deputy Premier.

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

That the question be now put.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, I was on my feet and speaking.

Mr. Millhouse: Well before the Minister got up.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. HALL: The point of order is that I was on my feet to exercise my right to reply to the debate on this motion, and I was speaking. I was on my feet before any Minister rose and I was speaking before any Minister spoke. That was audible I believe you could hear it. Therefore, I would like you to rule that I have a right of reply.

The SPEAKER: The practice of this House is that, when two members rise, it is left to the discretion of the Speaker as to which member shall get the call. On this occasion, I gave the call to the Deputy Premier.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, I was on my feet before any Minister had risen.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's what you say.

Mr. HALL: There's no doubt about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member rose on a point of order and now he is rambling on about something other than a point of order. I do not uphold the point of order, because, as I have previously ruled, when two members rise to speak to a matter it is left to the discretion of the Speaker as to who gets the call. On this occasion, I called the Deputy Premier.

Mr. MILLHOUSE moved:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham must bring it up in writing.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 133 provides:

When two or more members rise together to speak—

Mr. Mathwin: Rise together!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Standing Order provides:

When two or more members rise together to speak, the Speaker shall call upon the member who, in his opinion, first rose in his place.

No ruling is required of the Speaker by that Standing Order. It is merely an exercise of the Speaker's opinion and, in those circumstances, the point of order that I raise is whether there can be any disagreement to the Speaker's "ruling", because the Speaker has not given a ruling: he has exercised discretion.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order 133 provides that, when two members rise, it shall be left to the Speaker as to who gets the call. On a point of order raised by the honourable member for Goyder, I ruled in accordance

with Standing Order 133, and I interpret my decision in accordance with that Standing Order. Every honourable member then has the right to dispute my ruling as far as any Standing Order or point of order is concerned, and I rule on this occasion that the honourable member for Mitcham has disputed the ruling I gave in accordance with Standing Order 133. The honourable member for Mitcham has brought up the following:

That I move to disagree to your ruling that the honourable member for Goyder had not got the call to reply, but that the Minister of Works be allowed to move the gag, on the ground that the member for Goyder was already on his feet and speaking when you called the Minister.

In accordance with the reason for disagreement to the Speaker's ruling as given to me, I must rule this disagreement out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order. If you are going to be as technical as that and deny us the right to disagree to your ruling, then you are a very poor Speaker indeed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will withdraw that remark. It is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will withdraw that remark if you will give me the opportunity—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE—to reword my reason.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will withdraw that remark in an unqualified way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will you give me the opportunity—

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member in accordance with Standing Order 169. The honourable member must withdraw that remark in an unqualified way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I withdraw. Now, may I have the opportunity to reword the disagreement that I have moved to your ruling?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled on that matter and that matter is now not open to renegotiation so far as the honourable member for Mitcham is concerned.

Mr. HALL: Well, Mr Speaker, I disagree to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no ruling to disagree to. The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member wants to disregard the authority of the Chair, I will have no hesitation in warning him also, under Standing Order 169 There is no ruling before the Chair.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is your prerogative to send me out of the House if you want to and I shall go if the House votes me out. All I ask—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member rose on a point of order. What is the point of order?

Mr. HALL: The point of order is that I disagree to the ruling that you gave saying that you would recognize the Minister of Works and not me, and I am disagreeing to that ruling.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. There is no ruling before the House.

Mr. HALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I claim my right of reply.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before this House is—

Mr. HALL: What is the question?

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is "That the question be now put."

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, I was speaking—

The SPEAKER: Order! That motion cannot be debated, and the Speaker is on his feet. The question is "That the question be now put."

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I take a point of order. At some stage, you have ruled, and it does not matter how far back it was in this argument. I surely can disagree to your ruling. You are saying that I cannot disagree. I ask you to rule whether I have the right to disagree, and surely that will be a ruling that you must give.

The SPEAKER: At this stage, I cannot uphold the point of order, as there is no ruling before the Chair I have referred to a Standing Order, and that is all that is before the House in this connection. I now put the motion "That the question be now put."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move to disagree to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham in accordance with Standing Order 169. This is the second and last warning, as I have already warned him once. There is no ruling to be considered; therefore there can be no debate, nor can a point of order be taken.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask you to give a ruling whether or not the member for Goyder is entitled to reply to this debate. I do not—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member persists in defying the authority of the Chair, Standing Orders will prevail. There is no ruling. That being the case, no point of order about a ruling is permissible. The motion before the Chair is "That the question be now put."

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. HALL: I ask that there be a point of order. You are giving ruling after ruling, and you will not allow us to question your rulings. I should like to move a vote of no confidence in you. If you will not allow—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no Speaker's ruling before the House. Therefore, there can be no point of order on the matter. The question before the House is "That the question be now put."

Mr. DEAN BROWN. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to move to disagree to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has his last opportunity in accordance with Standing Order 169.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought you were sitting down when you said I had my last chance.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is "That the question be now put." For the question say "Aye"—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I desire to move—

The SPEAKER: I name the honourable member for Mitcham in accordance with Standing Order 169. As I have named the honourable member, in accordance with Standing Order 169 he has the right to make an explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret very much what has happened in the last 10 minutes, and it was not of my making that it should happen. Whatever you, Sir, may say are the technicalities of the situation, what you have

been doing is denying the member for Goyder the right to reply. Then you have said persistently that there has been no ruling before the Chair, so that no-one can disagree to your ruling. I should have thought that was an absurd situation to allow to develop. It is doubly unfortunate that this should happen right in the last hours of this session and on the last day in this Parliament of the member for Goyder. All the member for Goyder wanted to do was to reply to the debate. You, Sir, if I may say so, have acted absolutely unfairly in what you have done.

When I wanted to move a motion of no confidence in you because of your persistence in defeating any attempt to disagree to what you had done (which must be a ruling), you named me. With complete sincerity, I ask you to reconsider what has happened in the last 10 minutes. Perhaps there has been a series of unfortunate incidents, one leading to another. I do not know what was wrong with the motion to disagree to your ruling that I sent up. In the couple of minutes I had, I worded it as carefully as I could. You ruled it out of order without saying why. You then persistently said that there was no point of order so that no-one could move to disagree to your ruling. You acted as though you were trying to ride roughshod over members on this side. I do not know why you have done this. I hope that some of your colleagues in the Labor Party will have a word with you about this. This is an unfortunate occurrence over something that does not matter much: whether the member for Goyder replies to a debate.

Why are you taking this attitude on this occasion? Why should we not have the right which, as far as I know, we have always had before, to disagree to the Speaker's ruling. Whether we move such motions with merit is another matter. However, for you to get out of it by saying, "I have not made a ruling and therefore you cannot disagree with what I am doing" is surely a travesty of the functions of the Chair. That is what I am protesting about, and for that reason I have been named, apparently. I have never known a situation when a Speaker has said, "You cannot disagree to what I am doing, because, whatever you may think of it, I have not made a ruling."

I do not know what else I can say. I am entirely sincere on this occasion. I have had disagreements with the Government, with you, Sir, and with the Liberal and Country League, but at this time, at the end of a session, I do not want us to finish on a note like this. However, I am damned if I will be ridden over in this way by you or anyone else. I ask you to change your mind on this occasion (some of us do change our minds from time to time on various matters); then we need not end on such an unpleasant note as this.

I am certain that, if members opposite were not bound by their obvious loyalty to their Party, some would agree with what I have said. Surely we cannot have a Speaker get out of a motion to dissent from his ruling by saying that he has not given a ruling, when obviously that in itself is a ruling. I hope that I have said enough and that I have given you, Sir, enough time to reconsider the matter. I hope that I get some support for my point of view. I very much regret that this has happened.

Mr. HALL: I move:

That the explanation of the member for Mitcham be accepted.

I think there has been a chain of misunderstanding. In any decisions made by you, Mr. Speaker, there must be a ruling somewhere. You gave several decisions, and the member for Mitcham, for persisting in his view that he should be able to disagree to your ruling, has been named. I suggest that we should accept his explanation, which was very cogent. He has said that he simply knew no other way in

which to disagree to your ruling. Having listened to what occurred, I do not know how else he could disagree but to persist in his disagreement. However, you have refused to allow him to disagree. I do not regard the naming of a member and his expulsion from the House as being a substitute for his being able to disagree to your ruling. He does not want to be sent from the House: he wants to disagree to your ruling. He has been unable to do that and has been named for his pains and for his persistence. I suggest that it would reflect less on the conduct of the House if the honourable member's explanation was accepted and the matter forgotten.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Goyder has moved "That the explanation of the member for Mitcham be accepted." Is the motion seconded?

Mr. BLACKER: I second the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. Let me trace the history of the matter this afternoon. The motion was called on and two members rose.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That may be the opinion of members. At one stage, I saw the member for Goyder rise in his seat before the matter was called on. You, Mr. Speaker, look for who rises at the time a matter is called on.

Mr. Millhouse: He was on his feet.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He may have been on his feet for a considerable time before the matter was called on. That is not in accordance with Standing Orders. The position traditionally in this House (and the member for Mitcham knows this very well, because he has been here long enough to be aware of the ruling given by a number of Speakers on this matter) is that the Speaker looks first to the Minister in charge of the House. That is always the case: the first call is always given to the Minister in charge of the House if he rises, and that has constantly been the tradition of this House. Indeed, it was done by Mr. Speaker Nicholls, Mr. Speaker Teusner, Mr. Speaker Stott, Mr. Speaker Riches, Mr. Speaker Hurst and by you, Sir. That has always been the case in this House, and on this occasion you, Mr. Speaker, immediately the matter was called on, looked properly to the front Government bench, and the Minister of Works rose.

Mr. Millhouse: But you know—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have explained to the honourable member what the tradition of this House and that of the House of Commons in these matters has been. When there is a contest for the Speaker's attention, the first call is and always has been given to the Government front bench. You, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 133, called on the Minister of Works. At that stage of the proceedings, the honourable member tried to move disagreement to your ruling, Sir, and he put the proposition in writing, which was clearly not in accordance with Standing Orders. You, Mr. Speaker, said that it was not a proper disagreement to your ruling, and the honourable member did not persist.

Mr. Millhouse: What?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He did not persist.

Mr. Millhouse: I did persist. I did as much as I possibly could to get the Speaker to let me change the wording.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: You are lying, Dunstan, when you say that. You are lying.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why don't you do your block!

Mr. Millhouse: That's a downright lie—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: —and he knows that I persisted

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member did not persist with the motion, but the member for Goyder rose.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Goyder then tried to move a further motion of disagreement, and the honourable member must know that that was not in accordance with Standing Orders. A motion to disagree to the Speaker's ruling must be moved immediately, or it does not take at all.

Mr. Millhouse: I asked to be allowed to amend my reasons so that they would be in accordance with the Speaker's ruling.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but the honourable member did not move a motion in accordance with Standing Orders.

Mr. Millhouse: You'll say anything.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member then constantly defied the authority of the Chair, despite his being warned repeatedly. Indeed, he was given far more warnings than are provided for in Standing Orders and, as he does so persistently in this House, he defied the Speaker. You, Mr. Speaker, having upheld the Standing Order, were obliged to put the motion, and the honourable member interfered with that by defying your ruling. He persistently got up when you, Sir, were on your feet. There was no way in which you, Mr. Speaker, could maintain the authority of the Chair or uphold Standing Orders other than to name the honourable member. The honourable member has not withdrawn or apologized: what he said was that the Speaker was wrong.

Mr. Gunn: He's allowed to do that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not an explanation or an apology in accordance with Standing Order 171, and he has certainly not explained his conduct in this House, which was in plain defiance of the proper rulings of the Speaker. It is the duty of every member properly to uphold the authority of the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In view of what the Premier has said, I seek leave to make a personal explanation of what I have done.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier has just seen fit to say that I did not persist with my motion to disagree to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, after you ruled that it was out of order. I then said that you were not a fair Speaker, and I then asked you to allow me to amend the notice of disagreement to your ruling. However, Mr. Speaker, you would not hear me on that point and you insisted that I withdraw. I then withdrew in the hope (and only in the hope) that you would then allow me to amend the notice of disagreement to your ruling, which I had brought up to you. However, you would not allow me to do that. If that is not trying to persist with a disagreement to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is, and I believe the Premier knows that that was persistence. Yet he deliberately lied when he got up a moment ago and said that I did not persist. I persisted then, and I am still persisting in moving the motion of disagreement to your ruling. But you will not give me a chance to do it, Mr. Speaker, and that is how the whole thing started. It is all very well for the Premier with his numbers. As head

of his Party, he knows that he can do anything with his numbers. It is all right for him to carry on in this way, but it is not—

The SPEAKER: Order! What the honourable member for Mitcham is saying is far beyond the realms of a personal explanation. The question before the House is "That the explanation of the honourable member for Mitcham be accepted." For the question say "Aye"; against say "No". The "Noes" have it.

Mr. Hall: Divide!

The House divided on Mr. Hall's motion:

Ayes—(20)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allen. No—Mr. Langley.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham shall withdraw from the Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, as this will be the last chance I have, I wish you a happy and holy Easter.

*The member for Mitcham having left the Chamber:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In accordance with Standing Order 171, I am obliged to move:

That the honourable, learned, and gallant member for Mitcham be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of the sitting.

Mr. Hall: Divide!

The House divided on the motion:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Langley. No—Mr. Allen.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried

The SPEAKER: I have been informed that the member for Mitcham's parting remark was that he wished the Speaker a happy and holy Easter. I ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to convey a reciprocal message.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran's motion carried.

The House divided on Mr. Hall's motion.

Ayes (2)—Messrs. Blacker and Hall (teller).

Noes (42)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Mathwin, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, Virgo, Wardle, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 40 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

**DARTMOUTH DAM**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hall:

That the Prime Minister should be informed that it is the opinion of this House that Dartmouth dam should proceed as planned because:

- (a) the urgency of its construction has not diminished since the signing of the agreement;
- (b) its priority of claim on Commonwealth funds is at least equal to many other items included in the Commonwealth Budget; and
- (c) South Australia's extra water entitlement which is part of the Dartmouth agreement will not be available to this State until Dartmouth dam is declared operational,

which the Premier had moved to amend by striking out all words after "that" second occurring and inserting the following:

this House support the views expressed in the letter of the Premier to the Prime Minister refusing discussions for postponement of the construction of Dartmouth dam.

(Continued from September 26. Page 970.)

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

That the question be now put.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the Chair is "That the amendment be agreed to."

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

**DRINKING DRIVERS**

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr. Tonkin:

That in the opinion of this House, an intensive campaign focused on accident prevention should be conducted throughout the community, with particular emphasis on education, and with facilities made available to enable people who have been drinking to relate personal alcohol intake to individual blood alcohol level, and to be advised and warned against driving if a level above the legal limit is indicated,

which the Minister of Transport has moved to amend by striking out all words after "House" and inserting the following:

the South Australian Government's Road Safety Council is to be highly commended for its excellent work in focusing attention on all aspects of road safety through education and publicity campaigns. In particular the council is to be commended for its initiative in taking steps to publicise the relationship between alcohol intake and blood alcohol levels.

(Continued from September 26. Page 974 )

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

That the question be now put.

Motion carried

The SPEAKER: The question now before the Chair is. "That the amendment be agreed to."

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

**INFLAMMABLE CLOTHING (LABELLING) BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 19. Page 834.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I move:

That this Bill be read and discharged.

I move that motion because the Government has acted in a minor way regarding flammable clothing I consider that the Government look the lead from me, but it did not do enough.

Bill read and discharged.

*[Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.50 p.m.]*

**CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL  
(GENERAL)**

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 27 (clause 6)—Leave out "enter upon any land" and insert "after giving reasonable notice to the occupier of any land, enter upon the land".

No. 2. Page 3, lines 17 to 21 (clause 9)—Leave out subsection (2) and insert new subsection (2) as follows:

(2) Without limiting the generality of subsection (1) of this section, where the Governor proposes to grant a perpetual lease to—

- (a) a charitable or religious body;
- (b) a body formed to promote sport or any other social or community activity, or
- (c) a body formed to promote any other public purpose.

the Governor may, in the exercise of the powers conferred by subsection (1) of this section, make a modification in the terms of the lease providing for a more limited right to compensation in the event of resumption of land comprised in the lease than is prescribed in the third schedule.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 and 2 be agreed to.

Section 35 of the Act provides that a perpetual lease shall be in the form of the third schedule but with such modifications as the Governor thinks fit. The Bill provided originally that, without limiting the Governor's discretion, a lease could be issued with limited rights of compensation should that lease be resumed by the Crown. This did not confer any new powers on the Governor: it really only declared existing powers and specified more detail regarding them. The Government had in mind that, in the case of certain sporting bodies on which certain privileges had been conferred, a lease could be issued with limited rights of compensation, particularly where the lease had been made available at a peppercorn rental. As a consequence of the reduction in rental, the rights of compensation that would apply on resumption of the lease would be limited. The Government has decided to be more specific, although it does not matter how broadly or narrowly the amendment is expressed, because the Governor has full discretion.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): It seems that the Government has seen fit to take the same action as it took with the Ombudsman legislation: there was some ambiguity, and an amendment was necessary. I commend the Government for its action.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Governor still has full discretion, and all the amendment does is spell out one way in which that discretion can be exercised.

Motion carried.

**RATES AND TAXES REMISSION BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 35 to 37 (clause 7)—Leave out all words after "council" in line 35 and insert "decides by resolution supported by the votes of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the council that the meetings should so commence."

No. 2. Page 2, lines 39 to 42 and Page 3, lines 1 to 12 (clause 8)—Leave out paragraph (a) and insert new paragraphs (a) and (ab) as follows:

- (a) by striking out from subsection (5) the passage "Within three months after the commencement of the Local Government Act Amendment Act, 1972, or such longer period as the Minister may allow" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "Within such time as the Minister may stipulate";

- (ab) by striking out subsection (9) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:

(9) Where an employee of a council has previously been in the employment of another council, or other councils, any period of that former employment shall, to the extent to which, together with the period of his present employment, it constitutes a continuous period of employment—

- (a) be taken into account, for the purpose of determining the employee's rights to long service leave, as if it constituted continuous employment with the same employer (except to the extent that long service leave or payment in lieu thereof has already been granted in respect of the aggregate period of employment, or any part thereof); and

- (b) be taken into account in determining any other rights in relation to employment that may be dependent upon length of service.

(9a) A person in changing from the employment of one council to the employment of another council shall not be entitled to claim from the former council any pro rata payment in lieu of long service leave where his employment by the former council is continuous with his employment by the latter council.

No 3. Page 3, lines 17 to 20 (clause 8)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert new paragraphs (d) and (e) as follows:

- (d) by striking out from subsection (10) the passage "subject to subsection (11) of this section"; and

- (e) by striking out subsection (11) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:

No. 4. Page 3, line 22 (clause 8)—Leave out "and long service leave" and insert ", long service leave and other rights in respect of employment".

Consideration in Committee.

*Amendment No. 1:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

The Legislative Council has altered the provision as it left this Chamber in such a way that, with one minor exception, the position will be as it was previously. Under the Council amendment, to use the expression used in this Parliament, it will now be necessary for a constitutional majority to decide when meetings of a council should be held.

Dr. Eastick: An absolute majority.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Together, the Leader and I will make a good speech. The point is that the situation still remains, if this amendment is carried, that members of a council can gang up and arrange meetings so as to deprive from membership of a council certain people who would like to serve on councils, while other people will be unable to attend council meetings. We believe that is completely wrong. The Government's attitude has been vindicated by events that have occurred since the Bill was before this Chamber. I have no intention of aligning the Government with some of the comments made since the Bill was last in this Chamber.

Motion carried.

*Amendments Nos. 2 to 4:*

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 2 to 4 be agreed to.

Although I think that the provision desired to be inserted in the Bill is unfair, I am told on good authority that local government desires to have the provision so that charges for long service leave will be inflicted on all councils in the case of people whose service dates back before 1972. The original provision was for continuous long service leave entitlements for all local government officers and employees, notwithstanding changes in employment from council to council (this is often done to gain promotion). However, I believed that it was improper to allow councils to recoup money from councils that had employed officers in the time before the legislation was introduced, and so a cut-off date was set at 1972. The Local Government Association has now approached me (I am sure this is at the request of local government) to have the original provision in the Bill altered. If the amendment is carried, in the case of a town clerk who has served with council A for five years, council B for 10 years, and council C for five years, the final council with which he serves will be able to go back to the other councils and recoup the cost of the long service leave entitlement. That is an imposition I previously opposed but, if local government wants it, I am willing to accept it.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I am happy that the Minister has seen fit to accept the amendment. First, he acknowledges that local government has applied for this provision to be inserted. Following the experience of the Minister in 1970 or early 1971, he has seen the light and now listens to local government. When it has been able to substantiate its claims, he has accepted its approaches and has introduced measures in this Chamber that have benefited local government. When the Bill for local government superannuation was originally before the House, it was clearly indicated that some councils would have to bear an imposition. Not only major councils tend to draw council officers at the end of their careers. Many officers who have given long service go to the country. A tremendous financial burden could be involved. I believe it is in the best interests of local government that this new provision be implemented, and I commend the Minister for having seen the wisdom of the advice he received.

Mr. BECKER: Let us take the case of an officer with 20 years service with council A who transfers to council B. I know of a case where, during a transfer of positions, an employee was forced to take money from council A. He was given no option. Neither the council which he left nor the one to which he moved would make the necessary adjustment as regards his rights. Will these amendments tidy up such a situation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, as they treat a council officer in the same manner as a public servant who transfers from one department to another is treated. I know of one council officer who, having been a junior clerk at the Marion council, transferred to Mount Gambier, where he stayed for several years, thereafter he went to Waikerie for some years and then to Millicent. As a result of these amendments, all that officer's service will be regarded as continuous as far back as 1950. Therefore, the council with which he is at present employed will be able to require the councils for which he worked previously to pay their share of his long service leave.

Dr. Eastick: It's right that that service will be taken into account.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that the Leader accepts this principle.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am pleased to see that the Minister is now taking heed of local government and especially of the Local Government Association. A town clerk can rarely, if ever, be sacked.



The Hon. G. T. Virgo: One was sacked a few weeks ago at Meadows.

Mr. MATHWIN: Be that as it may, such an officer can be sacked only in special circumstances, as the Minister well knows. Some council officers are promoted from one council to another council, and it is only fair that councils should have some responsibility for officers that serve them well.

Mr. McRAE: I am pleased to see that for the first time outside the strict Government area the concept of portability of long service leave, sick leave, and other benefits has been accepted. I draw to the attention of Opposition members who consider themselves experts on local government matters, and who say that they are enthusiastic about the amendments, the dreadful troubles that faced hotel groups and others when this concept was introduced in an indirect manner. Certain councils would be well advised, as a result of these amendments, to start on their contingency funds light now. They might also check their records for the past 20 or 30 years, bearing in mind that the accumulation of long service leave and sick leave will now have to be paid not at the old rate but at today's rate. This word of warning should be heeded.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 was adopted:

That the amendment destroys a vital principle of the Bill.

*Later.*

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendment No. 1 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1.

We have reached a rather strange situation in our society today when a clause in a Bill, which was introduced to improve the image of local government and to make it easier for people who desire to participate in the affairs of councils either by nominating and being elected or by attending council meetings in order to see how the business is conducted, is being opposed by a group of people who do not represent the population and have never been elected by a popular vote, but who have suddenly become the custodians of democracy. I have never heard so much hypocrisy in my life. I have heard comments about the fact that an alleged 85 per cent of the population today live in council areas in which the councils meet at night

I know of no more temerity than that of people who have advocated a restricted franchise suddenly talking about representation of the population: they should be talking about representation of the minority view that they have permitted to be entitled to vote for councils. I am conscious of the fact that most of these hypocrites denied the people of South Australia the chance to have adult franchise for councils about two years ago. These are so-called custodians of the democratic lights of the people! It has been suggested that this amendment was directed at the Adelaide City Council. That would be the greatest figment of imagination that I have heard: it is absolute rubbish. If one considers the whole position, I believe that what will rise from this little effort is that the demand for adult franchise for all elections will have been strengthened considerably by the attitude of the Upper House on this issue and also by those outside Parliament who express

views that obviously are identical with those of members of the Liberal and Country League in the Upper House.

The Hon. L. J. King. And in the lower House, too

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are now debating this issue under the threat that there will be no compromise from the other place, and under the threat that it will not grant a conference. I do not believe it has the guts to refuse one.

Dr. Eastick: Try it and see.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I intend to do that, and I expect the Leader to support me. He claims to be the compromiser, the "Let's talk it over" type, and suggests 'Let us get together and get something for local government.' We will see tonight how genuine the Leader is, and, if he supports us, I shall be the first to congratulate him. But I suspect that orders have been given to the L.C.L. in the Upper House and in the Lower House to throw this out.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It has been suggested that this is a good amendment, but those who suggest that have not read it, because, apart from simply stating that the majority must be half plus one of the number of elected members, it does exactly nothing. I defy any Opposition member to show where it does anything at all. What it does is ensure the *status quo*, so that vested interests may continue to govern and rule councils. I am proud to stand in this place and represent people who have been described in the press today as the riff-raff and the workers I am proud to represent them, and I am sure I will continue to represent them in this place for a long time after many of the fuddy-duddies of the L.C.L. in the Upper House are gone and forgotten.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I think the Minister has left his run a bit late.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have your instructions already, have you?

Dr. EASTICK: The Premier has already performed at the zoo. Obviously, the Minister was trying to put on an act for his gallery. The situation is quite clear.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're against the riff-raff and the workers, too.

Dr. EASTICK: I represent the workers of this State.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: The position is quite simple: I have been asked for co-operation in this matter. My co-operation is there, as the members for Glenelg and Alexandra will attend the conference with the Minister.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If one attempts to get beneath the bluster and the obvious political overtones and noise in which the Minister has indulged tonight, and examines—

Mr. Payne: About an hour ago you said he was reasonable.

Mr. Becker: But look at what's happened in the last hour.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let us examine the political exercise on which the Minister is embarking regarding this amendment. The Bill comprises 38 clauses, but there has been no dispute regarding the other clauses, all of which are desirable. However, the Minister has sought, for obvious political purposes, to seize on this one emotional issue and build it up as the only matter of importance in the Bill.

Mr. McRae: He's daring to attack these crooked conservatives who run these councils.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If members (and most Government members represent metropolitan districts) analysed that statement they would see it implies that the majority of people in all these councils, bar the Adelaide City Council, are crooked conservatives. Just how stupid can one get! The Government has seized on a remark made by one individual.

Mr. Payne: A remark in which he said quite a bit.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister has seized on that remark.

Mr. Payne: Is he a member of the L.C.L., or not? Answer that!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know. However, the Leader made a statement in the House which, had he been here and heard it, would have cleared up the matter satisfactorily for the honourable member.

Mr. Payne: I was here.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would be inclined to take the word of the Leader of the Opposition when it concerns the membership of the Liberal and Country League rather than that of the member for Mitchell, who appears to think he is somewhat of an expert on matters pertaining to the personal affairs of members on this side. He has obviously got a dossier on me. Although the honourable member has made a few inane interjections trying to attack me, one treats them with the contempt they deserve. The Leader adequately dispatched any queries that the Government might have in that respect. Of course, the Government is trying to sheet home, for its own political purposes, the observations of one city councillor. The fact is that most councils already meet at night. When the Bill providing for the restructuring of the electoral system by which another place would be elected was before this House, the Premier made great play of the fact that minorities should not have a right of veto.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is right. I don't think they should.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Despite that, in this amendment the Government intends to give one member of a council of 18 or 20 members a complete right of veto over the other members. How the Government lines that up with its democratic principles, I do not know. It is the only instance that comes to my mind in which the Government has sought to give an overriding power to one member of an organization: it does not do it in Caucus or in this Chamber, and it certainly would not allow it in another place. The Government and its Commonwealth colleagues are at present trying to woo local government and the only weapon they have is a financial one. On the other hand, they are trying to strip local government of every vestige of autonomy which is its right. This is completely nonsensical.

We are embarking on one of those cheap political exercises on which the Government is happy to embark where it thinks it can score a point. It says, "Forget about the other 37 clauses of the Bill that local government wants, but highlight this clause." The Government does not think about country areas or about persons having to travel long distances to attend council meetings. These are the people who will be affected. The Government does not worry about throwing those people overboard to achieve a cheap political point. That is the sort of exercise about which the Opposition is not surprised and on which the Government embarks only too frequently.

Mr. MATHWIN: If one thinks about the nitty gritty of this whole subject one realizes from the Minister's adamant approach to this matter that the Opposition's suspicions

were correct. The Minister based the whole Bill on this one clause, on which he will give no ground at all, despite his having been the member of a council that met in the evenings. The Minister would realize that most councils do this and that it would be virtually impossible for most country councils to deal with all of their business in one night. Metropolitan council committees sit late at night now. In fact, they often sit until later than 1 a.m. It would be morally wrong to expect people to have to drive 50 miles (80 km) after a country council meeting that ended at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. Obviously, the Bill was moulded around this clause, which attacks the Adelaide City Council. I understand that a Minister already has said that it was directed mainly against the Adelaide City Council. I have no argument with this: I consider that that council ought to meet at night, and that all other councils in the metropolitan area should do likewise.

However, councils in outer areas ought to have the opportunity to meet in the day-time. The Bill contains many good provisions and some councils carry out those provisions now, but this clause gives one person, out of a whole council, the right of veto. That is completely different from the Labor Party's concept of one vote one value. If the Minister wants to attack the Adelaide City Council, let him say so and not hide behind a Minister in another place.

Mr. GUNN: This evening the Minister has engaged in one of his usual personal exercises of accusing members on this side of being under instructions. I assure him that we are not. He has the gall and audacity to accuse us, when he has signed an obnoxious pledge that makes him unable to think for himself and makes him act like a puppet.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member not to be abusive towards other honourable members.

Mr. GUNN: I was not being abusive. I was replying to the Minister, who launched an abusive attack on members on this side and accused them of not being able to think for themselves. He belongs to a Party that requires him to sign an obnoxious pledge.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be a big advantage to the Liberal and Country League if that Party had a pledge, but I am not aware of anything in this provision that refers to the Labor Party pledge.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order, but I ask the honourable member for Eyre to keep to the motion under discussion.

Mr. GUNN. The Minister of Local Government has accused members of another place of denying people their democratic rights.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about the riff-raff?

Mr. GUNN: If the Minister of Education thinks that the average citizen in this State is riff-raff, he can think that. We have dissociated ourselves from the disgraceful statement made by an alderman of the Adelaide City Council, and I make no apology for that. Surely councils have a right to decide when and where they should meet. What would the Premier and the Minister say if a member of this Chamber could force the House to meet at 2 p.m. on a Monday because Tuesday did not suit him? That would not be right, and the Minister knows it would not, but because he is Big Brother Virgo—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to address members by their correct titles.

Mr. GUNN: Why should one person have the right to prevent a council from meeting? In a country area that I know of, councillors have to travel 50 miles (80 km) to attend council meetings. That council normally meets at 10.30 a.m., and it usually sits well into the evening.

Mr. Keneally: How many wage-earners are members of that council?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. GUNN: Few people in this community do not work for a living. Every councillor makes a personal sacrifice. Obviously, the member for Stuart has never been associated with local government. As I said, some of the councillors I referred to live 50 miles from the seat of the council. If the Government's proposal becomes law, the councillors will have to make two, three or more trips a month, at night.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why can't they meet in the day-time?

Mr. GUNN: It needs only one councillor to vote for evening meetings, under the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And there would be one!

Mr. GUNN: If there has been a disagreement amongst the councillors, the easiest way for a councillor to get even is to insist that a council meeting should start at 6 p.m. The Minister would be the first to put people up to that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think people should be denied the right to serve on councils?

Mr. GUNN: No-one has indicated that in the debate; not even the Minister of Education could twist the argument to say that we have.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you support the Upper House, you are voting for that.

Mr. GUNN: The Upper House has allowed councils to choose the meeting time for themselves, and that is the proper course of action. I support the Council's attitude.

Mr. EVANS: I support the remarks that have been made from this side. The Minister accused members in another place of being hypocrites. The Minister speaks of one vote one value and of democracy. What is democratic about giving one councillor the right to impose his will on seven or more other councillors because he objects to meeting in the day-time? The Minister knows that some wage-earners do shift work. There could be a majority of that type of wage-earner on a council, yet one wage-earner who does not do shift work could say, "I do not want council meetings to be held in the day-time: I want them to be held at night." That may disadvantage the wage-earners who are shift workers. Clearly, this legislation is discriminatory in that sense. I cannot see why the Minister wishes to move into this field, except for political purposes. There is no reason for it. Tonight the Minister used the term "hypocrite" and he referred to political motives. He can have his Bill, except for this one clause, without any problems. Local government wants most parts of the Bill to become law; that can be done as a service to the State. My political philosophy is that, if there is a majority vote in Committee in this Parliament, one must accept the decision. The Minister's philosophy is this: if one person objects in a group of eight or more, that person's vote should outweigh the votes of the majority. We have heard the term 'riff-raff' used, because of one person who at one time belonged to our Party. The Commonwealth Minister for Labour calls some people fat cats, but I hope all Labor Party members do not accept that line of thinking in connection with the Premier's press secretary and other Ministers' press secretaries.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. EVANS: I am referring to a Minister picking out a statement by a person with no association with this House or with any group in the House and saying that that statement should be accepted as gospel; that is the sort of

thing the Minister is trying to do. If there is a hypocrite in Parliament tonight, it is the Minister of Local Government. He is saying that one person's vote should outweigh the votes of all others. I cannot support that principle.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has claimed to be the great white knight of democracy tonight, and we can recall similar claims with the same political motive last year. At that time, however, the Government was supporting the idea of one vote one value. Tonight the Government supports one vote—complete control! What an about-face—and within 12 months!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why don't you tell your colleagues—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister of Local Government is out of order. I ask the honourable member for Davenport to confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am pointing out that the Minister is putting forward a false argument, which he claims is democratic, but it is obviously not. He has accused the Leader of the Opposition in the other place of making a threat that there would be no conference on this issue. I was in the Upper House at the time, and it was not a threat: the Leader said it was a promise. The Minister, who now claims that he is reasonable and would like a conference, 24 hours ago in this Chamber said that on this issue there was no compromise whatsoever. They were his words last night when he claimed that his Party would not back down and that there was no room for compromise. Now, because a conference has been denied him, he takes the opposite line.

Last night I referred to this as a "Virgo veto". This is the sort of veto that dictators demand: one person in complete control. I shall not go through the arguments as to why the Government's original Bill was unacceptable, especially for the country areas. We have dealt with that. It is the Minister who is trying to make this a political issue and who has turned an about face, only 24 hours ago having refused to compromise. Now he is trying to get other people to take a similar stand.

Mr. ALLEN: If this legislation is passed as proposed by the Minister it will mean that, if one councillor insists, council meetings will have to be held at night. This will affect outlying country councils, because many councillors travel up to 50 miles (80 km) to attend council meetings. It is eight years now since I was involved in local government, but I know that, if nominations are called on two occasions and if no nominations are forthcoming, the clerk has the right to go out on to the street and tap any man on the shoulder, saying he is elected to the district council. That man cannot refuse, although he can attend one meeting and resign. As most country councils work with wards, there may not be difficulty in getting town councillors: the difficulty will be in getting councillors for the outlying wards. Those who have to travel long distances generally incorporate meetings and road or drain inspections, for example, on the same day. That situation cannot continue if meetings must be held at night.

Mr. McANANEY: I protest against members opposite saying that the Opposition has been dictated to on its attitudes to the Bill. I believe that a principle is being broken here. The majority at any meeting should rule. I cannot imagine any council or other organization existing where the majority does not make the decision. People, whether self-employed or otherwise, lose money when they attend council meetings. I was chairman of a council for 10 years, and I had to get up early, shift the irrigation pipe's,

fix the sheep, etc., and then go to the council meeting. To break the rule that the majority must have the say is contrary to every piece of legislation brought into this Parliament even during the Labor regime. I object strongly to that principle, and I have every confidence that in local government, as I have seen it in action, if someone can put up a good case to say he cannot attend a meeting a reasonable solution will be found.

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot imagine any situation in which members opposite would accept an absolute veto being applied to any meeting by one member of that meeting. I cannot imagine how this House would work if one member had the right to say when it should sit. We are equating unanimous decisions in favour with a one-man dissension. This is the worst form of gerrymander this State has ever known. It is a blatant gerrymander and smacks of totalitarian government, the sort of thing one equates with free elections in totalitarian countries where there is one candidate only. Had it not been for the unfortunate statements reported in the press this morning, I believe we would not be debating this now, because I think the Minister is normally a fair-minded man. Normally, he would agree that the majority should make a decision. The Council's amendment refers to an absolute majority. Although the minority view must be considered, the majority decision is final. I believe that the people of South Australia are aware of the Government's attitude in this case, and will take the necessary action at the first opportunity.

Mr. RUSSACK: I support the Council's amendment. Local government is having its authority eroded. I believe that it has a light to continue to enjoy the autonomy that it has enjoyed over the years. I remember hearing the present Premier say often, when his Party was in Opposition, that, as it had received more than 50 per cent of the votes at an election, it should have the right to govern. This evening the Minister has spoken about hypocrisy, but it is the Government that is being hypocritical in now supporting a proposal whereby one person will be able to decide when a council meeting should be held. Members on this side have had five times as much experience in local government as have members opposite. Therefore, I consider that we are entitled to say what should apply in this area.

My experience of local government dates back 20 years (I was in a council for 11 years), and the council on which I served met during the evening. Members opposite say that workers would be hindered in attending council meetings during the day. One member of the Kadina council was employed by a close relative of mine, who never denied that person time off to attend committee meetings during the day. I applaud employers who do the right thing in this regard. Whatever proposal we adopt, there will be difficulties for someone. Therefore, we must come back to the principle of democracy, which is that the majority decision shall apply. The amendment does not refer to a simple majority. If a council is made up of 12 members, the absolute majority (as provided for in the amendment) is seven. If only seven members were at a meeting, all seven would have to vote in favour of whatever proposal was made about the time of the council meeting. As the amendment is in the interests of democracy, I support it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It should be, as it has been, the right of the individual to choose whether he nominates for election to a council; he must decide whether to sacrifice a day or days of employment to provide this service. It has been said that workers cannot afford a day off to attend council

meetings and that this is why there are no five-day-week workers in local government. However, the real reason why we do not see such workers in councils is that they are not willing to work on the sixth day to make up for one of the five days, because they are dictated to by another organization—the one that dictates to this Government.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order. I ask the honourable member to discuss the motion.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am spot on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I consider that remark to be a reflection on the Chair. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. CHAPMAN: If you consider it a reflection, Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to withdraw it. We are willing to leave it up to the individual to decide whether he wishes to enter local government. Reference has been made to the high proportion of members on this side who have served in local government. Each of us has chosen individually whether to enter this field. It so happens that a large proportion of members on this side has used local government as a training ground before coming to this place. On the other hand, members opposite use the trade union movement as a training ground, with the result that a large proportion of those members comes from that field. Many members opposite are trained in the trade union movement, still think along those lines, and are directed how to act by that movement. I repeat that, if members of this working section of the community, which has been so often referred to throughout the debate, wish to enter local government, let them sacrifice a day's work during the week and put in a day on the weekend.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Oh!

Mr. CHAPMAN: Why not? When I was working for wages I sacrificed a day during the week to serve on local government and worked on Saturday to make up for it, and I am proud to say so. I would do it again if I felt so inclined, because I will not be dictated to by any little red group behind me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: This is the backbone of the clause we are discussing. The amendment is the guts of the Bill, the meat in the sandwich, the bitter pill in the icing. You should be ashamed of yourself for introducing this provision, and hoodwinking the public.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to refer to the Minister by title and direct his remarks to the Chairman.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should like to ask the Minister whether he would resign if one person in his district were to vote against him at the next election. If one person in his district was opposed to the Minister, would he resign? Would you change your practice and personal employment and get out of Parliament as a result of dictation by one person? No. Why, then, should 10, 12 or 15 members in local government—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You ought to be in Parkside.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister is out of order in interjecting. I ask the honourable member to address the Chair and confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister made an objectionable and unparliamentary remark about the member for Alexandra. The Minister said that my colleague was a candidate for Parkside. It was unparliamentary and I ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I did not hear the remark.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Sit down!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! What is the point of order the member for Eyre wishes to take?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister made an unparliamentary remark that reflected on the member for Alexandra and I ask for an unqualified withdrawal. If democracy is to prevail in the Chamber, surely members should be protected against smear tactics.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order because the remark was not taken up by the member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN: This is the first opportunity I have had in the past few minutes to rise and object to the unreasonable and unparliamentary remark the Minister directed to me and I support the unqualified withdrawal of that remark.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As the member for Alexandra continued to speak after the alleged remark was made, I call on him to resume his speech.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I ask you to reconsider your ruling. The member for Alexandra did not have a chance to continue to speak, because the member for Eyre and the member for Glenelg rose to object to the remark. The member for Alexandra had no chance to take exception until you had dealt with the point of order the member for Eyre raised.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the member for Alexandra to resume the debate.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I appreciate your keenness to have the Parliament resume the debate and get on with the job, but I take exception to the Minister's remark. Whether this is the right time or whether it is too late, I persist in my request that the Minister withdraw his remark. It was quite unreasonable, uncalled for, most offensive and unnecessary and, with respect, I call on you to ask the Minister to withdraw his remark. We all get heated on these occasions, but we should try to maintain a reasonable standard.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the Minister whether he made the remark and, if he did, will he withdraw it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would like to get on with the debate. If the honourable member is offended, I am happy to withdraw and get on with the job.

Mr. CHAPMAN: There is little more I wish to say. I have made the point that the opportunity exists for anyone to serve in local government. Admittedly, if the majority of a council chose to meet in the day-time, those members employed in industry who wished to enter local government would have to make a sacrifice. But so does every member of local government have to sacrifice the hours during which he serves, whether in the day-time or night-time. Local government ought to be able to decide on its own when and where it wishes to meet. It is a decision for the local community, not for the Minister or any other bureaucratic group that sets itself up to dictate to other parties.

Local government has taken an undeserved thrashing under this Government. Local government is a valuable part of the community, and to be effective it must at least retain the opportunity of managing its own affairs and not be dictated to under this kind of control. I support the amendment. I hope that now the Minister will appreciate having heard from some of my colleagues who have had experience in local government instead of getting the information he receives from Government members, who in the main have had no experience and who are talking once again off the top of their heads.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

Noes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, Langley, and Wells.

Noes—Messrs. Allen, Coumbe, and Rodda.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

*The Speaker having resumed the Chair:*

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that a conference be granted to this House in respect of certain amendments in the Bill, and that the Legislative Council be informed that in the event of a conference being agreed on this House will be represented by five managers, and that Messrs. Chapman, Duncan, Mathwin, Wright, and the mover will be the managers at the conference on behalf of the House of Assembly.

I thank the Leader for his indication of support in giving the names. I believe that, contrary to views that have been expressed in another place, a conference should be granted, because there is ample room to find a compromise. It has been suggested this evening—

Mr. Dean Brown: What changed your mind?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —by many members that it would be wrong for one member of a council to determine what was to happen about the meetings of the council.

Dr. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask whether it is normal for a second or third reading speech to be given at this point.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. It is not usual, and I ask the Minister to refrain from giving what has been termed a second reading speech.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not making a second reading speech, but I am trying—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —to give reasons why I believe a conference should be held and, by holding the conference, I believe—

Dr. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You have ruled that the Minister is out of order in continuing with these remarks. As the Minister persists, I ask whether your previous ruling will be upheld by you.

The SPEAKER: The latter part of the Leader's comments is not a point of order, but I said that requesting a conference did not open up the discussion into a second reading debate. The Minister should explain briefly why the conference is being requested and why it should be granted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not wish to transgress your ruling, Sir, but I was indicating—

Dr. Eastick: How much longer are you going to be?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I believe that a conference can achieve much, because there is room for compromise.

Motion carried.

*Later:*

The Legislative Council intimated that it had refused to grant a conference.

**HEAD MESSENGER**

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

The motion is one of appreciation of the services given to this House by the Head Messenger.

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: It has been the normal practice at the end of Parliament to express appreciation to the staff of the House and others, but it has not been the practice to seek a suspension of Standing Orders for that purpose. That right is given to each member and, if the Premier wishes to accept what has been the practice in the past, he has the right to express his wishes now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I intend to go further than what has been done previously because so signal have been the services that I believe a motion should be recorded in the Votes and Proceedings of the House rather than the normal simple expression of appreciation. In these circumstances, it is necessary for me to ask the House to suspend Standing Orders to enable me to move a motion without notice. That is what I am asking for.

Dr. Eastick: Did you tell the Opposition about it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I did.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders. Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, Sir.

Motion carried.

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

That this House place on record its acknowledgment of the signal service given to it by the Head Messenger, Mr. Jack Lawson.

Mr. Lawson joined the House of Assembly staff as a Messenger on July 18, 1955. He became the Chamber Messenger on March 14, 1959, and was promoted to Head Messenger on June 6, 1960, on the retirement of Mr. H. Tischer. He is due to retire on May 27 this year. Mr. Lawson has given outstanding service to this House and to members of the public. He has a great war record: he spent six years in the Australian Imperial Forces from 1939 to 1945, most of which was spent in the the Western Desert in North Africa, and he was one of the Tobruk Rats. He later saw service in New Guinea and the islands.

Mr. Lawson is one of the best Head Messengers that this House has ever had in the whole of its history. He has been unfailing in carrying out his duties quietly, efficiently, effectively, and with the greatest of courtesy and consideration for members of this House and for all members of the public who have had to come here and seek the assistance of Messengers in the House, to get in touch with members, or to know what was happening in the House. He has been an unfailing friend to everyone in this House. I believe that all members would want publicly recorded the great regard that they have for Mr. Lawson, their thanks for the service that he has given us and their unanimous wish that his retirement will be an active and happy one.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I have great pleasure in wholeheartedly supporting the Premier's remarks regarding Mr Jack Lawson, who is a quiet, unassuming and cheerful man, as well as being extremely helpful and efficient. I have uttered a few words that express, albeit inadequately, the opinion held of Mr. Lawson by honourable members of this House. We all wish that in his retirement Mr. Lawson continues to enjoy good health and that he is able to pursue his interests from which, we

hope, he will gain the greatest pleasure. The Premier has said that, without doubt, Mr. Lawson is one of the best Head Messengers that this House has had. It is not necessary for me to go any further than to say sincerely that Mr. Lawson will be greatly missed.

The SPEAKER. Although I know it is. unusual for a Speaker to support a motion, this is one occasion on which I, as Speaker, can say that I am biased regarding the motion before the Chair.

Dr. Eastick: And justifiably!

The SPEAKER: That is so Jack Lawson has been a member of the staff of which I have the honour to be the chief administrative officer, and I can sincerely say that I could not have received better service from a more loyal man. He has set an example not only to his fellow workers but also to honourable members, and I do not believe there is any member in this Chamber that would have had a cross word with him or a criticism of the services that Mr Lawson has given to honourable members or to the public. He has set a high standard, and it will be difficult for whoever follows him in this important position to maintain that standard. I join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in saying that Mr. Lawson has earned a well deserved retirement. All members hope that he lives long enough to enjoy it and that in his retirement Mr. Lawson may think of us. perhaps late at night while we are still sitting here. I put the motion, and I sincerely hope that, without my comments being necessary, it will be a unanimous one. Through this motion, a message of sincere thanks is being conveyed to Jack Lawson.

Motion carried.

**STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL (AMENDMENTS)**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**PROROGATION**

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, April 30, at 2 p.m

In moving this motion, I take the opportunity of paying a vote of thanks of the House to all those people who have been of assistance to it. On this occasion, I want to wish all the best also to another member of the staff who will be retiring shortly. Those of us who have been here for some time have known the strange machinations of some of the equipment with which this House has had to operate. Probably the most Heath-Robinsonian piece of equipment that this House has had has been its air-conditioning equipment. It has groaned on over a period, and the only reason that it has managed to stagger through is that there has been a certain man who knew its idiosyncrasies and could get it to work by giving it a few judicious kicks on occasions when no-one else could conceivably have done anything with it. The air-conditioning equipment is at long last being replaced with modem up-to-date equipment. However, the old air-conditioning in the building and the extraordinary convolutions of the engine and the electrical wiring in this place, which hardly anyone could work out except for its custodian, have been a matter of amazement to anyone who has ever had to investigate the equipment. It is actually a matter of some moment to us all that we have had someone who could manage to work the equipment and that we have not all been incinerated in the meantime. The strangenesses of the overloading of decades of the unusual electrical equipment in this place have required the most extraordinary understanding and attention.

We have had here, after 25 years of service in the Public Buildings Department, 11 years of which have been at Parliament House, in charge of the air-conditioning plant, Mr. Frank Henderson, who will be retiring next week. He has been an excellent servant to the House and the comfort of members simply could not have continued but for his great understanding of his job and of the sheer mysteries of it. He has been very kind to us all in his work and we all appreciate the service he has given. On behalf of the Government, I want to thank all members of the House staff, the Clerks, the Messengers, the domestic staff, the clerical staff, and the *Hansard* staff, as well as all those who have been associated with the workings of the House.

Mr. Chapman: Don't overlook the two lady cleaners.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN. I never overlook the two lady cleaners. They are constituents of mine and have been very good supporters for a long time. We in this House are extremely fortunate to have the devoted work of the staff. In every area of activity, we have had from the staff work that has been well beyond the normal bounds of duty, and all members appreciate the assistance they have had from and the devotion to duty of members of the House staff.

Mr. Chapman: Don't sit down without mentioning the secretaries, either, Mr. Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN. I have mentioned them actually, but the honourable member, through his Leader, will have the opportunity to expatiate on that soon. I appreciate that the honourable member gets great service from the secretary. I also hope that, during the recess, the members of this House, including you, Mr. Speaker, will have an interesting and active recess and will be ready to resume very active duty in July.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): This session has been an interesting one, the like of which I doubt that we will experience again. Several changes have been made to Standing Orders of the House, all aimed at an improvement. Consequently, it remains for each member to decide whether his opportunity to fulfil the purpose for which he came here has been improved or has deteriorated. All members considered the issues and debated them and, when a decision was made, it was necessary to give effect to those alterations.

I seriously suggest to the House that, during the recess, consideration be given to making necessary alterations to permit an effective Question Time and that in that matter regard will be had to the needs of members on both sides of the House. I reaffirm the thanks that have been extended to members of the staff, particularly Mr. Frank Henderson, whose abilities with the infernal machine have been highlighted by the Premier. In the six weeks of sitting since mid-February, we have certainly missed that machine operating. I hope that, in the time ahead, Mr. Henderson will find enjoyment in his retirement.

During this session, members have had difficulty regarding office space and the other facilities of the House. This has been occasioned by the alterations that are taking place. I recognize that these alterations are essential and that more adequate facilities will be available to members in future, thus increasing their opportunity to fulfil their

obligations to their constituents. In saying that, I recognize that during the recess there will be major changes in the location of our various offices in the House.

During the alterations in progress, the cleaning ladies, as they have been referred to, have had an almost impossible task. I take my hat off to them and I know I speak for all members when I say that I appreciate their work during those difficult times. I also point out that, during the period before we meet again, members from both sides will visit other countries to find out what can be put into effect to advantage in Australia, especially in South Australia. I look forward to the information that those members will be able to give the House and to the reports they submit.

The SPEAKER: It is usual for the Speaker to speak on such occasions as this, although, in terms of the Standing Orders, it could be said that he was biased towards the motion now before the House. I support the remarks made by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. The session has been heavy, yet interesting and educational. We have all had our differences of opinion and on most occasions members have expressed the various opinions that they have respectively been elected to express.

I, as Speaker, have tried to conduct the affairs of this Chamber. There have been some occasions when I have not been correct, and I am the first to admit that, because the Speaker who will never make a mistake has not been born and probably never will be born. I hope that the mistakes that I have made have been accepted on the basis that I have tried to do the job that the House has elected me to do. It is a job that must be done and, irrespective of who does it, it will not always meet with the complete satisfaction of all members. However, as long as I have the satisfaction of knowing that sometimes I have been correct, I shall be pleased with the job that I have done.

I have direct connection with, and jurisdiction over, the House of Assembly staff, and I say to each and every one of them, "Thanks for a marvellous effort" I have no doubt that some of the conditions under which we ask our staff to work would not be tolerated anywhere else, but I have never heard from one member of the House of Assembly or the catering staff a word of criticism of either the members or the conditions under which the staff work. I think that speaks volumes for the type of staff that we have. They are sincere, honest and cheerful in carrying out their duties in extremely difficult circumstances, and I hope that members of the staff, who have worked extremely hard and well, will have the same opportunity as honourable members have to enjoy at least some of the recess. I think honourable members will have an opportunity for some relaxation, and I hope all members of the staff, too, in this period will enjoy some moments of leisure. I hope that honourable members and members of the staff, as a result of the few week's we have in recess, will come back full of vigour, fight, and vitality, and fighting fit to continue to deal with legislation in the interests of the people of the State.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 30, at 2 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of the National Anthem.