HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 12, 1976

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

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 56 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the present discriminatory position of blood relations be removed and that blood relationships sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to *de facto* relationships.

Petition received.

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a petition signed by 28 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received.

COMMITTEE RESIGNATIONS

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received the following letter from Mr. C. J. Wells:

Mr. Speaker,

I have to inform you that it is my desire to be discharged from attending the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, of which I am a member.

(Signed) C. J. Wells, member for Florey.

I also have to report that I have received the following letter from Mr. C. A. Harrison:

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, and request that this resignation take effect forthwith.

(Signed) C. A. Harrison, member for Albert Park.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JUVENILE COURT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In accordance with the Premier's statement made in this House last Thursday that the Government would set up a Royal Commission to investigate certain aspects of the operation of the Juvenile Courts Act, I now wish to advise the House that His Excellency the Governor's Deputy this morning appointed Judge Robert Finey Mohr, LL.B., to be the Royal Commissioner for the purposes of the inquiry to inquire into and report upon:

1. Whether any person or persons and, if so, who, and in what manner, has interfered with the judicial independence of Judge Andrew Bray Cameron Wilson, a person appointed to judicial office pursuant to the provisions of the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1974, and upon whom has been conferred the jurisdiction exercisable by juvenile courts under the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974.

2. Whether since August, 1975, there have been any and, if so, what improper or unlawful acts or omissions in relation to the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974, and who was responsible for such acts or omissions.

3. Whether, having regard to the policy of the Government as enacted in Section 3 of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974, namely:

> 3. In any proceedings under this Act, a juvenile court or a juvenile aid panel shall treat the interests of the child in respect of whom the proceedings are brought as the paramount consideration and, with the object of protecting or promoting those interests, shall in exercising the powers conferred by this Act adopt a course calculated to—
>
> (*a*) secure for the child such care, guidance and correction as will conduce to the welfare of the child and the public interest;
>
> and
>
> (*b*) conserve or promote, as far as may be possible a satisfactory relationship between the child and other members of, or persons within, his family or domestic environment,
>
> and the child shall not be removed from the care of his parents or guardians except where his own welfare, or the public interest, cannot, in the opinion of the court, be adequately safeguarded otherwise than by such removal,

any and, if so, what changes by legislation or otherwise are necessary or desirable for the proper implementation of that policy. The Commission directed the judge to inquire into and report on the matters set out in terms of reference Nos. 1 and 2 before inquiring into or reporting upon term of reference No. 3 with the intention that the serious allegations made by Judge Wilson should be dealt with at the earliest possible time. The Secretary to the Royal Commission will be Mr. Jack Guscott, M.B.E., who has been Secretary to a number of Royal Commissions in the past, and Mr. E. F. Johnston, Q.C., with junior counsel to be briefed, will be counsel assisting the Commissioner. Judge Wilson will be invited if he so desires to be represented before the Commission by senior counsel during the consideration by the Commission of the first and second terms of reference. It is expected that the Commission will have a preliminary hearing within the next two weeks, and that an interim report concerning the first and second terms of reference will be brought down at an early date.

QUESTIONS

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

SAMCOR

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What profit did Samcor make in 1975-76?
2. What was Samcor's total income for 1975-76?
3. How much did Samcor pay out in interest to service its outstanding loans?
4. How many persons are now employed at Samcor?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

As to Nos. 1, 2, and 3 the accounts of Samcor for 1975-76 are not yet finalised, and replies to these questions are not available at present.

4. 1 808.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What forward plans does the Electricity Trust of South Australia have in respect of capital works for the period 1976-81?

2. Why does the trust foresee difficulty in raising finance for "new and replacement works", vide last paragraph on page 2 of the report to June 30, 1976?

3. Is a comparison available of unit costs for electricity between South Australia and the other Australian States and, if so, what are the respective costs?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The major capital works planned by the Electricity Trust for the period 1976-81 are:

(*a*) Final commissioning of Nos. 1 and 2 200 megawatt turbo-generators and associated plant at Torrens Island B power station.

(*b*) Installation of two additional 200 megawatt turbo-generators (Nos. 3 and 4) at Torrens Island, thus completing the B station.

(*c*) Part construction of the new northern power station.

(*d*) Continue expansion of the transmission and distribution system to provide for new consumers (about 15 000 a year) and for the increasing requirements of existing consumers.

2. Because of the very large capital sums required. There are two reasons for this:

(*a*) Because of general inflation, all capital equipment will be very much more expensive than in the past.

(*b*) A coal-fired power station is more expensive than an oil or gas-fired station. The trust has not installed any coal-burning plant since 1963.

3. The following figures are derived from statistics published by the Electricity Supply Association of Australia (they apply for the financial year ended June, 1975, being the latest available):

	Sales of electricity. (millions of kilowatt hours)	Income from electricity sales (millions of dollars)	Average price per kwh. (cents per kwh)
South Australia . .	4 434	102	2·30
New South Wales . .	21 356	523	2·45
Victoria	14 069	352	2·50
Queensland	7 008	205	2·93
Western Australia . .	3 017	91	3·02
Tasmania	5 358	60	1·12

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Have the Keith and Kapunda hospitals been granted "recognised hospital" status and, if not, why not?

2. If they are not yet "recognised", has an application been received from either or both for that purpose and, if so, when is it expected that consideration will be given to any such application?

3. What funds have been denied to the two hospitals as a result of not being "recognised"?

4. Have any hospitals lost "recognised" status, permanently or temporarily, since being granted it?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. No; because their boards of management sought private hospital status.

2. Yes. Action is being taken to refer the matter to the Commonwealth Minister for Health for his approval.

3. None.

4. No.

RATES AND TAXES REMISSIONS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Is the Government satisfied that the provisions of the Rates and Taxes Remission Act, 1974, except those specifically relating to the Local Government Act, are proving administratively practical?

2. Are any amendments considered necessary to ensure a more satisfactory implementation of any feature of the Act, except as may be applicable to the Local Government Act?

3. What criteria has the Minister declared under the provisions of section 4 (3) of the Act, and have there been any variations of the criteria since the commencement of the Act?

4. Has any punitive action been taken against any person under the provisions of section 4 (6) and (7) of the Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. The criteria was outlined on page 3413 of the *Government Gazette* dated December 18, 1975.

4. No.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Is the Government satisfied that the provisions of the Rates and Taxes Remission Act, 1974, more specifically as they relate to the Local Government Act, 1934-1975, are proving administratively practical?

2. Are any amendments considered necessary to ensure a more satisfactory implementation of any feature of the Act as it relates to local government?

3. How frequently does the Minister provide councils, pursuant to section 248c (1) of the Local Government Act, with the "list of persons who are eligible for the remission", and what is the maximum period of delay between Ministerial acceptance of eligibility and council notification?

4. Is a council required to give any concession in respect of the annual rate to a person who, at the date of declaration of the council's annual rate, is not eligible (and is not subsequently advised as having been eligible at the declaration date) but who subsequently becomes eligible during the current council year?

5. What redress does a council have to obtain, either from the Government or a ratepayer, any concessional amount allowed in good faith when at the date of declaration of the annual rate the person is genuinely believed to be eligible but who, at some subsequent notification (by the Minister) date, is deemed not to have been eligible at the declaration date?

6. Has the fact that some pensioners change to eligible from non-eligible, and vice versa, several times during a fiscal year caused any confusion, difficulty, or loss of income to local government?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. A list of eligible pensioners is made available to each council as at June 30 each year. This list is upgraded as at the date on which any council may declare its rates. Periodic amendments are made to lists already supplied.

It is not possible to give information about the maximum period of delay between acceptance of eligibility and council notification.

4. No.

5. In the first instance the council is requested to recover the amount of concession granted. If this is not possible, approval is given to allow the concession to remain, which is paid for by the Government.

6. No.

WATER RESOURCES APPEALS TRIBUNAL

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Is it intended that appeals to the Water Resources Appeals Tribunal be conducted on a simple, inexpensive basis similar to the procedure that prevailed under the previous appeals board?

2. Is it a fact that appellants who attended an allocation of appeal dates on September 17 were advised to attend with somebody to speak for them, or a lawyer, at their appeal?

3. What arrangements, if any, have been made to have interpreters available to appellants?

4. If no interpreter service is available immediately, will the Government give urgent consideration to making interpreters available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. As some questions about the interpretation of the new legislation need decision, the tribunal, at a calling over of cases on September 17, 1976, intimated that it was possible that parties to the appeals to be heard first could benefit from legal representation. The appellants in appeals Nos. 1/76 and 2/76 are so represented, and those two appeals have been listed for hearing on Thursday, October 14, 1976.

3. Because of the apparent language problem relating to many of the appellants, inquiries have been made to establish the availability of interpreting services. The State Government operates an Interpreting/Translating Service (telephone 216 8694) which is under the control of the Sheriff. This service has personnel who can interpret for people who appear as appellants before this tribunal. Arrangements for the attendance of an interpreter at the hearing of an appeal will be made by the administrative staff of the tribunal.

SCHOOL YEAR

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. On what date does the school year finish for 1976?

2. On what date do children return to school in 1977?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. December 10, 1976.

2. February 7, 1977.

EYRE HIGHWAY POLICE

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What plans has the Government to station extra police officers on the Eyre Highway, west of Ceduna?

2. Is it intended to base any extra police at Ceduna, or will new stations be built west of Ceduna?

3. If additional officers are not to be stationed in this area, or a new station not built, why not?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. It is planned to station one additional policeman at Penong as soon as an additional residence and new station have been built.

2. It is intended to base five additional constables at Ceduna, commencing in early November, 1976. Apart from the station referred to in 1 above, no new stations will be built west of Ceduna. The additional manpower to be provided will enable adequate patrolling of Eyre Highway with Ceduna-based personnel.

3. See 1 and 2 above.

PRAWN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Who are the members of the Prawn Advisory Committee?

2. When did this committee last meet?

3. When is it expected that it will hold its next meeting?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Mr. W. R. Harniman, S.M. (Chairman), Mr. G. J. Jensen, Mr. M. J. Corigliano, Mr. A. M. Olsen (Chief Fisheries Officer), and Mr. D. E. Poole (Secretary).

2. June 22, 1976.

3. No date has been fixed as yet.

TRUST HOUSING

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. In view of the heavy backlog of 327 applications for Housing Trust housing in the Gawler-Evanston area, has the trust given any consideration to increasing the building programme for 1976-77 beyond the already completed 28 units and expected further 44 units?

2. What forward plans are there for increasing the number of units to be built in 1977-78 and 1978-79, respectively?

3. As 59 of the current (as at September 21, 1976) applications are for cottage flats for elderly citizens, has or will special attention be given to this demand?

4. What number of persons have vacated Housing Trust premises in the Gawler-Evanston area in each financial year from July 1, 1970, and so far in this financial year?

5. Is this rate of turnover generally consistent with the trust's experience elsewhere, and, if not, to what is the difference attributed?

6. What is the trust's current policy relative to the release of rental premises for sale and, if such properties are released, is any financial consideration given to the tenant purchaser relative to the period of satisfactory tenancy and/or general improvement effected on the property?

7. Is the relatively high demand (50 of 327 applications) for purchase units reflected in other trust centres, and if not, to what does the trust attribute this interest?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Plans are in hand to maintain the rate of construction in Gawler. In addition, the trust is currently developing a major subdivision at Munno Para, about four miles from Gawler.

3. There are no immediate plans for the construction of further cottage flats in Gawler; the reason for this is that the trust's single person cottage flat programme is dependent upon Commonwealth grant money, and these funds have been fully allocated until the expiration of the

current Act in June, 1977. The trust is under considerable pressure to provide cottage flats in many country centres, as well as the metropolitan area, but the demands are such that it is not able to assist its pensioner applicants without a considerable delay; for example, in the metropolitan area, this delay is presently in excess of five years.

4. The number of vacancies occurring in Gawler for the last six financial years were as follows:

1970-71	24
1971-72	24
1972-73	23
1973-74	33
1974-75	26
1975-76	21
1976-77 (as at 8/10/76)	8

5. The following table presents a comparison in the percentage turnover in Gawler compared to the State as a whole:

Period	Percentage of vacancies in Gawler housing stock	Percentage of vacancies in State housing stock
1970-71	10·0	13·4
1971-72	9·2	13·5
1972-73	8·4	10·4
1973-74	10·9	9·3
1974-75	8·4	7·3
1975-76	6·0	8·8

6. The current policy of the trust is to retain rental stock. However, some tenants would have had legitimate expectations of a right to purchase before this policy was adopted. As a consequence, the following rights to purchase still exist:

i. Timber-frame, single units:

(*a*) Tenants must be in occupation before April, 1972, and occupy the premises for a period of not less than five years before being eligible to apply to purchase.

(*b*) The houses are sold to family units only.

(*c*) All sales are subject to a clause reserving the trust's right to repurchase for a period of five years, and a residential encumbrance restricting use for domestic purposes only.

ii. Brick veneer single units:

(*a*) Tenants must be in occupation before January, 1974, and occupy the premises for a period of not less than five years before being eligible to apply to purchase.

(*b*) The houses are sold to family units only.

(*c*) All sales are subject to a clause reserving the trust's right to repurchase for a period of five years and a residential encumbrance restricting use for domestic purposes only.

iii. All units sold at current market value, less the costs of any permanent and fixed improvements erected/constructed by the tenant.

iv. Amortisation of rents is applicable to timber-frame dwellings only.

v. All dwellings are sold on a first mortgage basis through lending institutions or trust mortgage. The trust mortgage is over a period of either 25 or 30 years, depending on the age of the dwelling.

vi. All dwellings are sold on an "as is" basis, with no further maintenance by the trust, and the purchasers must insure the property.

vii. Double units, flats and maisonettes are not for sale.

7. The proportion of sale applicants in Gawler is not high and is, in fact, significantly lower than the total State figure. Fifty of 327 applicants represents 15 per cent of the total number of applications. On the other hand, the trust has, for the whole of the State, about 7 000 sale and 19 000 rental applications on file. Therefore, on a State-wide basis, purchase applications represent 27 per cent of the total figure.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Are any changes occurring in the marine environment in St. Vincent Gulf as a result of the discharge of Bolivar effluent into the gulf, and, if so, what measures are being taken to prevent these changes occurring?

The Hon D. W. SIMMONS: A study of the marine environment in St. Vincent Gulf by the Engineering and Water Supply Department over the past 4½ years has shown no evidence of adverse environmental effects directly attributable to the discharge of sewage effluent from the Bolivar treatment works. However, aerial photographs of the sewage outfall aea provide indirect evidence that the effluent discharge may have contributed to the degradation of the sea grasses *Zostera* and *Heterozostera* in the intertidal zone within 500 to 600 metres of the outfall. This degradation may have been due to the low salinity of the sewage effluent while, in addition, it is probable that nutrients in the effluent have contributed to increased algal growth, especially of *Ulva,* in the vicinity of the outfall. The ongoing studies of the Engineering and Water Supply Department have identified several areas between St. Kilda and Port Gawler in which another sea grass, *Posidonia australis,* has been degraded in recent years. However, there is no evidence that this degradation has been caused by Bolivar sewage effluent. Rather, the phenomenon appears to be associated with changes in the pattern of sediment movement, as has occurred at several other locations along the metropolitan coastline between Brighton and Middle Beach. These sedimentological changes have resulted from structural modifications along the coastline rather than from the discharge of any effluents. In view of the lack of evidence for any substantial environmental effects attributable to the discharge of sewage effluent from the Bolivar treatment works, it would clearly be premature to initiate preventative or corrective measures, any of which would involve considerable expense.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. ARNOLD (on notice):

1. How many national parks are administered by the Environment Department, pursuant to the provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, what is the total area of these parks, and what percentage of the area of the State do these parks represent?

2. What number of persons are employed on the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service of the department and, of this staff:

(*a*) how many are located in Adelaide and, of the Adelaide staff, how many are clerical staff; and

(*b*) how many are located in the Cleland, Para Wirra and Belair National Parks and at Wilpena, respectively?

3. Will additional staff be engaged for the service during 1976-77, and what increases were made during 1975-76?

4. How many new national parks were dedicated or proclaimed during 1975-76, and will any new parks be dedicated or proclaimed during 1976-77?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. A total of 189 reserves under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, consisting of eight national parks, 159 conservation parks, 15 recreation parks, and seven game reserves. Total area: 3 635 882 hectares. Percentage of State: 3·7 per cent.

2.

Number of persons employed	148
Located in Adelaide	32
Adelaide clerical staff	13
Cleland Conservation Park	11
Belair Recreation Park	24
Para Wirra Recreation Park	11
Wilpena Pound	Nil

3. Yes.

Salaried (5), Wages (6)	1976-77
Salaried (5)*, Wages (4)	1975-76

*3 positions created 1974-75 but filled 1975-76.

4. A total of 10; yes.

CRYSTAL BROOK RAILWAY LINE

Mr. BOUNDY (on notice): Will the Minister contact the Federal Minister for Transport to ascertain:

(*a*) what progress has been made with the survey of the new alignment of the Crystal Brook to Adelaide standard gauge railway line;

(*b*) when that survey will be completed;

(*c*) when easements already surveyed are to be fenced and whether adjoining landholders may contract to do this work;

(*d*) when future use of surplus adjoining land will be determined; and

(*e*) when compensation is to be paid for all land acquired, including easements for railway purposes and fractions of sections adjoining easements?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

(*a*) The survey to define the new alignment is complete from Port Pirie to Dry Creek. No worthwhile progress has been made south of that point.

(*b*), (*c*) (*d*) and (*e*). Further progress is dependent upon the recommendation of the committee of review appointed by the Federal Government.

SPECIAL CLASSES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Are any classes conducted outside of primary and secondary schools to cater for persons suffering from specific learning difficulties and, if so, how many classes and where are these classes held?

2. How many adults are attending these classes for the correction of illiteracy and innumeracy, respectively; what is the most common age group attending classes for the correction of illiteracy, and is illiteracy considered to be a major problem in this State?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. There are three types of tuition:

(*a*) Department of Further Education at:

LeFevre College of Further Education, Elizabeth Community College, Panorama Community College of Further Education, Onkaparinga College of Further Education, Croydon Park College of Further Education, Northern College of Further Education, Strathmont College of Further Education, Tea Tree Gully College of Further Education, South Coast College of Further Education, and South-East Community College.

Note: The classes are not restricted to those with specific learning difficulties, but are open to anyone with literacy problems.

(*b*) In addition, the Education Department provides a remedial teacher at Bedford Industries.

(*c*) Outside of Government control is the tuition provided by bodies like SPELD.

2. (*a*) Department of Further Education classes cater for 110 students, mainly aged from 18 to 25 years.

(*b*) About 30, ranging in age from 17 to 30 years.

(*c*) Not known.

In general, illiteracy is not considered to be a major problem in South Australia. Figures produced within the recent surveys indicate that the situation in South Australia is little different from other States and in other developed countries. In all situations a few children do not find it as easy as most to learn to read and to develop number concepts. Research has indicated that the percentage of such children is higher in low socio-economic areas. Only a small percentage of students (Nicholson suggests not more than 2 per cent to 3 per cent even in low socio-economic areas), leave school without survival literacy skills.

BUCKLEBOO-KIMBA ROAD

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What plans has the Government to seal the Buckleboo to Kimba road during the next five years?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Subject to the availability of funds and the terms of the Commonwealth Government's legislation covering aid for roads for the period beyond June 30, 1977, it is hoped to construct and seal this road in 1978-79.

SAMCOR SPORTS COMPLEX

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What was the cost of the feasibility study carried out by Hassell and Partners into the proposed recreational and sporting complex which was to be built by Samcor at Gepps Cross?

2. Who requested this complex?

3. Will the Minister make available copies of the feasibility study and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The cost was $38 475.

2. The board of Samcor.

3. No. The report is an internal document, the property of Samcor.

Mr. GUNN: In view of that reply, I ask the Minister whether he is willing to reconsider the Government's decision not to release the report which was commissioned by Samcor and which was carried out by Hassell & Partners into the feasibility of providing a recreational and sporting complex on Samcor premises. This matter is far more serious now in my view because it

was disclosed in the reply I received that the cost of the report was in excess of $38 000. Because of the great concern in the minds of meat producers that Samcor costs are far too high, producers would like to know what is contained in the report and why Samcor can spend $38 000 on it without making available the report and the reasons for it. I believe that the Government should release immediately this report in the public interest.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would be aware that the reply to which he refers came to me from the Minister of Agriculture, so any further consideration of this matter will have to be referred to him. I shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member.

KOONGAWA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Is it intended to close the Koongawa school during the next school year and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The policy relating to the closure of schools is constantly under review in relation to enrolments. If enrolments fall then the viability of a particular school has to be examined. Koongawa is one of the small schools where the situation is under review. The current enrolment is 11; it will fall to nine next year; and there is no prospect of an increase in the succeeding years. The regional Director of Education, and the district Principal Education Officer have been to Koongawa to discuss the situation with parents. As a result of these discussions, consensus was reached that it would be sensible to close the school at the end of this year. These officers are currently preparing a report for me based on the discussions with the parents. A final decision will be made when that report has been completed.

ANIMAL WELFARE COMMITTEE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Why was the Animal Welfare Committee appointed by the Government, when was it constituted, and who are the members?

2. What are the terms of reference of the committee?

3. When is it expected that the committee will report, and will the report be made public?

4. What provision has been made to obtain community participation in the committee's inquiry?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Animal Welfare Committee was appointed to report on the need to rationalise animal welfare services in South Australia and the feasibility of establishing a first-aid and desexing service for animals. The committee was established in March, 1976. The members of the committee are Messrs. G. S. Lewkowicz and I. Dunn and Drs. R. Gieseke and J. Collard. All are officers of the South Australian Public Service.

2. The terms of reference of the committee are as follows:

To report to the Chief Secretary on the need to rationalise animal welfare services in South Australia and the feasibility of establishing a first-aid and desexing service for animals. In particular, the committee should:

1. Examine the nature and extent of problems caused by stray animals.

2. Examine the nature and extent of the problems of animal welfare organisations and services, including the provision of services for animals owned by persons on limited incomes, and recommend the most appropriate ways of solving any such problems having regard to the capacity of existing animal welfare organisations and services. Attention should be paid to the most appropriate role of animal welfare organisation and the Government in the implementation of any proposals.

3. The committee will report in the next few weeks. When the report is forwarded, its public release will be considered.

4. During its investigations the committee sought submissions from all South Australian local government bodies, all animal welfare organisations, interstate animal welfare organisations, and the public. In addition, the committee met all animal welfare organisations which provided submissions, and representatives of local government.

STATE BANK

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. To whom does the State Bank of South Australia lend its short-term deposits?

2. What security does the bank receive for its deposits?

3. What interest was obtained from short-term deposits during the 1975-76 financial year and for the July to September quarter of the 1976-77 financial year, respectively?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Elder's Finance and Investment Company Limited.

2. Commonwealth bonds, negotiable and convertible certificates of deposit of major Australian trading banks, bank endorsed commercial bills and Commonwealth and State authority debentures, all of which are trustee securities.

3. Interest obtained:
For 1975-76 financial year, $2 256 508;
For quarter ended September 30, 1976, $1 375 595.

TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many contracts have the South Australian Transport Authority, through its Bus and Tram Division, signed for the supply of components for the new Volvo buses and associated equipment?

2. What components and tender numbers are involved?

3. How many of the successful tenders will be supplied from South Australia?

4. Of the components to be supplied from another State were there any South Australian tenders submitted and, if so, by what companies?

5. For what reasons, in each case, were the South Australian tenders unsuccessful?

6. If any accepted tender from other States was for a sum greater than that tendered for an equivalent South Australian product, why was the higher tender from another State accepted?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The number is 22.

2. The components comprise the following:

Two-way radio equipment; rubber mudwings; rub-rail end pieces; hand-rail fittings; fluorescent light fittings; rubber flooring and step treads, etc.; fire extinguishers; fare brackets, top; fare brackets, bottom; destination mechanisms; fanal switches; bell pressers and passenger signals; rotary

switches; foam latex seat cushions, passengers; operators' seats; lamps, P.M.G. flashing; air-cooling equipment consisting of: air-blower units, D.C. electric motors, water transfer pumps, aspin wood eliminator pads, water and air line filters, and air heating equipment.

3. Eight.

4., 5. and 6. Yes. A tender for water and air-line filters was submitted by Jury & Spiers Pty. Ltd., but the filters offered were considered unsuitable for the bus cooling application. A tender for water transfer pumps was submitted by B. L. Shipway on behalf of Schraeder-Scovill, but the units did not comply with the specification.

THE STATE OF AGRICULTURE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): Is it intended that the monthly publication *The State of Agriculture* will regularly feature "Comments from the Minister of Agriculture", similar to those appearing in the September issue?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

CONSUMER LEGISLATION

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has a consumer legislation advisory committee been created, what are its terms of reference and who are the members?

2. Has the report entitled *Fair Dealings with Consumers* been referred to the committee and, if so, has it reported and what action does the Government intend to take on that report?

3. Does the Government intend to take unilateral action on any of those recommendations?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. A Consumer Legislation Advisory Committee has been established. Its terms of reference are to investigate consumer affairs matters involving legislation, to consider submissions from interested parties, and to report thereon to the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs. The committee is comprised of the following persons:

Ms M. Doyle, Senior Legal Officer, Attorney-General's Office, who chairs the committee; M. A. Noblet, Director-General, Public and Consumer Affairs Department; R. N. Armitage, a member of the Credit Tribunal, who is Secretary of the Australian Finance Conference (S.A. Division); Prof. A. Rogerson, a member of the Credit Tribunal, and a professor of law at the University of Adelaide; Ms M. Meek and Ms H. Barrett, Research Officers in the Public and Consumer Affairs Department; and Mr. P. O'Brien, Personal Secretary, Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, is Co-ordinator and Liaison Officer.

2. Judge White's report *Fair Dealings with Consumers* has been referred to, and is now being considered by the committee. The committee has as yet submitted no recommendations.

3. The Government will, of course, consider all recommendations made by the committee with a view to taking legislative action. Matters that may require consideration at a national level will be treated on that basis.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

Is it now intended that Mr. R. D. Bakewell will cease to be Director-General of the Premier's Department and, if so:

(*a*) why;
(*b*) when;
(*c*) to what other duties, if any, will he be assigned; and
(*d*) has a successor been appointed and, if so, who is he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: To the extent that answers can be given, this information has been detailed already in Parliament. If and when any announcement is to be made, I will do so at the appropriate time.

ACTUARIAL OFFICER

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Has the period of provisional appointment of Mr. P. O. Whelan as Deputy Public Actuary now expired and, if so:

(*a*) when did it expire;
(*b*) has his appointment now been confirmed, and when and why; and
(*c*) if his appointment has not been confirmed, what arrangement has been made concerning his employment, and why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The probationary appointment of Mr. P. O. Whelan as Deputy Public Actuary has been extended until such time as a new Public Actuary has been appointed and has occupied the position for a period sufficient to enable him to advise the Under Treasurer of his organisational and staffing requirements.

EAST END MARKET SITE

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Has the Government abandoned the project to redevelop the East End Market site for use by the South Australian Institute of Technology and the Adelaide College of Advanced Education and, if so, are there any other plans for redeveloping this site?

2. Did the Government's East End Market Relocation Committee recommend that a new wholesale market be built at Gilles Plains and, if so:

(*a*) is it the intention of the Government to follow this recommendation and, if not, has the Government any other plans to relocate the market; and
(*b*) is the site at Gilles Plains recommended by the committee still available, and is it intended by the Government that this site should be retained for a new market?

3. Has a body been appointed by the Government to investigate fruit and vegetable marketing in South Australia and, if so, who are the members of this investigating body and what are its terms of reference?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Yes.

(*a*) A detailed study of fruit and vegetable marketing in South Australia is being conducted to determine whether a central wholesale market is required.

(*b*) Yes. See 2 (*a*).

3. The East End Market Relocation Committee is conducting a detailed study into fruit and vegetable marketing, as outlined in (*a*). The members of the committee are T. Miller, B. Tugwell, G. S. Lewkowicz, R. Elleway and D. Harvey. The terms of reference of the more detailed study are as follows:

The committee should report to the Minister of Agriculture on the most appropriate and feasible form of marketing fresh fruit and vegetables in South Australia and determine the objectives of such a system.

In particular, the committee should examine:

(1) alternative methods of the physical distribution and exchange of produce, including supply-demand management;
(2) alternative methods of the mechanical handling of financial transactions and the movement of goods within the system;
(3) alternative methods of price determination; and
(4) the provision of an adequate system of market intelligence.

WATER RESOURCES ACT

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (September 16).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Membership of the four regional advisory committees established pursuant to the Water Resources Act, 1976, and published in the *Government Gazette* dated July 1, 1976, and July 22, 1976, is as follows:

1. The Northern Adelaide Plains Water Resources Advisory Committee:
Ronald Keith Baker, J.P. (Chairman)
James Arthur Bishop
William Roy Penn Boucaut, B.Sc.
Clarence Oliver Fuller, M.B., B.S., D.P.H., F.A.C.M.A.
Oscar Drysdale Hassam
Andrew Munro Kinnear, B.E., F.S.A.S.M., M.I.E.Aust.
William Edmund Matheson, M.Ag.Sc.
Petko Miho Rousanoff
Neville William Sharpe, J.P.
Rosario Trimboli
Michael Walsh

2. The River Murray Water Resources Advisory Committee:
Richard John Shannon, B.E., F.S.A.S.M., F.I.E.Aust. (Chairman)
Rodney Revett Cant, M.Sc., B.Ag.Sc., M.A.I.A.S.
Arthur Reginald Curren
Clarence Oliver Fuller, M.B., B.S., D.P.H., F.A.C.M.A.
John Winston Gilchrist, R.D.A., M.A.TA., J.P.
Norman Mervyn Green, J.P.
Geoffrey Russell Inglis, B.E.
Colin Glen Marks, J.P.
Maxwell Roy Till, B.Ag.Sc.
Kenneth James Turvey
Victor Ronnie Zadow

3. The Padthaway Water Resources Advisory Committee:
Ronald Hallam Badman, R.D.A., J.P. (Chairman)
Terence Charles Brown
Donald Norman Ide, B.E., F.S.A.S.M. (Mech.)
Ronald Murray Kelly, J.P.
Edgar Walter Bike, J.P.
Maxwell Roy Till, B.Ag.Sc.
Anthony Fyfe Williams, B.Sc. (Hons.)

4. The Arid Areas Water Resources Advisory Committee:
Frederick James Vickery, M.A.T.A., J.P. (Chairman)
William Roy Penn Boucaut, B.Sc.
Richard Douglas Stuart Clark, M.A., D.I.C. (Eng. Hyd.)
Richard Russell Hancock, B.E., M.Aust.I.M.M.
Edgar Gwynne Hughes
Malcolm Ian McTaggart
William Percival Mitchell
Walter Edward Reick
Maxwell Roy Till, B.Ag.Sc.

RIVERLAND ALLOTMENTS

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (July 29).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government has approved of the Lands Department providing serviced residential allotments in irrigation towns, some of which are available at Berri, Barmera, and Waikerie. At Loxton, the Lands Department has agreed to make land available to the District Council of Loxton for residential development whilst industrial/commercial sites are available at Berri and Waikerie. The South Australian Housing Trust also provides housing in the towns of Berri, Barmera, Waikerie, and Loxton. The Land Commission does not propose to operate in these areas.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 11).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The enclosure of the cooling towers was completed by the Public Buildings Department on July 14, 1976.

PORT ADELAIDE EXHIBITION

In reply to Mr. WHITTEN (September 8).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: An exhibition of the first stage report prepared by the consultants, Monarto Development Commission, was set up in a marquee, outside the Port Adelaide Town Hall, for the period of August 19 to September 4, this year. This was preceded by publicity of the three planning "options" suggested by the consultants, and attendance during the day averaged about 300 persons. The exhibition included a display of photographic material and a taped commentary explaining the study, which was explained in detail by three attendants. In total, some 4 000 people attended the exhibition, and 400 questionnaires were completed by interested persons. Additional comments were provided in visitors' books, attendance records, and displayed comment sheets. In general, the exhibition of the suggested planning options was considered successful by the authority, and will be followed by a presentation of the draft scheme to a meeting of representatives of the community and business organisations in October. The proposed redevelopment scheme should then be available for public comment early in December.

TRUCK LOAD LIMITS

In reply to Mr. VENNING (September 16).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Traffic Board has decided to continue its policy of 40 per cent over the gross vehicle or gross combination mass limit, subject to the same conditions for the forthcoming grain harvest, but the limit will be reduced from March 1, 1977, to 30 per cent for a period of 12 months, and as from March 1, 1978, will be reduced to 20 per cent which will then conform with the provisions of the Road Traffic Act relating to the carriers of other commodities.

LIVESTOCK

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (September 16).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The use of amber flashing lights under the existing provisions of the road traffic regulations is restricted to tow-trucks, service trucks of

public utilities, and other special purpose vehicles which may be required to stop in hazardous positions on the roadway. Similar requests have been made in the past, but have been refused on the grounds that a proliferation in the use of such lights is likely to lead to a reduction in observance and hence reduce the safety of existing personnel using such lights. However, it is recognised that a potential hazard does exist and the matter will be considered by the Advisory Committee on Road User Performance and Traffic Codes at its next meeting to be held this month.

VANDALISM

Dr. TONKIN: In view of the escalating costs involved in acts of vandalism, can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Government will initiate immediately a community programme directed against vandalism? Recently, five trees in the Rundle Mall were destroyed; their calculated amenity value was $6 400. Vandalism is a continuing problem to local government bodies throughout the State. Vandalism in South Australia cost Telecom Australia about $250 000 and the Post Office about $20 000 last year, while fires and vandalism cost the Education Department many thousands of dollars. One fire bomb incident alone cost $10 000. No specific figures are kept for the railways, but damage runs into thousands of dollars each year, and other departments suffer.

As well as the cost involved, the danger to life is often extreme. Railway crossing boom gates have been interfered with, and signals have been damaged. Each stone thrown through a train window may involve up to $100 for replacement. There must be a co-ordinated programme including the following:

1. Accurate assessment of incidence and cost;
2. Increased security and enforcement;
3. An investigation into the possibility of requiring offenders to be liable for compensation, either financially or in service to the community; and
4. An educational programme based on schools and on a media campaign in the community generally.

Such a campaign is more urgently necessary than are the proposed films on consumer affairs to be released for Christmas and played to the tune of "Jingle Bells".

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am not averse to examining the Leader's proposal, but I think that certain points should be made perhaps to clarify what he has said. I think that most members would agree with me that one way of reducing vandalism is finding a way to occupy people's time, and the Federal Government is not making this any easier at present.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The present unemployment situation is so disgraceful and so darkening to young people generally that some of them might well be trying to express their frustrations in this way at not being able to get employment. The State Government is trying to do something about this matter through job hunters' clubs and making money available for unemployment generally throughout the State. However, it cannot handle a problem of this magnitude: the matter lies directly in the hands of the Federal Liberal Government, which presently might even listen to its own back-benchers. Federal back-benchers can see this problem, even if our own State Liberal Opposition members cannot. Federal back-benchers see where the responsibility for this problem lies, and realise that something needs to be done about it: they have more guts than have the local Opposition members, because they are telling Mr. Fraser about it, both publicly and privately, through channels in their own Party. I recall recent reports in the press, including the *Australian* and other reputable journals, pointing out that Federal back-benchers, both Government and Opposition members, had taken every opportunity to publicise this problem.

Hundreds of thousands of young people are likely to be out of work in the new year, and that is a shocking prospect. To talk about vandalism in isolation is just not on. There is no way one can talk about vandalism as the Leader has tried to do, making disparaging remarks about *bona fide* attempts by the State Government to look after consumers' interests. The Government has a responsibility in this matter to make consumers aware of their rights because, if they are unaware of their rights, how can they obtain them? I commend the Government with respect to that part of the Leader's remarks, but I suggest that it did not do him any credit when he tried to disparage that activity of State Government. I will examine the proposals with respect to vandalism, which I deplore, as do most people in the community, but I do remind the Leader that to try to consider vandalism totally out of context and in isolation is not doing justice to the problem.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister state his source of information for saying that the current unemployment situation has increased the incidence of vandalism? In replying to the Leader, the Minister implied that unemployment was responsible to some degree for the increase in vandalism. I inform the Minister that the crime statistics in the report of the Commissioner of Police for the year ended June 30, 1975, showed a 10 per cent increase in crime and that 58 per cent of crime was committed by people aged 18 years and under and that 25 per cent of crime was committed by people aged 14 years and under. Recently in the House the Minister stated that crime statistics for the 12 months ended June 30, 1976, had shown no increase at all. I therefore ask the Minister, in view of the costs and dangers to the community and the need to curb vandalism, what is his source of information in relation to vandalism.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If I were a member of the Opposition I, too, would be trying to disguise what had been stated, because it certainly needs covering up. Anyone responsible for creating the present unemployment situation would try to get out of it and deny that they were responsible. I should like to correct something said by the member for Hanson, who suggested that I stated that the juvenile crime figures had not shown an increase. I did not say that. Instead, what I said earlier was that there had been a marked decrease in the rate of increase of juvenile crime, which is a vastly different thing. There has been a small increase, but it has not been at the rate we have unfortunately experienced in recent years. That evidence, if you like, was supported by Judge Wilson in the Juvenile Court report, so presumably what I have said will not be challenged. In speaking in the House earlier today, I did not necessarily say that there was a causative link between unemployment and vandalism. What I did say was that it might be that people were trying to express their frustration at not being able to gain employment. Vandalism could be the way they are trying to bring to the attention of authority generally the way they feel about a situation in our country wherein so many young people, and for that matter, people who are

not young, who are willing to work are unable to work. The remedy lies in the hands of the Federal Government. To that degree, I can certainly show that unemployment is the direct responsibilty of the Federal Liberal Government, and there could well be a link between the degree of unemployment and the incidence of vandalism. If the honourable member put forward the suggestion that an investigation was necessary to confirm the link, I would agree with him. I never suggested that that was an absolute fact, however. I indicated, I think in my reply to the Leader, that I was willing to examine the proposition put forward. I believe that the occasion should not be allowed to pass without the true facts being stated about the responsibility for the sad state of affairs of the economy and unemployment in Australia.

SCHOOL LEAVERS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Education give me details of the programme to commence at the end of October to help students find jobs? One of the schools in my district, namely, Port Adelaide High School, is one of the schools that has been selected to assist in this matter. Employers need to have sufficient confidence in the economy of this country to give extra jobs to school leavers. As the Minister has said thousands of young people will soon be unemployed. Yesterday's *Advertiser* contained a report relating to children coming from Kingscote and Parndana to Port Adelaide High School to get training in how to secure a job. How long will they stay, how many will be brought over, and how will they be accommodated? The report states:

Country students will be brought to the city for work experience and career development. Students from the Kingscote and Parndana Area Schools will be the first and will work with Port Adelaide High School students.

I should appreciate any other information that is available.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As some of the information the honourable member requires is specific, I will get it for him. For the general information of honourable members, I believe that 11 schools will initially be involved in this programme, which has been jointly devised by the Youth Work Unit of the Premier's Department, and the Education Department. The schools selected are largely in those areas where there is already a very high unemployment rate amongst young people. I think the only two extra-metropolitan schools that are involved in the scheme at this stage are Whyalla Stuart High School and Port Augusta High School. It was always considered in the scheme that the courses available at these 11 schools should also be made available to students from other schools, both in metropolitan and country areas, so that at metropolitan schools there will be students from other schools coming in to take advantage of the course offered.

As the honourable member has indicated, there will also be provision for country students to gain the benefits of the courses. The teachers who will be involved in the course are at present undergoing a preparation programme which has been devised by the Further Education Department and which will enable teachers to assist young people in gaining some of the specific skills needed in applications for employment. I point out that all this programme will do is assist those young people in their competitive situation within the labour market. It does not, of itself, do anything to create additional employment, the need for which is the core of the problem. There does seem to be a certain impression that the problem with the employment of young people is the sort of preparation they are given within the education system. The plain fact of the matter is that there are not enough jobs, and if enough jobs are created the problem disappears.

SECURITY OFFICER

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say what was the reason for the resignation of the security officer from the Education Department? Were any reports written by the officer on security in schools and, if they were, did the officer believe that improvements could be made in school security? I am not seeking information that would assist would-be school vandals and thieves. However, school damage and loss causes great expense for the South Australian taxpayer, and it seems strange that the recently appointed security officer should have resigned so soon after his appointment. Did he make reports to the department and, if so, what did he have to say about school security?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Mr. Patterson made a series of reports to the department during the time he was an officer. These were not what one would call extraordinary actions of a public servant: they were part of his function. The recommendations in those various reports are still being evaluated by the department, because most of them involve money, and that means getting some sort of priority for them in the capital works programme. Regarding his resignation, the house has already been told by means of a Question on Notice where Mr. Patterson is now employed, and I guess he saw this as some advancement for himself. I believe that Mr. Patterson rendered valuable assistance to the department during the time of his employment. For this reason I think we were correct in creating this position in the department, and we will fill the vacancy as soon as we possibly can.

DORSET VALE COTTAGES

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister for Planning say whether he will have stopped the demolition of two cottages at Dorset Vale and the contract for their demolition terminated? Although the two cottages that were the subject of a news release over the weekend are not ancient in terms of the history of the State, they represent the era of the 1940's. The land on which they stand belongs to the State Planning Authority. The neighbouring land belongs to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which has given permission for the Coromandel Valley and District National Trust to preserve the buildings on its land. The State Planning Authority has started to demolish the two buildings, which this branch of the National Trust believes to have some significance within that era of development of that area. The State Planning Authority owns much land in the area including that on which stands the old chimney stack of the Alamanda mine, and the National Trust branch is concerned that that will also be demolished. One cottage has been partly demolished, but the material from it can be used for other purposes, and the other building can still be salvaged at this stage. The National Trust branch believes that $2 000 or $3 000 has been paid for the demolition of the buildings. Last weekend there was an opening of the buildings on the Engineering and Water Supply Department land. The local trust believes it was a spiteful slap in the face that the demolition of the other buildings

took place at the end of last week. Can the Minister stop any further demolition so that the National Trust branch can preserve the buildings, whether or not they have any actual classification according to the Adelaide branch? The buildings, which represent an era, are on land owned by the State. If preserved, they can be used for recreation purposes and could be an attraction for tourists. Will the Minister take the action I have suggested?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer is "No". The National Trust does not support the retention of these buildings.

Mr. Evans: The local branch.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The local branch may do so. The National Trust itself supports the view of the State Planning Authority that there is no requirement to preserve these buildings. The matter has been investigated fully and detailed reports have been considered by both me and the Premier. No case has been made out on grounds that the Government can accept for the retention of these buildings either from the point of view of conservation of buildings of historic interest or from the point of view of tourist attraction. In fact, I recall that the letter written to me by the local branch of the trust did not refer to the historic character of these buildings; it stated that it wanted to make temporary use of the buildings for its own purposes. There was nothing in the application (in my recollection, but I may be incorrect and I will check that) relating to historic significance. As I am not familiar with the situation of the old chimney, I will get a report on it and check the other points I have already made.

SUCCESSION DUTY

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Premier say whether, once the necessary legislation has been passed by Parliament to exempt succession duties for estates passing between spouses, there will be any change in procedure in preparing and presenting documents to court for the necessary granting of probate? I understand that the present procedure requires forms A and B to be completed, and involves legal and valuation costs, which for a simple estate can amount to $300 or $400. I also understand that many executors are delaying the processing of estates passing from one spouse to another because they are awaiting this legislation, as I believe that the Government promised to make it retrospective to July 1. People involved in this matter have told me that there are considerable delays at present, and possibly the delays are incorrectly founded, because people believe that the procedure will be simplified once the legislation has been introduced. If the procedure is to be simplified, obviously the legislation should be introduced as soon as possible, so that people do not have to incur costs that would now be necessary but might not be necessary if the legislation had already been passed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assume that the honourable member is referring to the filing of succession duty statements when he refers to forms A and B. From memory, I do not recall forms A and B in relation to the granting of probate.

Mr. Millhouse: No, succession duties.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report from the Commissioner for State Taxation but I expect that the procedure will be markedly simplified.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier introduce the amending legislation on the Succession Duties Act as soon as possible in order that the estates which have been delayed since July 1 may be dealt with expeditiously? It has been put to me that many estates are awaiting finalisation but have been deferred following notice the Government has given about amending legislation to come before the House. Because of that fact, and particularly if the legislation is going to make the whole process an easier one, I ask that the Government take steps to introduce the legislation as soon as possible so that those people can receive as soon as possible the assistance and benefit of the concession that is being allowed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The legislation will be introduced as soon as possible. I have already indicated that no succession duties will be payable on estates in respect of deaths occurring as from last July 1, and that is the case.

JUVENILE COURTS ACT ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask a question of the Attorney-General, and hope that the Premier will not reply to it because I ask it specifically of the Attorney-General. Were Their Honours the Chief Justice and the Acting Senior Judge consulted before the announcement of the appointment of His Honour Judge Mohr as the Royal Commissioner to inquire into the matters giving rise to the resignation of His Honour Judge Wilson? I emphasise that I do not intend to canvass any of the matters that will be the subject of the Royal Commission, because now that it has been appointed I cannot do that. My question refers specifically to the appointment of His Honour Judge Mohr as the Royal Commissioner. In the debate on Thursday, I raised the question of the advisability or not of having a Local and District Criminal Court judge presiding over the Royal Commission that will inquire into the actions, etc., of another Local and District Criminal Court judge, and I referred to the great embarrassment that may be caused. The more I think about it the more certain I am that the Government has made a great mistake in appointing a judge of the same level. I point out that it is the normal practice, indeed the courtesy (and it is more than a courtesy), to approach the Chief Justice about a matter of this kind, and we were told that no judge was available, or to approach the Acting Senior Judge who is in charge of the administration and work of judges in the Local and District Criminal Court, before making an appointment. Therefore, I ask whether or not the Government did this on Thursday. The actions of the Government on Thursday reminded me irresistibly of the panic moves in the dying days of the Walsh Government regarding the appointment of the Murrie Royal Commission.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now entering into debate and not asking a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Having made that point, I remind the Attorney-General that one of the cardinal rules of cross-examination is never to ask a question unless you know the answer to it.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not know what the honourable member meant by his last comment, but I shall ignore it. He has asked whether the Government approached the Chief Justice and the Acting Senior Judge. The answer is "No".

ADOPTIONS

Mr. WOTTON: Since conflicting views have been expressed recently, will the Attorney-General indicate the present situation regarding the adoption by South Australians of Vietnamese and Cambodian children? Recently, at least two statements have been attributed to the Attorney-General that are somewhat conflicting: first, that cases can proceed successfully without amending the legislation, and secondly, that the matter is being considered by State and Federal Attorneys-General with a view to amending the legislation. Will the Attorney indicate which statement will be adhered to and, if it is the latter, what action has been taken? A few cases have been successful lately, but many people are extremely concerned about the adoption of children, particularly those involved in the airlifts.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member did not attribute either statement to any source.

Mr. Wotton: To the Attorney-General.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: He did not give the source. I do not recall having made the first statement. I have said that the Government believes that the present legislation is satisfactory to deal with the adoption applications before the courts. At no stage have I sought to presume what the opinion of the courts might be in dealing with such applications. If a court were to make a finding that in its view the legislation was not wide enough to enable the adoption proceeding to be successful, we would look further at the situation. I have often said that difficulties exist in this area involving children from other countries. It may be (and I say only that it may be) that the State, under the Constitution, does not have the power to legislate for the adoption of such children; it may well be that children from other countries should be adopted pursuant to some exercise of the Federal foreign affairs power.

Mr. Millhouse: Unless there is some legislation.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As the member for Mitcham says, unless there is some Federal legislation. A number of constitutional difficulties as well as other difficulties arise in this area. Officers of my department, in conjunction with officers of other departments of State Government and the Commonwealth Government, have been looking at these matters. As the member for Mitcham will well know, such unified actions often take considerable time. Some time has passed since these negotiations have been taking place and since these discussions got under way. Only last week, a meeting of Government officers in the social welfare field in Adelaide discussed, amongst other matters, recommendations to the Government on this matter. No applications have yet been unsuccessful; some adoptions have proceeded successfully over the past few weeks.

Mr. Wotton: They're special.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: They are not special, other than that a certain witness was involved in those matters. The question that must be placed before the court is whether it is prepared to exercise its power under the adoption legislation and to dispense with the consent of the parent. That is a preliminary question that can be dealt with by the court, and a decision can be made on that matter before the substantive question of whether or not the adoption will take place is dealt with. It has been suggested that the adoptions legislation provides that, once an application has been rejected, it is difficult to resurrect it. That situation does not arise until the preliminary point has been dealt with. I suggest that solicitors acting for the people concerned should take the matters to court and have them dealt with on this preliminary question to have them tested. That is proceeding slowly, but I understand from the court that legal practitioners have shown considerable reluctance to have the matters dealt with. I suggest that the appropriate course is to have the question tested in each matter to determine the situation. A number of applications as to the preliminary question can be made. Once an order refusing an adoption application has been made, the matter cannot be tested again except in special circumstances. I suggest that the honourable member should advise his constituents to proceed to have the preliminary matter determined.

Mr. Wotton: These people have already gone to court, and they have been told that they have not got sufficient evidence.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the honourable member wishes to take up that matter with me later, I shall be happy to discuss it. Question Time is not the place to debate it.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether any further progress has been made in the vexed question of the adoption of children from Vietnam and like countries? I raised this matter with the Minister earlier, and much publicity has been given to it. Indeed, as the Minister well knows, a case in the South-East is causing much anguish to the would-be adoptive parents. I would be grateful if the Minister could inform the House what progress is being made regarding the adoption of these children.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I suspect that the main import of the question was answered earlier today by another Minister. I think the honourable member is referring mainly to the welfare aspects of this matter, and I will endeavour to answer him on these lines rather than on the legal aspects. The welfare aspects in relation to the specific case raised by the honourable member are such that I can only reassure him (as I did on an earlier occasion) that there is no intention to disturb custody of children already with prospective adopters. Cases come up in a certain order, and I understand that some progress has been made recently, as was outlined by the Attorney-General today. Reference was made to a special witness who was able to assist, I believe, in court in a matter of identification. With respect to certain of the children involved in those adoptions, some progress has been made on the general scheme; this was mentioned briefly by the Attorney-General when he referred to a meeting of social welfare administrators from the State and the Commonwealth held recently in Adelaide. The public servants concerned were discussing what I have already called the welfare aspects of the adoption of children from foreign countries. Certain proposals were put forward which are now being examined by the departments of the Attorneys-General of the States and the Commonwealth to see whether any legal technicalities are involved. When the discussion period has ended, it is proposed to take some legislative steps, if necessary. That is, in general, what was intimated to the House earlier today. In the specific matter mentioned by the honourable member, I assure him that there is no intention of causing anguish to the people concerned. The assurance given earlier still stands.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Attorney-General any report to make regarding his immediate plans for justices of the peace? Over a period of time, questions have been directed to the Attorney-General and to his predecessors on this

matter. It has been commented recently that, in addressing a meeting of justices, the Attorney-General outlined to them his proposals regarding justices and their future activities.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have not got the report concerned, but I would have been only too happy to read large portions of it into *Hansard*. I think the honourable member has slightly misconstrued the references in that article to my comments. At a recent cocktail party held by the justices, some justices raised with me the question of having justices older than 70 years of age sitting on the bench. I explained to them again the Government's position: because we require Supreme Court judges to retire at 70 years of age, we believe that no other persons should sit in the courts of South Australia beyond that age. Generally, they were willing to accept that this was a fair and reasonable principle. They did say, however, that they thought we would find some difficulty in manning the courts if we enforced that policy vigorously. We accept, of course, that that may well be the present situation. An investigation is being carried out in my department at present to work out how this policy can be implemented as soon as possible. In the short term, this may mean that justices older than 70 years of age will continue to sit on the bench, but my department is taking the necessary action to ensure that people below that age will be available in sufficient numbers to man the courts as required.

We can look to receiving valuable assistance from justices in this State below the age of 70 years in several areas. For example, no doubt a number of justices of the peace are housewives who would be only too happy to make available some time to sit in the courts. If we could attract more women justices to sit for the examination and subsequently give their time in the service of the State, that would be a useful development, and one I look forward to; it is a development that is likely to take place soon. I am not able to say finally what the results of the departmental investigation are likely to be, but I know various matters are being investigated. I hope that soon I shall be able to inform the House about the outcome of those investigations and about the proposals and plans the Government has to implement this policy.

WALLAROO NORTH BEACH

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister for the Environment say what specific area of the coast at North Beach, Wallaroo, has been proclaimed to be under the control of the Coast Protection Board? Can he also say whether it is only above and within 100 metres of the high-water mark that has been proclaimed or whether the area proclaimed covers the entire sand dune area, too?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I believe that the area controlled by the Coast Protection Board is 150 metres above the high-water mark, but I will check that for the honourable member.

MOBILE RESOURCE UNITS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on whether the three mobile resource units that were to be bought to operate in widely spread areas of Adelaide are now in use? Can he also supply full details about how the scheme of encouraging interest in pre-school and child-care activities by the use of these vehicles in these areas will operate? In June this year the Childhood Services Council made available $27 000 to provide three mobile resource units to operate in the Modbury and Valley View area, the Christies Beach area and the Taperoo and Port Adelaide area. The units were expected to cost about $9 000 fully equipped and were to operate through the Kindergarten Union in conjunction with the Education Department and the Community Welfare Department. It was expected to take about three months to make the vehicles operational.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The vehicles are in operation. Perhaps I should get a considered reply for the honourable member, but I understand that the operation is proceeding with much success and much support from local people and augers well for future expansion for this type of operation.

MILLICENT NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. VANDEPEER: Can the Minister of Education provide a report about the cause of the collapse of the ceiling in the new double-unit open-space school building at Millicent North school? The ceiling collapse in this newly-constructed building, which is an addition to the Millicent North school has, naturally, caused deep concern at the school. As far as I know, an explanation has not been given of the cause of the collapse. The new building is of Samcon construction. At the time of the collapse no staff or children had moved in permanently, so we were fortunate that no-one was in the building, because, if children had been present, a tragedy could have occurred. Unless the cause of the collapse is ascertained and other buildings with similar ceilings are checked, it is possible that all Samcon buildings will be considered suspect because the ceilings could fall.

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

FREE SPECTACLES

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health what progress has been made to provide locally prescribed free spectacles for pensioners in remote country areas instead of their having to attend the Royal Adelaide Hospital? It is now more than 12 months since I engaged in correspondence with the Minister, who said that a report would be handed down in due course. Transport, accommodation, fatigue and the time involved often stop pensioners from attending the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I should appreciate it if this matter could be examined.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will bring this matter to my colleague's attention.

SCHOOL DENTAL CARE

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Community Welfare tell me what action the Government is taking to provide school dental care to all South Australian students? During the recent Loan Estimates debate I raised this matter on the lines, and the Minister said that he would pass on my query to the Minister of Health. I asked whether or not the programme of providing school dental care to all students was up to schedule. As I believe that the programme is not up to the schedule the Government hoped to maintain, can the Minister say whether the

Government intends to make use of dentists in private practice to assist in this scheme to ensure that all South Australian students, and not just those in selected schools, receive dental care, or does the Government intend in the meantime to provide additional mobile units to try to solve the problem presently existing?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I shall be pleased to try to obtain the information for the honourable member.

CAVAN BRIDGE

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport expedite the building of the bridge over the railway line at Cavan? Today's *Advertiser* contains a report under the heading "Holiday motorists cause chaos". It is not the motorists who cause chaos: it is the total inadequacy of the road that is the problem. This is no new matter: we have had this problem for some time. The press report states, among other comments, that the leg between Port Wakefield and Cavan on the Port Wakefield Road took up to three hours to complete in the late afternoon. I think that, in a civilised country such as ours, traffic being held up on a holiday weekend for three hours is a matter that really needs serious attention by the Government. Will the Minister direct his attention to this problem?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I can remember the day during a holiday weekend when it used to take between four and five hours to complete the trip: that was before duplicating quite a deal of the road took place. However, fortunately over the past six years much of that duplication has taken place, and traffic passes much more quickly than was previously the case.

Mr. Venning: The bridge is the weakest link, though.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member may say that that is the weakest link, but, from information I have sought from people on site, that may not be the case. I do not know whether the honourable member has an "in" to my conversations, because only last Thursday I discussed this matter with the Commissioner of Highways, and he is examining several suggestions I put forward.

Mr. Venning: I think there must have been a leakage.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That may well be so. I know that the honourable member is clued up in this regard. I assure him that work is proceeding as rapidly as possible, and design work on the new bridge is going ahead. I remind the honourable member that all the factors associated with the road programme are not in the South Australian Government's court. Indeed, if he had referred to another report in this morning's paper, he could be pardoned for believing that South Australia was getting $10 200 000 extra for roads, according to the statement of his Federal colleague (Mr. Nixon) to that effect. If the honourable member had read that report carefully, he would have ascertained that we were getting only Mr. Nixon's approval for the sum of about $10 000 000 included in the legislation brought down by the Whitlam Labor Government.

Mr. Becker: Ha, ha!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Hanson may laugh, but I have written this morning to Mr. Nixon, thanking him for his approval of the list we forwarded last April. We have operated for three months, hoping that, from his far away ivory tower in Canberra, he would approve of what was needed. Fortunately, he was abreast of the situation.

SAMCOR COTTAGES

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Deputy Premier ask the Minister of Agriculture what plans he or the South Australian Meat Corporation has in mind for the future use of the cottages originally occupied by Samcor staff members at the old abattoirs on either side of the railway line on the Main North Road? On a recent visit in that area, I noticed that many of these cottages were vacant. Some of them had apparently suffered at the hands of vandals, front windows having been smashed, and the place looked derelict. If these cottages are not to be used by Samcor's employees, could they be renovated and used by people in our community urgently seeking housing?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report from my colleague as soon as possible.

NURIOOTPA-LOXTON ROAD

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Transport say when it is intended to complete the 13 kilometres of unformed, unsealed road on Main Road No. 34 between Nuriootpa and Loxton? I travelled on that road to the Loxton show yesterday. A number of constituents approached me while I was there and asked me about this road. The Minister will recall that an undertaking was given that this road would be completed by June, 1975. I do not know why the road was not completed in time, but it would seem that, because eight kilometres of the 13 km has been formed, some work should be done at least to protect the expenditure that has already been incurred.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member, particularly in view of the experience, unpleasant as it must have been, for the honourable member to be where he was yesterday.

WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMMES

Mr. BOUNDY: Has the Minister of Education any further information regarding the future of work experience programmes in schools? I am sure the Minister will recall that on August 3, 1976, I asked him a question about the withdrawal of work experience programmes from schools because of difficulties about arranging insurance, and like matters. The Minister answered by saying it was not something he believed he would be able to resolve in isolation from his colleagues but that he hoped to have a reply soon.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am afraid I have to prolong the matter further. It has been necessary to get a Crown law opinion on this matter, which is still not resolved. I take this opportunity to dispel an impression that seems to be abroad. I noticed, for example, some time ago a reference to this matter in a newspaper in the Murray District which tended to underline that the whole matter had been scrapped because of pressure from the trade union movement. Nothing is further from the truth: I want to make that perfectly clear. The Government has received advice, properly sought and properly tendered, that some legal problems are involved in relation to compensation and that sort of thing. We are very eager to proceed with the programme, but until these matters are resolved it is important for the protection of the children and teachers involved that a proper basis for operating

is worked out. I again have to disappoint the honourable member, but I make the point that we are very anxious to resolve this matter as soon as possible so that what I believe was a very valuable programme can be continued.

PROJECTED SCHOOL NUMBERS

Dr. EASTICK: Is the Minister of Education in possession of details regarding the projected school numbers for 1977? It is obvious that, in the management of an organisation as large as the Education Department, predictions of likely scholar numbers are undertaken well in advance of the commencement of a school year. I should like to know whether, on the information that the Minister has, there seems to be an increase in school numbers for 1977 or whether there is a decrease. I relate this question to the information which was given earlier this year that, although there was an expected increase for 1976, by the end of March the figures were a little lower than in 1975. I appreciate that in some areas the numbers of students will be far greater than in the past (this is a shift of age group and the like), but I seek this general information from the Minister. If the Minister does not have this information immediately available, could he acquaint the House of the predictions?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get the figures for the honourable member. From memory, I think the figures suggest a marginal decline in both primary and secondary enrolments for 1977.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the South Australian Government intends, in accordance with statements he has previously made on this matter, to ignore the Governor-General in future when he is visiting South Australia? We know that the Government and the Premier ignored the Governor-General on previous official visits to South Australia. We also know that the majority of the South Australian public believe this to be a completely childish procedure. Does the Premier intend to persist in the discourtesy that the Government has displayed to the Governor-General in the past?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has made perfectly clear its position on occasions when the Governor-General attends functions in South Australia and, where protocol requires that it be there, the Government will be there. I do not know to what the honourable member is now referring, but I understand that the Governor-General came to South Australia last week and went to a winery in the Barossa Valley and to a show at Loxton. So far as I am aware, I was not invited to attend at either occasion.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Would you have gone?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That question did not arise. I do not know what the honourable member is carrying on about. I do not know whether the honourable member was at Loxton; I did not see that he was there. Had he been there, he would have been one of those holding up a League of Rights placard.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

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

That Mr. C. J. Wells be discharged from attending the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and that Mr. C. A. Harrison be appointed in his place, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting that resolution.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

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

That Mr. C. J. Wells be appointed to the Public Accounts Committee in place of Mr. C. A. Harrison (resigned).

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The change in chairmanship of the Public Accounts Committee has been made for reasons not apparent on the surface. This committee was established some years ago at the instigation of the member for Mallee, who had been pressing for several years for the establishment of such a committee. As a foundation member of the committee, I believe it has done this State a good service, and I would like to pay tribute to the former Chairmen, the Minister for the Environment and, latterly, the member for Albert Park. I believe one or two attempts have been made to muzzle this committee, particularly by the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's a lie. You haven't been able to prove it. You had to apologise once before, and you'll have to apologise again.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I could request a retraction of that, but the Deputy Premier will have his opportunity to reply. Some time ago a letter came from the Deputy Premier seeking to curtail the activities of the committee, when I was a member. The contents of the letter were the subject of some debate in this House. I understand, although I am no longer a member of the committee—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The best thing that could have happened to the committee.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: My Party promoted me to the position of Deputy Leader and in those circumstances it was not appropriate for me to continue on that committee. I do not doubt that I would have continued on the committee had I been able. An inquiry was made in relation to a question I asked in this House. A Public Service Commissioner was involved, and it seemed to me to be an improper inquiry. We now find out of the blue that there is to be a change in the chairmanship of the Public Accounts Committee. I have not discussed this matter in any detail with my Party but to me, and to perhaps some members of the Liberal Party, this appears as though it could be a continuation of the attempts by some members of the Government to muzzle the committee. We know that the member for Florey, who has been appointed, has recently been given some rather unsavoury duties in this House, and I refer to the debate that ensued as a result of unsubstantiated allegations made by the member for Florey in a political exercise in the past two weeks.

It is with some misgiving that I have heard this motion to replace the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. From all reports I have received on the operation of that committee, he has been a most successful Chairman. If this is an attempt by the Government to muzzle the Public Accounts Committee and it has changed the

Chairman for that purpose, that is a serious state of affairs. If that is not the case, I would like to have an explanation for the change in chairmanship, because no reason has been given to this House to justify the change in chairmanship of that important and so far successful committee. We know the committee has embarrassed some Ministers because the committee has made some adverse comments in its tabled reports. To drop this motion before the House out of the blue with no explanation lends much weight to my belief that this is one of the continuing attempts of the Government to muzzle this important committee. I believe that the Government owes the House more detail than it has so far given in this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The change in membership of these two committees was at the request of the two members concerned. The request was specifically made by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee that he be relieved of that position and that he transfer to another.

Mr. Millhouse: Was it too much for him, or something?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He makes up his own mind. He believed he would better serve the Parliament in another position. He discussed the matter with the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and they agreed and made a recommendation to the Government. There was no question of the Government's making any request of either member in respect of this matter. Regarding the honourable member's suggestion that we are somehow setting out to muzzle the Public Accounts Committee, I can assure him that the new Chairman of that committee is completely unmuzzled, and I hope he bites the honourable member.

Motion carried.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. WELLS: I was saddened by the Deputy Leader's outburst, and I wish to state categorically that the change of chairmanship of these two committees was by mutual agreement between the member for Albert Park and me. Although I was branded in this House recently as a hatchet man and a contract man of the Party, I can assure the House that I will conduct the duties of Chairman of that committee, if I am so elected, in the manner in which I conducted the chairmanship of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I will carry out the duties as I am required, without fear or favour.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION JURISDICTION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I take pleasure in introducing this Bill. The fact that it has proved necessary to extend the life of the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act is an indication that the "fragile package" of wage indexation has survived with benefit to the workforce and the Australian economy generally.

However, I do not feel either complacent or greatly confident about its future. From the first time at the beginning of this year when the Fraser Government backed away from its election promises of supporting wage indexation and asked the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to apply half the percentage rise in the consumer price index, the system has been under strain. Full acceptance by the Australian Commission of the submissions of the Commonwealth Government in the three cases this year would have killed it, and plunged us back into the old chaotic system of grab what you can. Fortunately, the union movement has so far shown great restraint in accepting less than full indexation (amounting to a cut in real wages for many members of the workforce) and generally confining wage increases to those allowed under the guidelines.

If the system is going to continue into 1977, then this enabling Act must remain in force to allow the State Commission to apply the Federal decisions to the extent it considers is necessary and desirable. I remind members that the Act does not purport to lay down guidelines or direct the commission. It is purely an enabling measure. The Bill provides that the Act continue in force for a further 12 months, but that it can be terminated by proclamation at an earlier date if the wage indexation system is abandoned before that 12 months has expired. The Government remains committed to the orderly fixation of wages through indexation, which is intended to ensure that the purchasing power of wages is maintained during the present inflationary period. It sees this as vital in the present economic situation: its value has been clearly demonstrated. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

The operative provision, clause 2, repeals and re-enacts section 9 of the principal Act, which provides that the principal Act shall expire on December 31 of this year. In its re-enacted form section 9 will provide that the principal Act will expire on a date to be fixed by proclamation, with the proviso that if such a proclamation is not made before December, 1977, the principal Act will expire on that day.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. Evans: No!

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is refused. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This Bill makes several important amendments to the Licensing Act and, notwithstanding the fact that I supplied copies of the second reading explanation to the Leader of the Opposition about 15 minutes ago, I will read it. An important aspect of the amendments consists in a reorganisation of the Licensing

Court. As members are no doubt aware, the Licensing Court, when it sits to deal with new applications for licences, must be constituted of a judge and two licensing magistrates. The Government considered that a court so constituted was necessary to deal with the very substantial reorganisation of the liquor industry that took place following the new Licensing Act passed in 1967.

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

Leave granted.

REMAINDER OF EXPLANATION OF BILL

However, it believes that, now the reorganisation has been substantially completed, the existence of a Licensing Court which is constituted of three judicial members is now no longer warranted, at any rate for ordinary day to day business. The Bill therefore proposes that the court should normally be constituted simply of a single member of the court. The Full Bench of the court continues to exist under the terms of the Bill, but it will normally only be called together for the purpose of hearing appeals from a magistrate sitting alone or for the purpose of determining a special case referred by a single member of the court to the Full Bench.

The Bill provides for the appointment of magistrates to the Licensing Court. These magistrates will be specificially appointed for the purpose of Licensing Court work, and are to be distinguished from special magistrates who will normally not sit in the Licensing Court but will be called in possibly as members of the Full Bench or to assist the court at those times of the year when its business is especially heavy. The Bill also provides that the clerk of the court may exercise the jurisdiction of the court in certain routine matters: for example, the court issues a great number of permits in each year. Applications for these permits do not normally involve contentious matters, and there seems no reason why non-contentious applications should not be dealt with by the clerk of the court.

The Bill contains a provision relieving the court from compliance with the strict rules of evidence. The Government believes that this is an appropriate provision, because the court is very largely an administrative tribunal which should not be bound to require strict judicial proof.

Another major feature of the Bill is the relaxation of trading hours in certain cases. In future there will be no limitation on the hours during which a hotel may carry on its dining-room trade; that is to say, upon the hours during which liquor may be supplied with or ancillary to a *bona fide* meal in those parts of the premises designated as a dining room. Corresponding amendments are made in relation to motels and restaurants. The hours during which a hotel may carry on its bar-room trade on weekdays are extended to 12 midnight. The obligatory hours during which a hotel must be open for the sale of liquor are rendered uniform by the Bill. In future a hotel will be required to be opened between the hours of 11 a.m. and 8 p.m. on every day except a Sunday, Christmas Day, and Good Friday.

Amendments are made providing that the holder of a vigneron's licence or a distiller's storekeeper's licence may sell liquor in pursuance of the licence at any time on any day. An amendment is made to the provisions of the Act dealing with club licences providing that the hours during which the licence authorises the sale of liquor shall be such as are fixed by the court on the application of the club. The existing limit of 78 hours a week has been removed. The provisions relating to packet licences and packet certificates are consolidated in a new provision which provides simply for issuing of packet licences.

The Bill deals with the provisions of the principal Act relating to the holding of licences by companies. For some time the Government has been concerned by the fact that licences can be effectively transferred from company to company by means of company take-over, rather than in accordance with the normal procedures of the Licensing Court. The effect of the Bill is to provide that no change in the directorship of a company that holds a licence under the Licensing Act, and no change in the membership of a proprietary company or a public company that is not listed on the stock exchange, is to take place without the approval of the Licensing Court.

An amendment is made to the definition of public entertainment for the purposes of the Licensing Act. The amendment is directed primarily at discotheques. It will ensure that the safety of those who participate in this form of entertainment is adequately protected. This Bill makes important changes to the principal Act in relation to the sale or supply of liquor to under-age persons. It provides that any person under the age of 18 years who enters a hotel bar-room is guilty of an offence. The provision will not apply however in the case of an excepted person, or in circumstances removed from the application of the provision by regulation. The Bill deals with the obligation of licensees to provide lodging and meals. The holder of a full publican's licence or limited publican's licence will in future be obliged to supply breakfast only to a *bona fide* lodger. The holders of restaurant licences and limited publican's licences are relieved from the obligation to supply lunch. In addition, an existing provision under which the court may limit the obligation of a restaurateur to supply dinner is retained.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 4 deals with the membership of the court. It provides that the members of the court shall consist of:

(*a*) the Licensing Court judge;

(*b*) Special magistrates designated by the Governor as members of the Licensing Court; and

(*c*) Licensing Court magistrates appointed specially to the court under section 5.

Clause 5 deals with the constitution of the court. It provides that the court must be constituted of the Full Bench for the purpose of hearing special cases referred to it by a single member of the court or for the purpose of hearing appeals of magistrates sitting alone. Otherwise the court may be constituted of the judge, or a magistrate, sitting alone. New section 6a empowers the clerk to exercise the jurisdiction of the court in certain routine matters. New section 6b provides that the court is not to be bound by the strict rules of evidence and new section 6c empowers the judge of the court to make rules of court.

Clause 6 makes a consequential amendment to the principal Act. Clause 7 amends section 9 of the principal Act which deals with appeals to the Supreme Court. The amendments provide that where a matter has been determined by the Full Bench of the court, or by the judge or an acting judge of the court, an appeal shall lie to the Full Bench of the Supreme Court on a question of law. Clause 8 makes consequential amendments. Clause 9 amends the trading hours applicable to a full publican's licence. The holder of the licence is authorised to open between the hours of 5 a.m. and 12 midnight on any day (except Sunday, Christmas Day, or Good Friday). The hours during which he may carry on dining-room trade are unrestricted; the obligatory hours during which he must open are 11 a.m. to 8 p.m. on any day except a Sunday, Christmas Day or Good Friday.

Clause 10 repeals and re-enacts section 20 of the principal Act. The new section contains no restrictions upon the hours during which the holder of the licence may supply liquor to *bona fide* lodgers, or to persons consuming *bona fide* meals in a dining room. Clause 11 amends section 23 of the principal Act which relates to wine licences. The present provision providing for a pool of wine licences is removed. No new wine licence is to be granted except in an area of the State in which wine is produced or in respect of a genuine museum or art gallery. Clause 12 repeals and re-enacts section 25 of the principal Act. The purpose of the re-enactment is to remove restrictions upon the hours during which liquor may be sold or disposed of in pursuance of a distiller's storekeeper's licence. Clause 13 removes restrictions upon the hours during which liquor may be sold or supplied in pursuance of a vigneron's licence. Clause 14 provides that the court may tailor the hours during which liquor may be supplied to a club licence to suit the requirements of the particular club and removes the existing limit of 78 hours a week.

Clause 15 repeals and re-enacts the provision of the principal Act relating to packet licences. The new section enables the court to specify the terms upon which liquor may be sold or supplied in pursuance of the licence. In addition, it provides that a packet certificate granted under the principal Act before the commencement of the new amendments will be deemed to be a packet licence. Clause 16 amends section 31 of the principal Act which deals with restaurant licences. The amendments remove any restriction upon the hours during which liquor may be supplied for consumption with or ancillary to *bona fide* meals. Clause 17 provides that a person who applies for a 20-litre licence must advertise his application.

Clause 18 makes a consequential amendment to the principal Act. Clause 19 provides for the fee for a booth certificate to be prescribed by the rules of the court. It provides that application for a booth certificate must be made 14 clear days before the day for which the certificate is sought. Clause 20 provides that a fee fixed by the rules of court will be payable for a permit under section 66 of the principal Act. Clause 21 repeals the provisions of the principal Act that deal with packet certificates. Clause 22 amends section 82 of the principal Act. This section deals with the holding of licences by companies. It provides for the court to approve changes of membership in companies that hold licences under the principal Act. Clause 23 makes a consequential amendment to the principal Act.

Clause 24 deals with entertainment permits. It provides that the fee for such a permit will be fixed in future by a rule of court. It removes an existing restriction on the meaning of "public entertainment". Clause 25 amends section 153 of the principal Act. The amendments make it an offence for a person under the age of 18 years to enter a bar-room in a hotel. However, certain exceptions to this provision may be prescribed. Clause 26 deals with the hours during which the holder of a full publican's licence, limited publican's licence or restaurant licence must supply meals.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOLD BUYERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In deference to the member for Hanson, this Bill provides for the repeal of the Gold Buyers Act, 1916-1967. The repeal of this Act is intended to enable South Australians to take advantage of the recent relaxation of Commonwealth requirements relating to the ownership of gold.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends the Police Offences Act in relation to two separate matters. First, it enables a court before which a person is convicted of an offence under section 33 of the principal Act (relating to the publication or exhibition of pornographic material) to order the confiscation of that pornographic material. Secondly, it amends section 78 of the principal Act. This section requires a police officer, upon making an arrest, to convey the person whom he has detained to the "nearest police station". However, there are many police stations at which facilities do not exist for the care and custody of persons who have been arrested. The amendment is designed to make clear that the expression "nearest police station" is to be understood as referring to a police station at which such facilities are continuously available. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 empowers a court to order confiscation of pornographic material where a person has been convicted of an offence under section 33 of the principal Act. Clause 3 inserts a definition of "nearest police station" in section 78 of the principal Act.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends the Fruit and Plant Protection Act in two respects. First, it provides for a simplified and more expeditious procedure in the event of an outbreak of pests or disease affecting fruit or vegetables. At present, when such an outbreak occurs, it is necessary for a proclamation to be made under section 7 of the Act proclaiming quarantine areas and restricting the movement of fruit and plants from those areas. The administrative procedures involved in making a proclamation necessarily take several days to complete. As the initiation of measures to control an outbreak of pests or disease is usually a matter of great

urgency, the Government thinks that it would be better if these measures could be initiated by the Minister by publication of a notice in the *Gazette*. The Bill also amends section 9 of the principal Act in a corresponding manner. This section, in its amended form, will enable the Minister to require orchardists to take specified measures to prevent the spread of pests or disease from an affected area.

A further amendment proposed by the Bill enables the Governor to prescribe fees to be paid in respect of services provided under the principal Act. A schedule of fees was prescribed under the Vine, Fruit and Vegetable Protection Act, the predecessor of the present Act, and, following advice from the Crown Solicitor, it is considered desirable that specific power be conferred to prescribe fees under the Fruit and Plant Protection Act. The Bill accordingly provides this authority. Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 transfer to the Minister powers formerly exercisable by the Governor. Clause 4 provides that the Governor may prescribe fees for the purposes of the Act.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the principal Act. First, it alters the membership of the Medical Board by providing for the appointment, in addition to the present members, of a nominee of the Flinders University of South Australia. With the establishment of a medical school at the Flinders University, it is obviously desirable that the university should have the right to nominate a member of the board, in the same way as the University of Adelaide. The Bill also contains amendments modifying the present requirements under which an applicant for registration or provisional registration is required, as a matter of course, to attend before the board or a member of the board. As over 450 medical practitioners register annually with the board, it has become a physical impossibility to have the registrants presented to the board. The Bill therefore contains provisions which enable the board to call an applicant before it, but do not require the board to follow this course automatically,

The Bill contains an amendment doing away with the present privilege of continuous registration. Prior to 1966, a medical practitioner who registered in South Australia could pay $10·50 and be granted continuous registration. No annual practising fee existed prior to that time. By the Medical Practitioners Act Amendment Act, 1966, an annual practising fee was introduced. However, under the 1966 amendments practitioners who were registered at that time could retain the benefit of continuous registration. At present, this means that about 50 per cent of the medical practitioners on the medical register have continuous registration without payment of an annual fee, which means that the sole revenue of the Medical Board is derived from medical practitioners registered after the commencement of the 1966 amendments. The expenses of the board are not covered by present revenue. The Bill will remove the present anomaly, and will have the effect of requiring approximately 1 600 medical practitioners to pay an annual practising fee, which will increase the annual revenue of the board by about $14 000. This will go a long way towards making the Medical Board self-sufficient in revenue.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 to 4 deal with the appointment of the new members of the board. Clause 5 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clauses 6 and 8 abolish the requirement for the board or a member of the board to interview, as a matter of course, applicants for registration under the Medical Practitioners Act. Clause 7 does away with the privilege of continuous registration for medical practitioners registered before the enactment of the 1966 amendments.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LACEPEDE (VESTING OF LAND) BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This short Bill vests certain land, within the district of the District Council of Lacepede, in that council. The land in question is occupied by a residence that in the past was used by the local doctor. However, recently the council purchased for the local doctor a new residence. The land on which the doctor's old house stands was impressed with a trust that was intended to ensure its perpetual use as a residence for a doctor. The original trustees are now dead, and the council in question is anxious to avoid the costs of a somewhat expensive and complex application to the Supreme Court to set aside the trust. Accordingly, at the request of the council this measure is now proposed.

To consider the Bill in some detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out certain definitions necessary for the purposes of the measure of which the most important is the definition of "the land". Clause 3 vests the land in the council for an estate in fee simple free of all trusts. Clause 4 is a consequential and machinery provision and clause 5 enables the council to deal with the land so vested in it in all respects as if it were its own property. The grant of this power is consistent with the fact that the council has already purchased another residence for a doctor. This Bill has been considered and approved by a Select Committee in another place.

Mr. VANDEPEER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on question:

That the report of the Select Committee be noted.

(Continued from August 18. Page 730).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): On August 18, when I previously spoke on this matter, immediately after I had moved that the report be

noted I sought leave to continue my remarks. The passage of time since then has allowed for the printed report of the committee to be made available, and I am sure that members generally will have availed themselves of the opportunity to peruse it. I shall make one or two points regarding the committee and the report. As would be apparent to most members, the Select Committee was considering a matter of great importance that created tremendous interest in the community. As indicated by the report, this was clearly shown by the many people who made submissions or appeared before the committee as witnesses to give evidence. I commend to the House the diligence of the committee as a whole. As Chairman, it was my lot to sit at the end of the table, and I was most impressed by the manner in which all members (and three Parties were represented around the table) tackled the task of listening to the evidence and studying the Bill, to see whether we could come back to this Chamber with a series of recommendations. That has occurred. The response of the committee at all times was most pleasing to me on this first occasion on which I have chaired a Select Committee. No problems arose. The way in which members tackled their task made mine simple.

Those who have studied the report will have noticed that it is a consensus report. I do not recall an occasion when it was necessary to resort to vote taking to reach a decision. That in itself speaks volumes for the way in which committee members devoted themselves to the task. I shall make no further remarks until other members have put their viewpoints. If specific matters are raised, I shall then speak to them. Meanwhile, I ask all members to support the motion.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): In supporting the motion, I agree with the basic comment of the Minister: this is a consensus report. The Minister would be the first to admit, and I shall be the first to state, that the decisions reached were not reached lightly. Until certain issues had been resolved satisfactorily to the understanding of all, no consensus was taken. I believe that is a useful statement. The need for having had a Select Committee on this matter cannot be disputed. Brief comment has been made about that fact on earlier occasions, but it is important to look at some of the evidence placed before the committee to indicate further how important was the Select Committee. No-one who appeared before the committee denied the concept that a Health Commission Act would be advantageous to the State. That opinion was expressed generally in this place earlier, but the manner of approach and some of the content of the Bill needed serious consideration. It was said consistently that the Bill sought to implement the requirements of the Bright committee. I suggest to members who are interested in that view that, if they read the evidence given before the Select Committee, they will find that many of the witnesses, including some departmental witnesses, debunked that view.

The Bright committee has been the basis of this Bill's coming into existence, but the implementation of the Bright committee report was, unfortunately, a departmental assessment of what was required, and in that departmental assessment the requirements of the community at large were not canvassed. As expressed by some of the witnesses, this was a situation in which the old guard was making sure that the new guard reflected in equal numbers the people existing under the old guard, with a position in the new system for everyone. In great part, I think there was sufficient evidence to suggest that that was so. I do not necessarily criticise those who were responsible for having tried to determine that no-one was to be out of employment, but I believe (and I reiterate the extreme importance of this) that a measure coming before Parliament for the creation of an Act must be the best available. To make that determination on the basis of assuring a position for everyone was not, I suggest, in the best interests of all concerned. We could note the comments of the Chairman of the Public Service Board, who gave a clear indication on this matter. At page 239 of the evidence, under questioning Mr. Inns stated:

> The steering committee was merely established to provide programmes and detailed implementation of the Bright report. By and large, the Bill is a reflection of the Bright report.

He went on to say that no consultation between the steering body and vitally interested groups was undertaken by the steering committee, that the steering committee was an administrative body, and that interested groups had had an opportunity, when the Bright committee first considered the matter, of influencing the end result.

The Bright committee took evidence over an extended period and brought down its report in 1973. The steering committee commenced its work in 1974, but the matter did not reach finality until November, 1975. The period between the original representations to the Bright committee and the final determination of the steering committee was considerable; changes effected in society in that time obviously required a new assessment, more particularly an assessment of the practicality of some of the provisions, to be undertaken. Regrettably, the method of approach in the compilation of the Bill did not allow for that situation.

I hope sincerely that this Government, and indeed any future Government, will acknowledge the need, having put a matter to a departmental inquiry, to attempt then to relate it back to the community or to the major organisations within the community that will be affected before the relevant legislation is brought forward. I suggest that the Government was hellbent on having this Bill passed through this House last November and that political circumstances required that it be sent to a Select Committee. However, one had the distinct impression in November last year that the Bill would be forced through the House but, because of circumstances that were beyond the control of the Government, politically speaking, it became prudent to accept that the Bill be put before a Select Committee so that eventually it might be passed in another place.

More important is the lesson to have been learnt that, by going to a Select Committee, the Bill that we are about to consider is a better Bill and that the resultant legislation will be more meaningful and will give the people of this State a distinct advancement in relation to health care. Who will be out of favour with the recommendations made by the Select Committee? The Minister has indicated that many witnesses appeared before the committee; indeed, the volume of evidence is a worthy indication of the concern for health care in the community. The consensus report of the committee favours the majority of the views that have been put.

It is necessary to indicate that the Local Government Association established clearly for members of the committee that it was opposed to councils continuing to be required to pay a percentage of their rates to hospitals in their area. That point was considered closely by the committee. It is a matter of individual Government policy whether councils should provide funds towards total health care. This Government has stated clearly that that should

be so. Members on this side have said for a long time that, if councils are to play an integral part in health delivery on the local scene, there is a distinct advantage in councils making a financial contribution. Furthermore, any body, council or advisory group that undertakes the final presentation of health to the community, has certain rights when providing health care.

The real issue is what councils should be expected to pay. Amendments suggested by the Select Committee indicate clearly an upper limit, so councils will not be called on to put their hand deeper and deeper into their pocket to finance health care. It is necessary that any alteration to the sum that will apply should be brought back to Parliament for scrutiny and for public consideration. No opportunity will otherwise be given for administrative action to be taken that would suddenly put councils in the position of paying a certain percentage. At page 430 of the evidence taken before the Select Committee the Local Government Association, under the heading "Note—hospital contributions", stated:

Whilst it is not considered that the section of the Bill relating to rating for hospital purposes forms part of the substantive subject matter of this Bill, it is opportune to reaffirm the association's opposition to this tax and its determination to have it abolished.

Councils have that right. It is a right about which the Minister of Local Government is now receiving representations. It is a matter that will undoubtedly be considered by all political Parties, but it has not been resolved. The Local Government Association put forward a balanced view when it submitted that it was not the substantive part of the Bill. I therefore believe that it is a matter that can be resolved in another field at another time and that it bears no relationship to our deliberations. At least we have closed the open-ended cheque.

The percentage is now up to 3 per cent, which means that that 3 per cent of rate revenue will not necessarily apply in council areas. It means that that is the upper limit, and I believe there should be an upper limit. Adelaide City Council indicated its concern for this matter. Its representations showed the tremendous sum that it provides for this purpose. Council made the point that money is provided for people who come into the city from other areas of influence and who are not specifically Adelaide City Council ratepayers. The same could be said of other areas of society. Beach councils could claim justifiably that people who use beaches and other facilities and who come from other council areas should contribute in some way to beach councils. Consideration of this matter is limitless.

We all recognise that, by the existence of some of these facilities, income and business are generated to various bodies (this certainly applies to the Adelaide City Council) whereby there is a greater ability to pay rates and taxes because many people living outside the Adelaide city area use city facilities. I do not know whether this problem will be solved finally to everyone's satisfaction at all times. I cannot accept what Adelaide City Council submitted, that the use of its facilities should be recognised in a certain way, because it could follow that Woodville council could say about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, "We should be considered in a particular way," or Tea Tree Gully council could say the same thing about Modbury Hospital, thereby creating a continuing problem that would get rapidly out of hand and would revert to the old policy where ward books were kept and where, if money was not generated in a ward, it could not be spent there.

The Select Committee considered realistically the matter before it. Its recommendations do not close the door to further representations being made in the proper place, which I suggest is not in a consideration of this Bill.

Part-time medical officers who give a considerable part of their time to the positions they occupy at the Royal Adelaide Hospital or other teaching hospitals are concerned about this measure and asked the Select Committee to recommend that a superannuation fund be set up for their benefit. The committee did not make such a recommendation, because members, by and large, accepted the situation that it was a matter of discussion in an arena beyond the interests of this Bill. If, indeed, a case can be made out for superannuation for part-time employment for people engaged not only in the medical and para-medical areas but also in all the other professional and trained areas where persons make their time available to Government instrumentalities, perhaps an appropriate amendment could in due course be made to the Act. Certainly, I believe that there was no immediate requirement of the committee to find unilaterally for the medical persons involved and so create a situation that would have an effect on numerous other South Australian Acts and, indeed, on the whole approach to superannuation.

There is another area I will ventilate, because I believe it important that it be publicly understood. When the Select Committee was appointed and began to take evidence, it was said that persons within the Government service who were not heads of departments or fairly senior within the various departments were denied the opportunity of putting their point of view before the committee. Indeed, there is a considerable amount of evidence to indicate that several departments and sub-departments undertook seminars so that the point of view of members working in the field could be considered, and so that the expression by the head of department or by a sub-department up through some other head of department finally reached the committee for consideration. During the course of Mr. Inns's evidence, he was asked whether Public Service members were free to make representations to a Select Committee, and I think it important that this position be clearly understood. As I understand it, no-one who wanted to appear before the committee was denied the opportunity of appearing before it. It may be that some people within the system believed that they were denied the opportunity simply because to stand up and be counted in relation to such committee findings, when the point of view concerned was totally opposed to that of their seniors, could have been damaging. I hope that the people who have thought that way will rethink the situation and recognise their duty to society. If they have a point of view and can sustain it, it is legitimate for them to put it forward. No Government would jeopardise their job if they made a statement based on fact as they knew it.

More particularly, in evidence on page 241, I asked Mr. Inns whether any direction had been given to public servants that would deny them the right to give evidence. Mr. Inns, on that page and on the following pages, clearly indicated the right of persons to appear. Indeed, he referred the committee to a report that was issued at the time the Corbett Committee was conducting its inquiry. It is a Public Service Board notice, issued on June 27, 1973, page 8 of which deals with submissions by officers of the Public Service to public inquiries and which states:

Commissions of inquiry (or the like) are periodically set up by the Government (Australian or South Australian) and officers of the South Australian Public Service, as private citizens, may wish to make submissions or be called to give evidence on topics which are the subject of the inquiry. Officers are advised that there is no restriction in making such submissions or appearing as a witness, so long as the inquiry is made aware that he is

acting in his private capacity as a citizen and is not speaking on behalf of the Government or of his department.

That is a completely reasonable approach. It is important that this matter be mentioned, because there may still be some Government employees who believe that their voice was unheard. However, the opportunity existed for it to be heard. Those people who approached me on this matter were referred to Mr. Inns's evidence, and I know that at least one of those persons who had some fears previously, subsequently appeared. Indeed, members of the committee will know that many public servants appeared before the committee, not always as heads of departments but as members of delegations representing specific points of view of social workers, community groups, and the like, and that is as it should be.

Much more could be said about the evidence and the Bill, but I will only highlight again what I believe is important for any Government or potential Government to heed. On a matter that seeks to alter basic services, such as the Health Commission Bill seeks to change the whole of the hospital and medical services, it is important to ensure that the measure, when brought before the House, has close scrutiny by all those persons involved in it. I believe that one could foreshadow that, if in future we are to consider the Mental Health Act, as I believe we will, it is another area that could well be put to a Select Committee for the benefits that would accrue from a non-Party non-partisan review of the matter, and the measure subsequently brought back to the House would be the better for it. Certainly, if there is evidence on that measure or on any other measure that suggests that the matter has been kept strictly within the confines of deparmental officers and has not been aired to members of the community who are involved, there will be claims in the future for Select Committees. The very results which the Minister has lauded and which I support are evidence of the value of such a course of action having been taken. I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not intend to say much in this debate. It sounded to me, although I did not listen to all he said, that the member for Light has already exhausted the subject. First (and I hope that this will not be taken as too much self-congratulation), I think it was my influence that caused this Bill to be referred to a Select Committee in those days when the members of the former Liberal Movement and I held the balance of power. The Government was afraid that the Bill would not be passed at all if it did not agree to a Select Committee (that is what I said to the Government). However, those days have gone for the time being. I do not believe that I will be on many more Select Committees, or be able to force the appointment of any. Those days have gone for the time being, but not for long. I think it was well worth while putting the Bill to a Select Committee, because a great amount of information came out. The Bill is probably a better one now than it was when we started.

I am not sure whether we yet have a Bill in its final and acceptable form. I said to my colleagues on the Select Committee (and I say now) that, although I was satisfied with the Bill as we finished with it in the Select Committee, I kept, and I keep, an open mind on whether or not any further amendments should be made or whether it is yet so amended as to make it acceptable, or whether it can be amended to make it acceptable. Last week I received a letter from the northern regional area of local government opposing the whole idea, and I saw in the paper that Mr. Hullick on behalf of all local governments is now saying the same thing. It may be the point of view they espouse (which I do not know in detail yet) will capture me, even if it does not capture anybody else.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: The last bloke who put that view to us on the committee subsequently resigned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe the Minister is hoping the same thing will happen to this one. As I understand it, what happens now is that the Bill is reprinted with our amendments in it and it will only be then (in my view) that lay people will get a fair idea of what is now proposed. I will have to see what their reaction is before I know precisely how I will vote on the Bill when we deal with it in Committee. I said much the same thing to the committee, but I wanted to say it here in the House.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support most of the comments made by the Minister and the member for Light. In particular, I believe that the exercise was more than useful. In line with what the member for Light said, I believe it was a model of what should happen in many cases of important legislation. Multi-Party committees taking evidence, reaching conclusions and reporting to the House can so often avoid unnecessarily long and tedious sittings of this House. Other Parliaments have found that committee hearings have permitted swifter procedure and, also, a proper ordering of the business of the House. I hope that this Select Committee on an important piece of legislation is a forerunner of other Select Committees and, perhaps even more importantly, of a new way of looking at the whole of the legislation.

As I see the matter each major Party has an industrial matters committee, a health committee and so on, and the members of each Party committee are chosen for their expertise in those fields. There is no reason why this Parliament should not follow the lead of other Parliaments and, as a matter of course, have committee investigations and reports to Parliament.

Mr. Coumbe: You are thinking of the Commons procedure?

Mr. McRAE: Yes, the House of Commons situation, and the situation that prevails in many other democratic Parliaments throughout the world. I believe that would be a very good idea. A number of committees would be sitting, but there would be a more logical and sane approach that would lead to more common sense and more informed debate in the House. Committees would not deal with every major problem of policy, or of finance, but this procedure would do away with much of the unnecessary boredom we now have.

I believe it was made clear by the many witnesses who came before this committee at its 25 meetings that the general philosophy of the Bill was strongly supported. The idea of a Health Commission received unanimous support throughout the community. I do not recall one exception to that rule. I was sceptical at the beginning in the sense that it has often been said that Governments can hide behind commissions, instrumentalities and boards. That may have been true years ago, but I doubt that it is true today. I believe that political responsibility will find its way to those who are elected towards that responsibility. I found, as time went on and I learned a little more about this area, that the idea of a commission was appealing. Another point I make in passing, is that not only does the committee proceeding lead to a better result but it is far more of an education process for the members on the committee.

The integration and co-ordination of health services was another basic principle that received unanimous support.

The method of implementation (as the member for Light said) was in a slightly different category, but the idea had all but unanimous support. Both these fundamental recommendations were obvious because of the giant strides that have been made in medical science since the initial passing of health legislation in this State. Concern was expressed by numerous witnesses as to the width of power of the commission. I believed that the Chairman of the committee made a sound contribution by suggesting that, if the objects of the committee were inserted in the Bill, in the same way as the objects of the Juvenile Court and that system are inserted in the Juvenile Courts Act, that would be a guide to those who comprised the commission and, as it were, a road along which they should pass. The committee has unanimously recommended that, and I hope that that will obviate the fears of some people who believe that the powers of the commission were too widespread.

The committee believes the commission has to have wide powers in order to achieve the very objectives of integration and co-ordination. On the other hand, the committee was at great pains (as members will know if they study the report) to see that, in certain areas where there were genuine and valid fears, restraints were placed on those powers. That is not to say that the committee believes for a moment that those vested with the responsibility would abuse their power, but rather the committee took the view that there should be no possibility that that could happen.

Many witnesses spoke in terms of regionalisation, which of course is very desirable and which has worked well in the field of community welfare. There is no reason why it should not work in the more diverse field of health services generally. The committee believes that it can be achieved within the framework of the Bill.

I now turn to the all-important question of the staff of the commission and the necessary industrial protections that should be accorded to the staff and the union. Recommendations were made to the committee by all industrial organisations in this area to ensure, as far as possible, that on transfer from the Public Service to the Health Commission (even though the Health Commission should be an independent authority) there would be a guarantee that there would be no reduction in status or salary and, indeed, that there should be a continuation of at least the existing status and salary of officers at the point of transfer. That is what the committee recommends, and I believe that it is essential.

Because the Bill is not capable of dealing with the wide range of industrial matters that can arise, power is vested in the Governor to proclaim that certain sections or parts of the Public Service Act will apply to the commission, while the commission still maintains its independence. The parts that ought to be declared, and I believe they will be declared, will include appointment on merit, the right of appeals, the right of disciplinary appeals and the whole range of things that need to be included in industrial conditions. Very importantly, just as there are existing superannuation rights, it has been made clear in this committee's report that all officers and employees of the commission and, indeed, incorporated health centres and incorporated hospitals should have that right. As from the first day all employees in the whole of the health service encompassed by the Bill will have an immediate right to become a contributor to the South Australian Superannuation Fund.

To obviate the horrible possibility that on the first day of the commission's coming into operation there would be a farcical series of demarcation disputes between industrial organisations in the field, there has been express provision that unions such as the Public Service Association, the Royal Australian Nursing Federation and the Australian Government Workers Association will be recognised as the negotiating bodies by the Health Commission. I believe I learned a lot whilst sitting on the committee. Members worked very hard to bring back to this Parliament an acceptable Bill, and I believe that has been achieved. I look forward to the commission's coming into being soon and working effectively. Like the member for Light, I look forward to a similar successful exercise in relation to mental health services. I support the motion.

Mr. ALLISON: Before I make general comment about the report, I would like to make a few comments about information I have just received. This afternoon I have received a report from the Northern Metropolitan Regional Organisation (No. 1, S.A.), dated October 7, a quick examination of which shows that several aspects of the Bill appear to have been misunderstood by the compiler of that report. I do not know how many members have received it, but I would advise them to consider it carefully in relation to the Bill before they come to any conclusions. I will treat it with deep reservation, before I make any further comment on it. In today's *News*, appears the following report about South Australian councils stating they will fight the health levy rule:

Mr. Jim Hullick, South Australian Local Government Association secretary, said today only three out of 120 councils had so far agreed to continuation of the levy.

That refers to the 3 per cent levy that the member for Light has mentioned. In defence of the committee, which will no doubt be taken to task for its report if that South Australian council move is on, I refer members to two aspects of the evidence that was submitted to the Select Committee. Mr. James Maitland Hullick, secretary/planner, appeared before the committee and a prepared submission put forward appears at pages 463 to 470 of the evidence. On page 469 of the evidence reference is made to Part III, Division VII of the Bill, under the heading "Rating for hospital purposes". The marginal note of clause 38 (1) reads "Power of commission to require contribution". Among the requirements that Mr. Hullick sought from the Select Committee was a clear provision in clause 38 (1) as follows:

Where, in the opinion of the commission, the area or any portion of the area of a council is served by an incorporated hospital, or will be served by a proposed incorporated hospital, the commission may, with the consent of the Minister by notice addressed to the council, require the council to contribute not more than 3 per cent of the council's rate revenue for the purposes of that hospital or proposed hospital in accordance with the notice.

The report in today's *News* does not bear out the evidence which Mr. Hullick previously submitted to the committee and which certainly had some bearing on the report handed down. The Local Government Association also gave evidence. It was a valuable experience to have taken part in the deliberations of that Select Committee. It was the first time I had been a member of a Select Committee, and I believe it was the first time the Chairman had chaired a Select Committee. I commend him for the way he allowed comments to flow and at no time did he try to direct the evidence towards any particular point of view. It was a fair hearing. What probably surprised me was that witness after witness expressed pleasure in being called before the committee and being allowed to present his point of view in that way. I say that I was surprised because I had assumed, incorrectly, they would have been called before the committee that drafted the original legislation, and it came as a surprise to find

many of their points of view were being presented to the Government for the first time. In light of that, it appeared that a Select Committee was a necessity. I think this House and the many organisations that presented evidence to the committee will find the amended Bill better and more acceptable than was the original Bill.

After hearing witnesses, I concluded that one of the main oppositions to the Bill was fear, not fear of what was in the Bill but fear of what was being read into the Bill (fear of the unknown), because the commission appeared to have such sweeping powers and so much could be done by regulation. The committee concluded that there was a need for some sort of preamble or statement of intention (and this has been included in the report) laying down fairly strict guidelines as to how the Bill shall be interpreted. That must go a long way towards allaying the fears of the people who appeared before the commission. From the 20 or more sessions, the 700 to 800 pages of evidence, and the 100 witnesses who appeared before or wrote to the committee, 10 or 11 main points of contention arose and they are pointed out in the report. Evidence from local government was represented by Mr. Walker and he, like most others who appeared before the committee, acknowledged the deficiencies in the current system of administering health services and acknowledged the need for a health commission. He stated that local government must be involved at policy, planning, and implementation levels within the commission. It has been pointed out by some people that, perhaps without financial involvement, local government might abrogate its rights to determine local health policies and be quite happy, since it was not financially involved, to leave the matter of health completely in centralised hands, but that is not what the Bill intends.

As the member for Light has stated, evidence from local government on hospital contributions has reaffirmed the association's policy of opposition to the tax and the determination to have that tax abolished, but it did not consider that that section of the Bill was part of the substantive subject matter of the Bill. It has become evident to me during the past 8 to 10 months that there is dissent event in local government. We have the report today in the *News*, and also the case where the Mount Gambier City Council, having twice refused to pay the health levy (in 1974-75 and 1975-76), has now, after convincing the South-East Local Government Association of the wisdom of that policy, decided to pay the levy, and it did so earlier this year much to the embarrassment of that association. There has not been unanimity of approach within many councils, and this has some effect on the determinations of the Select Committee.

Because of the Minister's affirmation to the committee that the levy would not be removed, we sought to have it pegged at a 3 per cent maximum, and this was unanimously agreed to by the committee. To local government generally we must point out that it is incumbent on the State Government of the day to decide how much, if any, of the 3 per cent levy is to be charged against local government. That is an issue that should not decide whether the Bill stands or falls: it is an issue that should make local government decide how it will approach the State Government. This issue, however, should not bring down this Bill. The remedy is in the hands of local government, if it wishes to discuss the matter with the State Government.

The Australian Medical Association had not been considered in depth when the Bill was first drafted, and in its evidence it stated that it accepted that there was a real need to co-ordinate health services, and it welcomed the ideas produced in the Bright report. We do not accept necessarily that this Bill is a reflection of everything recommended in that report: it is considerably amended. It was not possible to accept every bit of evidence and all the suggestions made by all the organisations, because many of the matters suggested were not within the ambit of the Select Committee. I think that voluntary organisations were concerned whenever they appeared before the committee, and were fearful that they would be forced out of existence by the commission. It is patently obvious that it would be an act of political and economic folly to reject the work of the voluntary organisations, doing, as they do, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of free work for the Government and the people each year. There would be no way that any Government would put them out of business and institute a totally paid service, so that their fears are unfounded. It has been written into the report that voluntary organisations are to be protected and encouraged under the new Act.

Concerning public servants, I believe that the member for Playford said that part of the work of the committee was to ensure that, after the Act was passed, every member of the commission would be covered and have a right to apply for superannuation. One reservation made was that not every member but every full-time member would have that right, because part-time members, although they may wish to be superannuated, presented a considerable problem that was not within the ambit of the committee to solve. The member for Playford with his expert knowledge of industrial legislation proved to be an invaluable member of the committee. As he said, the Public Service Association and other unions were recognised within the provisions of the Act in order to prevent them from predatory action, as the Minister said, from unions from other States that may wish to move in quickly and steal members for their unions. We are more interested in protecting South Australian unions that at present operate within the hospitals and health services in this State. After the work of the committee was completed a few weeks ago, we concluded unanimously that the Bill was better, and, if people are dissenting from the report, the idea of the report was that people should have a much clearer view of the Bill presented before it finally passed through Parliament. I have no hesitation in supporting the report as it now stands.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I commend members of the Select Committee for their work. It was a mammoth task, as was made clear by the schedule of amendments contained in the report. The whole concept of having a health commission was that it should be based on the Bright report, which stated that there should be an autonomous health authority operating outside the Public Service. The Bill originally presented to the House did not provide for that concept, and I am pleased that the findings of the Select Committee clearly show that that was not the way it was originally drafted. The original Bill had strict controls on hospital boards and employees, and was without doubt one of the most dictatorial and centralised measures that we have considered, because it would have set up an extremely powerful central body to administer health delivery and care in this State. Even the controls on employees were dictatorial. With the Select Committee's recommendations, most of the objections have been overcome.

No-one will suffer from transferring to the Health Commission, although they will be outside the ambit of the Public Service. There have been some questions about the membership of the commission, but I believe that the recommendations will be an immense improvement, and more in line with the recommendations of the Bright report. It is important that we have as wide a spectrum as possible from the general health care community. The regulations have also been changed, and I refer to paragraph 37, which specifically guarantees the confidentiality of patients' records from one institution to another. The member for Mount Gambier and the member for Light referred to the role of local government. There has been some suggestion that local government should be represented directly on the commission. I have always believed that, if a commission existed on a levy or tax from any organisation, that organisation should have representatives with a say in the proceedings. I do not know whether that means there should be a representative from local government on the commission. It would be an unhappy day when representatives of local government did not have a large say in the activities of their own hospitals, health clinics, or local community health centres. It is a fundamental principle which must be adhered to that people should have a say in the care provided for them, a say at the local level, where that care is delivered. These are certainly not the original recommendations of the Bright committee, but this is much more acceptable than was the original Bill. I look forward to examining the legislation when it appears before us soon in what, I believe, is to be a far more understandable form. Once again, I congratulate the members of the Select Committee on their work.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Select Committee report is comprehensive and deserves the attention of this House. The many amendments recommended would indicate that the initial Bill, as presented by the Government, was far from satisfactory. I have some doubt on the matter of contributions by local government bodies to hospitals. Before the original Bill saw the light of day, representations had been made to me by local government bodies in my district complaining that councils were required by law to make contributions to hospitals in their areas. There could be no complaint that councils were not represented on hospital boards, because they were. I shall canvass this point at greater length when the redrawn Bill is before the House; I believe a great deal of dissension remains on this point, as is indicated by the report in today's *News*, in which Mr. Hullick, the recently-appointed Secretary of the Local Government Association, has stated that a recent survey has revealed that only 2·5 per cent of South Australian councils have indicated any support for the hospital levy. I shall be seeking further information in relation to this matter.

Mr. Langley: Did you read what he had to say before the Select Committee?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No. I shall have more to say on this later, when the redrawn Bill is before the House. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank honourable members for their thoughtful and sensible contributions. The member for Light seemed to be worried that, after the Bright report became a public document, a steering committee set up a year later, in 1974, did not make much contact with the public, as distinct from keeping within departmental lines in trying to prepare legislation for an organisation in the form of a health commission. Although I was not privy to the discussions, like any Government of any political persuasion, the Government was, I suggest, faced with doing something in addition to investigating matters. The member for Light would be the first to admit that the Bright committee was in action over a long period, took a vast amount of evidence, and had much expertise available to its members from which the report was prepared. Perhaps the Government took the view that, if it did not start to produce something, the matter could go on for another triennium without our getting anywhere. Nothing else would have been in the minds of members of the steering committee or of the Government at that time. It was not intended to preclude people from taking part. The desire being manifest would be to get something done, although later there could have been a need for an alteration.

Dr. Eastick: There is a lesson to be learnt.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Perhaps another approach should have been taken, but what I have suggested might have been the case. The matter of rating occupied a good deal of time before the Select Committee and has figured prominently in today's discussions. As the representing Minister (and honourable members will understand why I qualify any statement I make in that way), I believe the Government has gone much of the way it has been asked to go by indicating no objection to the maximum levy of 3 per cent contained in the committee's report. I understand there is some fear that, by some trick of legislation, perhaps under the Local Government Act, a similar levy could be applied more than once in the same year to a local government body. As Chairman of the Select Committee, and as the representing Minister in this House, I can say that the Government has no such intention. New clause 38 (3) makes the position clear. The subclause contains the words, "the contribution or the aggregate of contributions", in itself suggesting that there is no intention to apply this levy more than once. I can give an assurance, to the level of my competence in this matter, that the Government has no intention of doing any such thing.

The member for Mitcham spoke only briefly, saying that, whilst he had agreed with what we had produced and did not disagree with my remark that we had a consensus report, he reserved the right to change his mind. I suppose that is a reasonable attitude. It has been said in the past that the only people who change their minds more than do females are politicians, so perhaps the honourable member is simply asserting his right. I was interested in the thoughful and sensible remarks of the member for Light and the member for Mount Gambier on local government matters. Both honourable members have had experience in local government in addition to their experience in this House, and one could accept their remarks as having the additional weight of a proper understanding of the local government approach as well as that applied by members of Parliament. I appreciate their remarks. It was my impression, subsequently confirmed by the member for Mount Gambier, that Mr. Hullick seemed to have changed his stance somewhat from that which he had adopted before the Select Committee. I do not suggest that he is not entitled to do so; I simply record the fact.

Perhaps the most important thing that emerged from the Select Committee was not what was in the Bill, but the fear expressed before us of what was not in the Bill, what was not spelt out. All members will agree after studying the report that we have gone a long way towards allaying many of those fears. I suggest that this is a reason why the Leader of the Opposition has reconsidered his

approach to what he describes as the volume of amendments to be considered. Many of the amendments have been included because of the committee's anxiety to spell out what is not in the Bill in such a way as to allay many of the perhaps genuine fears of people outside Parliament, fears that have been put into the minds of members of the committee. If it does that, as suggested by the Leader, it will be useful.

The Leader did not have the advantage of being a member of the Select Committee. In fairness to the Leader regarding the question whether the commission as conceived in the original Bill is to be an autonomous body outside the Public Service, I would point out the reply of Mr. Inns, Chairman of the Public Service Board, to a question I asked about whether he was surprised at the reaction of some members of Parliament during the second reading debate on the Bill when they had taken the viewpoint that the organisational structure of the commission would be within the Public Service. I asked whether he expected this reaction in view of his having had the opportunity of reading the second reading debate. His reply was that he was quite surprised that that view had been taken. He was sure that, in the event of the Bill not having gone to a Select Committee and the second reading debate having continued, the belief would have been dispelled. The contributions made today have been such that they have vindicated what I said earlier about everyone concerned having tackled this matter in a way that could be considered only to be conducive to the ultimate benefit of the people of this State. I ask members to support the motion.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

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

That the Bill be amended *pro forma*.

If this motion is carried, it will mean that there will be no further proceedings on the Bill in this Committee, that the Bill will be reprinted to incorporate the Select Committee's amendments, and that the reprinted Bill will be recommitted in future and considered in Committee as if it had been committed for the first time. It will then be subject to the usual scrutiny and admission of further amendments. It is believed that this procedure will be most helpful to all members.

Dr. EASTICK: I support the motion. The magnitude of the amendments is such that people in the Parliamentary sphere and outside should be able to see the recommended Bill in its entirety. The debate that will ensue subsequently on the recommitted Bill will be beneficial and there will be no misunderstanding about what has been intended by the Select Committee or the Government. I recommend this procedure and believe that it could well be used at other times and that it will be used later today in another matter.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE moved:

That the third reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow.

Motion carried.

INFLAMMABLE LIQUIDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 674.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The Opposition supports the Bill, the effect of which is to lower the temperature at which the Bill becomes operative from 150 degrees farenheit to 61 degrees centigrade, a reduction of 8 degrees F or 4 degrees C. Simply, the purpose of the Bill is to exclude domestic heating oil from the provisions of the Act. Several people have asked me whether new substances will be included under the provisions of the Act. The lowering of the flashpoint means that other substances that could be included will no longer be included under the Act. I am talking about heating oil. If anything, the application of the Act is restricted rather than expanded. Can the Minister say whether any other liquids about which he knows will be affected by this Bill?

The Bill is a commonsense Bill. It would be most unfortunate if people who use heating oil had to adopt certain safety precautions when storing their domestic heating oil that would have been necessary for them to adopt under the principal Act. The Opposition supports the Bill, and looks forward to its rapid passage.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I thank members opposite for their support. It is an important Bill. I am not aware of any substances other than domestic heating oil that will be involved, but I will ascertain from the department whether any other substances are involved. My advice is that no other substances are involved.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 10 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

WEST TERRACE CEMETERY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 5. Page 457.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This Bill vests the West Terrace Cemetery into a body corporate, which will be the Minister of Works, as provided by clause 3. The Bill will come into operation by proclamation. The Opposition supports the Bill. The matter dealt with by the Bill has been the subject of discussion for a long time. This is an extremely delicate subject and I am sure that, had the Minister not taken the action he has taken, he would have found violent reaction to what is proposed. This cemetery, as is the case with all burial places after two generations, has graves which have fallen into disrepair and which have become an eyesore, uncared for and unkempt. Certainly, this was the case at West Terrace.

West Terrace Cemetery is part of South Australia's history. It was one of the first burial places in South Australia, and has a close relationship with the early history of this State. This matter has not been lightly entered into. The West Terrace Cemetery Advisory Committee has made a long inquiry into the proposition that this Bill enacts, that is, the development of this area as a park.

Various church bodies, including the Roman Catholic Church, the South Australian Hebrew Community and the Quakers have been involved in this matter as have all people who have interest in the cemetery. I refer also to the Services Cemeteries Trust and the Garden of Memory. About 4 000 ex-servicemen are buried in the cemetery. There have been about 150 000 burials at the cemetery since it was opened in 1837. Clause 4 empowers the Minister to resume leases at the expiration of the 99-year lease. It will be the year 2032 before the final leases expire, and there are about 27 000 leases in force until that date.

The plans contained in this Bill will not come to fruition speedily but, to this end, a worthwhile start has been made on the cleaning up of the cemetery, which will be extremely beautiful when it is grassed and made into a park. The park will honour all that we attach to such a resting place. I am told that the West Terrace Cemetery Advisory Committee will be a permanent body that will advise and liaise with the Minister and interested people on the development and maintenance of the cemetery, park and garden areas.

The area comprises about 57 hectares, much of which has been overgrown by weeds (in some places it is a wilderness). Headstones and graves have fallen in and the cemetery has many eyesores throughout its area. The proposed development will make it a congenial and well-kept area. In addition, there are saving clauses in the Bill concerning its long-term use as a sacred area; the maintenance work will be restored and the project can be summed up as worth while.

It is the wish of the Services Cemeteries Trust and the Returned Services League that the names of these 4 000 ex-servicemen, whose last resting place is the cemetery, will be commemorated in a suitable and revered way.

There is little else I want to say, except that I commend the Government for introducing the Bill, and for the appointment of the permanent body. From discussions I have had with Mr. Sexton, I am assured that this is a worthwhile project that will tidy up an area that has become an eyesore. This area should be looked after with the respect that we hold for those people who are no longer with us. I support the Bill.

In Committee. Bill read a second time.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Closing of portion of cemetery."

Mr. RODDA: Will some of the leases of the graves that have fallen into disrepair be resumed under proclamation in the interests of developing the cemetery?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The honourable member would be aware that the last lease expires in, I think, 2033.

Mr. Rodda: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That will enable the Government or the body corporate to close parts of the cemetery progressively and, certainly, the consideration to which the honourable member has referred will be taken into account. There is no way in which parts of the cemetery would be closed if there were a good reason for not doing so, having regard to all the factors involved. This is a necessary power, because, without it, we would not be able to do the things which are finally recommended to the Government and which have not yet been decided. The legislation hands over the land that was previously in the hands of three or four other organisations, and enables the one central authority to control it.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 13), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on question:

That the report of the Select Committee be noted.

(Continued from June 10. Page 141.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): When the Select Committee's report was presented to the House on June 10, I simply moved that it be noted and sought leave to continue my remarks. What I will do now is deal, at least briefly, with the committee's activities so that members may have a clear understanding of the committee's report in relation to the Bill, which seeks to amend the voting provisions to provide for adult franchise.

I think the first important point to understand, particularly because of matters to which I will refer later, is that the committee went not only through the usual motions of advertising its activities by placing advertisements in the press but in addition circularised every local governing body in South Australia. On March 1, the regular bulletin issued from the Local Government Office, bulletin No. 29, was addressed to every local governing body individually (to all 131 of them, as there are now). The bulletin drew the attention, in item No. 1, of local government to the fact that the committee was in existence, and it invited witnesses to appear before it. I will read the last two paragraphs of the section dealing with the committee, because it demonstrates the point I am making, as follows:

> The Select Committee has held its first meeting and is inviting any persons who desire to give evidence before the committee to communicate with the Secretary. In the press last week advertisements appeared inviting such evidence. If any council, councillor, member of the staff or other person desires to give evidence to the Select Committee it is requested that advice of such desire be given to the Secretary, Mr. G. D. Mitchell, at Parliament House, Adelaide, as soon as possible.

That clearly demonstrates that the committee went to great pains to ensure that the whole of local government was made aware of the committee's activities and purpose, and extended to it the opportunity of presenting its views to the committee. However, notwithstanding this somewhat extended invitation, members will have noted from Appendix A that only 17 witnesses gave evidence.

I presume that members have also looked carefully at the list of witnesses and have perhaps done some calculations. However, if they have not done so, and so that there is no misunderstanding, I point out that, of the 17 witnesses, only five councils appeared before the committee. There were four persons representing West Torrens council, three representing Prospect, two representing Walkerville, and one representing Tea Tree Gully (making four councils), and all opposed the general concept of adult franchise. The Adelaide City Council, which was represented by one person, and which did not oppose the concept of adult franchise, asked the committee to amend some of the provisions in the Bill, particularly as they relate to the voting powers of corporate bodies, companies, and the like, and drew attention to and asked the committee to consider restricting the power of persons who were not actually payers of rates (it is difficult to use the term "ratepayer", which covers the whole field of occupiers of property, etc.). It sought to restrict the rights of people who were not actually contributing rates.

Of the 17 witnesses, 11 came from five local governing bodies. Of the remaining witnesses, two came from the Local Government Association (being the Chairman and the then Secretary). Mr. Fuller, who is an ex-Chairman of the Blyth District Council, gave evidence, as did Mr. R. G. Lewis, who appeared not for the purpose of presenting a view in support of or opposed to the Bill but rather to draw the committee's attention to amendments he considered necessary and desirable if the Bill was to pass. Indeed, it would be fair to say that the committee is indebted to Mr. Lewis for the information that he presented to it. Of the remaining two witnesses, one was from St. Peters' Residents Association who sought to have the Bill amended so that persons who were not necessarily Australian citizens might have the right to vote. The final

witness was the State Electoral Commissioner whom the committee called so that it could have information as to the effect of the compilation of rolls. Indeed the information that Mr. Douglass was able to give the committee was of inestimable value. I think that is shown in the report, because several amendments recommended by the committee have flowed from the information presented by the Electoral Commissioner.

Of the witnesses that came before the committee, we find that four councils expressed opposition, one sought amendments, and Mr. Fuller supported the Bill. There was no other opposition from councils, although the St. Peters' Residents Association sought to amend the Bill, as did the Local Government Association. In addition to these witnesses there were several written submissions, which are shown in Appendix B of the report. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry expressed opposition to any change from the present situation. The City of Henley and Grange did not oppose the Bill, although paragraph 4 of the report shows that it did. I will refer to that matter latter. However, the council sought amendments to clauses 18 and 26, about which most of those who gave conditional support took the same line. These clauses relate to the voting powers of companies, and whether people could be elected to council if they were not actually paying rates. The City of Marion also sought amendments on a somewhat similar line, although on a lesser scale.

The Corporation of the City of Elizabeth supported the Bill; the District Council of Hallett opposed the Bill; the District Council of Minlaton opposed only clause 18, which permitted a person who was not actually paying rates to be elected to council; Mr. W. A. Rodda, M.P., wrote a letter, and using his own terminology that he was writing on behalf of the Lucindale District Council, I have regarded it in my summary as being opposition from that council, because I think that is a fair way of doing it. We find from the written submissions that only another two councils opposed the Bill outright, three sought amendments, and one supported the Bill. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry opposed it, but the Good Neighbour Council sought an amendment in relation to the migrant vote. When the committee had concluded its deliberations, it was faced with the situation that of the councils in South Australia only six had expressed outright opposition to the Bill. I should be grateful if members would alter paragraph 4 of the report: in the third line they should delete "City of Henley and Grange" and insert in lieu "Corporation of Walkerville".

Mr. RUSSACK: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the House competent to alter a report of a Select Committee? The report has been tabled, but the Minister is now asking that it be altered.

The SPEAKER: No, it is not competent for the House to alter a report of a Select Committee.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If members do not wish to alter the report, that is their business and not mine; I am drawing to their attention—

Mr. Russack: The report is inaccurate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member wishes to become so pedantic, I should have thought that he would pick up this error, as he was involved in the drafting of the report, but he did not do so.

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Mount Gambier would keep quiet, he may find that there are more rights than wrongs. As the member for Gouger would know, Henley and Grange did not oppose adult franchise, and I should think that he would be charitable enough to acknowledge that fact.

Mr. Russack: I haven't had the chance to speak.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: You did: you could not get on your feet quickly enough. Why not do what your Leader tells you to do, and keep quiet. The Corporation of Walkerville opposed the provisions for adult franchise, and, if members examine the report, they will find that both the Mayor and the Town Clerk were witnesses. No member of the committee would have any doubts about where they stood. However, the City of Henley and Grange should have been grouped with the Adelaide City Council, St. Peters' Residents Association, and the District Council of Minlaton, as a council that sought an amendment. I hope that the situation is understood by members. In paragraph 5 of the report the committee stated that it believed that nothing had been placed before it to persuade it to move away from the principles of the Bill and, accordingly, it rejected the concept that had been placed before it by some councils that there should be a watered-down version of adult franchise.

Indeed, some people put before the committee what seemed to be the horrifying thought that, under the provisions of the Bill, people not paying rates could be elected to a council and thus determine the rates that would have to be paid. I do not know where these people have been for many years, because the Local Government Act has provided and does provide that an occupier can be (and in many cases is) elected to councils. It seemed to be a fallacious argument, and the committee's majority decision is shown in the report. I would be less than fair if I left the impression that paragraph 5 was agreed to unanimously: it was not, it was a majority decision. Paragraphs 6, 7, 8, and 9, do not need any discussion, because they are fairly self-explanatory. However, paragraph 10 merits some comment. It was suggested that the present prerequisite of payment of rates should continue to apply, even though the property qualification has been removed. If local government is to be elected on adult franchise and elections are not to be related to property, surely the relationship there must be related to the provisions of adult franchise, and this is the stand that the committee took. The committee took the view that, if one had not paid one's income tax, one would not be denied the right to vote at a Federal election. Likewise, if one had not paid one's land tax or water rates, one would not be denied the right to vote at a State election. The committee, again by a majority, held the view that the same thing should apply to a local government election and recommended accordingly.

Clauses 12 and 13 are again self-explanatory. For that reason, the committee, having considered the constructive criticism that some witnesses placed before us, has recommended that the Bill should be passed in the amended form. However, since the report has been tabled, there has been much activity in relation to the Bill, and apparently, from the correspondence forwarded to me by the West Torrens council, the activity emanates from that council, which seems to have got rather upset when it saw the submission from the Local Government Association of South Australia. The council wrote to me saying that it dissociated itself from the association and that the association was not submitting the view of that council.

The West Torrens council did point out that already it had made submissions to the Select Committee and that we would know that the Local Government Association's view was not the view of the West Torrens council, which

of course we did know. In addition, I have had correspondence from the Walkerville council expressing concern that the name of that council was deleted from clause 4. I wrote to the council explaining the reason for that and expressing apologies for the omission. I also received correspondence from the Tea Tree Gully council, pointing out that the evidence that the council previously had presented to the committee was no longer shared by the council, and the council asked the committee to reverse that decision. Of course, the report had been tabled and the committee had been discharged. I am no longer able to call the committee together for that purpose, but I draw that situation to the attention of honourable members, namely, that the Tea Tree Gully council has amended its attitude. As a result of the letter from the West Torrens council, which apparently it sent to all councils, it then advised me of the result of a poll that apparently had been conducted with this correspondence. I have no information about the poll but a further letter from the West Torrens council sent to councils stated:

Thank you for your reply—

this is the letter to one council—

to our letter of May 21, 1976, concerning the evidence.

The letter then set out the result of the replies that the council had received, showing that 64 councils opposed adult franchise, 11 were in favour of it but with reservations about the present proposal, nine were undecided, and 17 were in favour. It is important to note the next words in the letter: it is like asking how many people attended a meeting of protest called when people were in favour. That part of the letter states:

It is felt that councils who oppose the legislation, either because they are totally opposed to adult franchise or because they are opposed to adult franchise as envisaged at present, should individually make their views known to their local members of Parliament. As your council has indicated that it is either opposed to the introduction of adult franchise or approves its introduction in an amended form, it would be greatly appreciated if you could forward a copy of your letter to the members of Parliament representing your district and to the Chairman of the Parliamentary Select Committee (Hon. G. T. Virgo), Minister of Local Government.

Clearly, West Torrens council wanted only those councils who were opposed, totally or in part, to forward that correspondence to the Minister. It did not want others who supported adult franchise to forward the correspondence. It is interesting to see what result that brought: it brought what I consider a very poor response. As a result of this additional campaign, we found that 10 more councils in South Australia supported the West Torrens council and were opposed outright to adult franchise, so, after this strange campaign by the West Torrens council, 16 councils were opposed to that democratic principle called adult franchise!

Five additional councils stated that they did not favour clause 27 and those councils, added to the other three, showed that eight wanted an amendment in some form. One more council wrote saying that it was in support, and the Adelaide City Council wrote simply reiterating its previous view, namely, that it saw the desire for this amendment. All in all, the committee has been engaged in an interesting exercise. I believe that, as a result of what has been done, the House should adopt the amendments that have been brought forward. I consider that they improve the Government's intention to provide adult franchise. I think that the amendments, particularly as they relate to electoral rolls, will be of enormous value to local government.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): What a shambles! The Minister has admitted this afternoon that the report is inaccurate. I made this statement publicly, and he has confirmed that the report of the Select Committee on the Local Government Act Amendment Bill concerning adult franchise is inaccurate: I agree. The Minister started by relating to the House the procedure that was adopted in advertising that the Select Committee would be sitting and in calling for submissions. He said that this was advertised in various local papers, as the report states. On March 1, 1976, the bulletin from the Local Government Office carried an invitation to councils to make submissions. I agree that local government displayed apathy in not coming in greater numbers before the Select Committee; had local government come in greater numbers, the true position would have been revealed much earlier. I say "the true position" because I am certain that local government is now aware of the far-reaching contents of the Bill. I am sure that we now have a true indication of local government's views on the matter. I believe that 17 witnesses either came before the committee or forwarded written submissions. Paragraph 4 of the report states:

There were only four councils (namely, the City of West Torrens, the City of Prospect, the City of Tea Tree Gully, and the City of Henley and Grange) and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry who expressed opposition to the principles of the Bill, namely, adult franchise.

The Minister suggested that the City of Henley and Grange did not submit that it was opposed to adult franchise—another admission by the Chairman of the Select Committee that the report is wrong. Had the report been correct, the City of Henley and Grange would not have been in that category. I will be fair: I will read a letter from the City of Henley and Grange that the member for Hanson has passed on to me, and I pay credit to the honourable member for contacting the council. The letter, headed "Adult Franchise Bill", states:

Thank you for your letter of June 16, concerning the above.

The report of the Select Committee indicates, to my reading, that Henley and Grange is opposed to the whole principle of "adult franchise" and, if this is the construction, it is incorrect. I enclose a copy of the brief written submission made to the Select Committee which referred only to two points: (*a*) voting by companies; (*b*) the qualification of any "elector" for the office of Mayor, Alderman or Councillor.

In consideration of the voting rights for companies, it appears that not only has the committee refuted this but it proposes, by amendment, to restrict the votes of partnerships to one vote, and even more drastically, all non-resident ratepayers of an area, or the ward, would be restricted to nominating one vote. As the council objected to reducing the voting rights of companies, it certainly would want to object to these further restrictions.

The Select Committee has also rejected the concept that adult franchise should be restricted to elections of members of councils, which means then that any "elector" could be nominated as a member of a council despite the fact that he may not have any financial responsibility (by payment of rates or even rent) in the affairs of the council.

Additionally, the Bill also extends the right of "electors" to all financial provisions of the Act, e.g., consent to loans, special rates, etc., even though a large number of electors will have no responsibility for payment. (It will be noted of course that a previous amendment allowed all "ratepayers", which includes the "occupier" of a property, to have this right.) Also, any "elector" will have the right to demand, free of cost, a copy of a council's financial statements and balance sheets. How many of these copies will be required and at what extra cost to council (at about $4 per set)?

I stress the next sentence, as follows:

Although this council does not have objection to some concept of adult franchise, it objects to the above points.

Therefore, that council is opposed to some form of adult franchise, and it must be placed in the category of having some opposition, if not complete opposition. There was an omission of some other councils' submissions from the report. A representative of one of the councils came personally, and the other two made written submissions. I see no excuse for their having been omitted, because other evidence came in after these submissions had been made, and that evidence was included in the report. In its submission, the Walkerville corporation said:

This Bill contains one of the most radical proposals to affect local government which has ever been put forward.

A letter addressed to me from the Walkerville corporation states:

I have been directed to write in connection with the report of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly on the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (Adult Franchise). Due to an oversight, this council was not mentioned in paragraph 4 as one of the councils which had expressed opposition to the principles of adult franchise as set out in the Bill. The honourable the Minister who was Chairman of the Select Committee has acknowledged this oversight and stated that the attitude of this council would be taken into account by the Parliament when it resumes debate on the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Did I do that? You tried to stop me.

Mr. RUSSACK: No. I did not. The Minister cannot alter a report. I refer now to a letter from the Hallett District Council dated April 7, 1976, and addressed to Mr. G. D. Mitchell, Secretary, Select Committee of the House of Assembly, Parliament House, Adelaide. The letter states:

The District Council of Hallett wishes to submit that the existing provisions contained in the Local Government Act, 1934-1975, in relation to the nomination and voting for council members and also for voting at polls of ratepayers should be retained.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is it in the minutes that the letter was received?

Mr. RUSSACK: It is in the appendix that it was received on April 8—the day after the letter was written. A letter from the member for Victoria on behalf of the Lucindale District Council states:

Lucindale councillors have voiced disapproval of the Bill in that it provides all adult people who are enrolled for the House of Assembly, in respect of their place of living, will be entitled to vote and have their say in the running of local government in that area, although they make no contribution as a ratepayer. Adult franchise in local government under the present financial arrangement of council's revenue coming from ratepayers, it is felt strongly that the only people paying rates should be the people having the say in the administration and election of councillors.

Paragraph 4 of the report states that four councils were opposed to adult franchise, but three more councils must be added to that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Read the report. It says "who expressed opposition". Look at the minutes: you voted for that clause.

Mr. RUSSACK: I have here the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, June 2.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Read it! You divided on those clauses.

Mr. RUSSACK: The fourth paragraph of the minutes of that meeting is as follows:

The question that the paragraphs do stand part of the report put. Those in favour: Messrs. Boundy, Harrison, Keneally and Whitten. Those against: Messrs. Russack and Wardle.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And you know that with the subsequent changes all the clauses were numbered one ahead.

Mr. RUSSACK: I challenge the Minister here and now. At that meeting, the last held by the committee—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was the second to last meeting. You demanded a meeting on the day that Parliament reassembled, so that we could alter one word and so that you could get another $12·40.

Mr. RUSSACK: I object to that. I take a point of order, and ask the Minister to withdraw that remark.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Minister to withdraw that statement.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Actually, it was $12·50. However, if the statement hurts the honourable member, I will withdraw it.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Sir, I demand, on behalf of the Opposition, and the member concerned, an unconditional withdrawal and an apology.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order, and ask the honourable Minister to withdraw the statement.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have withdrawn it, but I will do so again if it helps the Leader.

Dr. TONKIN: And an apology, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't be so stupid.

Dr. TONKIN: On a further point of order, Sir, the Minister has withdrawn his statement but has not apologised for it. He has made one of the most scurrilous charges that any member can make on another member of this House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I asked the honourable Minister to withdraw his statement, and he did so.

Mr. RUSSACK: According to my record, the penultimate meeting of the committee was held on June 2. I have read the minutes of that meeting, at which I voted against clause 4. The last meeting was held on June 9, and I will explain why that meeting was held. The Minister came to me in this Chamber on the afternoon of June 8 and asked whether I had some disagreement with the report: I said that I did, and I referred to paragraph 12, which reads:

There have only been five objections made to the principle of adult franchise for local government purposes, which makes your committee firmly convinced it is a principle which is unchallengeable and, accordingly, endorses that principle. Most of the other recommendations contained in the body of this report reflect that principle and are necessary to ensure its smooth implementation.

I said to the Minister, "Either you change the 'five objections' to 'eight objections', or you alter 'purposes' to 'elections'." In reply, he said, "We will have another meeting." He offered the meeting. I did not—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You would lie your way around a corkscrew.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am telling the truth. The Minister said that I would lie my way around a corkscrew, and I ask him to withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable Minister to withdraw that accusation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are in a difficult situation, in which the member for Gouger is fabricating the whole of this matter. He knows that this is untrue.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Minister to withdraw the statement that it was a lie.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I think enough has been said, I withdraw it.

Mr. RUSSACK: The Minister came to this bench, where I am now standing—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's untrue.

Mr. RUSSACK: I did have a high regard for the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSSACK: —and I am very disappointed that he should adopt this attitude. As far as I am concerned, and if my memory serves me correctly, what I am saying is the absolute truth. The Minister said, "We will have another meeting," and I agreed. That meeting was held on the morning of June 9 and, before the vote was taken at that meeting (and my memory is, I think, fairly good), I questioned the Chair whether the vote that was being taken was a vote on the acceptance of the report. I was told, as is stated in the minutes, that it was a vote on its being a fair print of the report. So, officially, I voted against the report. The report was altered, paragraph 12 being changed. The word "purposes" was removed, so that it then read as follows:

There have only been five objections made to the principle of adult franchise for local government, which makes your committee firmly convinced it is a principle which is unchallengeable and, accordingly, endorses that principle.

I could not accept that because, when one examines the facts relating to the committee and the submissions that were made to it, one sees that they are incorrect. I accept responsibility, the same as every other member of that committee does, for not detecting these inaccuracies before the report was submitted. However, I think that the signal responsibility was that of the Chairman of the committee; it was he who should have detected these omissions.

I should like to point out the facts. Seventeen submissions came before the committee. One can make allowances for Henley and Grange, but I must take it, as the committee report has suggested, that four councils were opposed to it. Another three (putting it in the words of the report) expressed opposition. They were Walkerville, Hallett and Lucindale. That makes seven councils, as well as the Chamber of Commerce, making a total of eight organisations that were opposed to the principle of adult franchise. In addition, three would accept it with qualifications. I refer to the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, St. Peters' Residents Association, and Minlaton District Council. Therefore, 11 organisations out of 17 organisations expressed some opposition to the Bill. If 11 out of 17 expressed some opposition to the Bill, I suggest that there is something wrong with the report and that it is not a true indication of the committee's findings.

Mr. Wells: What was the view of the Local Government Association on this matter?

Mr. RUSSACK: I understand from what I have been told (and this is from an authoritative source) that the same thing happened with the Local Government Association. There was a certain apathy on the part of the councils. When an indication was sought of the views of individual councils, the response was not what it should have been. Since this report has been released, in view of what the Minister has said regarding the West Torrens council, local government has clearly indicated that, in the main, it is opposed to adult franchise and to the contents of the Bill as it stands. The Minister was quick to mention this afternoon the latest viewpoint of the Tea Tree Gully council.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They wrote to me. I reported all the correspondence I had received.

Mr. RUSSACK: The Minister would have loved to take that into account.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I read the report and everything else. Are you criticising me for that?

Mr. RUSSACK: No, but if the Minister accepts what the Tea Tree Gully council says, at the same level he should accept what West Torrens does.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I do. I reported it to you. You were probably having a sleep.

Mr. RUSSACK: If the Minister accepts it, it is an indication that local government in this State has indicated a view different from that of the committee.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I said that 10 more councils have expressed opposition. Didn't you hear that?

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes. I heard that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Then why are you making such a thing about Tea Tree Gully?

Mr. RUSSACK: I turn now to the City of Adelaide council. I have here a copy of a letter written to the Leader of the Opposition. With his permission, I shall read one paragraph from the letter from the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, as follows:

In view of these opinions, expressed in detail in the submissions made to the Select Committee, it is not a fair statement for the Select Committee to say that the Adelaide City Council supports the principle of adult franchise for local government elections.

I shall read the relevant part of the report from the Adelaide City Council, as follows:

As the financing of local government services is dependent basically upon a property tax, the council believes that those who do not contribute directly to the services provided by local government should not be treated in the same way as the people who are required to directly meet the expenses of local government, that is, those people who pay the property tax. In this regard there are a number of specific situations which deeply concern the council. These situations occur predominantly in the city of Adelaide because of the larger proportion of non-residential property.

The concluding paragraph of the report states:

The council is concerned that while the Bill provides that electors may demand a poll for special works and vote at the poll, the ratepayer is the one who must meet the cost. It seems to the council reasonable that, in a financial poll or a poll on a loan, there should be added weight given to the votes of the people who are required to meet the cost—a retention of the present principle, in fact.

Therefore, the Lord Mayor considers that a wrong interpretation has been placed on the submission of the City Council. I had believed that a Select Committee sat to gain information from those involved in the community, those who were interested in a certain matter, so that that information could be assessed and the opinion of the people ascertained. I am afraid that, in one or two instances, a bias was apparent in the attitude of this committee. The report, as I have explained to the House, is inaccurate; 11 out of 17 witnesses had some opposition to the principle of adult franchise. I am sure the Government has a three-fold condition in relation to this franchise. I say that in reference to paragraph 10, which states:

One witness was concerned that under the terms of the Bill a person who had not paid council rates would be entitled to vote and stand for office. Your committee holds the view that the payment of rates is not a qualification that should be taken into account in determining adult franchise, and accordingly your committee does not propose that the Bill should be amended to contain a financial prerequisite for voting.

I point out that the original draft provided that the sole qualifications should be age, nationality, and location of residence. This Government does not consider that the

payment of rates is a condition for adult franchise. I consider the report inaccurate. Without question, paragraph 12 cannot be accepted. It states:

There have only been five objections made to the principle of "adult franchise" for local government which makes your committee firmly convinced it is a principle which is unchallengeable and accordingly endorses that principle.

I say that it can be challenged, because the majority of the witnesses who came before the committee had some opposition in some form to the principle of adult franchise.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I should like to start by saying what I believe about the Minister's interjection regarding extra sitting fees, but the bells should ring at any moment, and I shall start on that when we resume.

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

Mr. WARDLE: I am disgusted with the Minister for having interjected when the member for Gouger was presenting his point of view. The Minister, without doubt, was accusing the member for Gouger of having asked for an additional hearing of the Select Committee in order to receive $12·50. That accusation is one of the most scurrilous things that I have heard in my nine years in the House. I take great exception to it. In the nine years I have been here I have lived with all that has been said in a reasonably patient and pleasant manner, but when I hear accusations like that which was directed against a member whose intentions, above all other members in the Chamber, would not be based on finance, I view such an accusation as dopey, ridiculous and ludicrous, and I hope I never hear anything like it again.

Financially, the Minister condemns himself. When I travel to a Select Committee I must travel 50 miles each way at 20c a mile. It therefore costs me probably $20 and I spend three hours behind the wheel of a motor car to attend a committee hearing. What person would wish to gain $12·50 for an expenditure of $20? The member for Gouger travels a 200-mile return trip at 20c a mile and spends four hours behind the wheel, so to say that he would want to travel that distance for $12·50 is not a sensible statement from the Minister. It is absolutely ridiculous from every aspect.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WARDLE: The Minister made a stupid accusation on the spur of the moment to try to gain a political point that reacted completely against him. I hope that the Minister will never make such a statement again on an issue such as this, and certainly not directed towards two people such as those to whom the remark was directed. Those members do not travel the farthest distance; the member for Stuart would do that. If the member for Stuart was to speak on this motion he would have to say exactly what I am saying.

A Select Committee sits for the sole purpose of gathering from all interested people their attitude towards the subject in question. I agree with the Minister that much publicity was given to the sittings of this committee. It is not to the credit of councils that they were not stirred up before they were. In fact, they were sluggish about coming forward. I am sure that many councillors have not thought about the true significance of this Bill. I am a little disappointed in council officers and clerks for not having made it their business to involve themselves a little more in the fundamental principles of this measure. I would have hoped that most clerks as dutiful servants of their councils would make it their business to obtain a copy of the Bill and study it in order to tell their councillors what it involved.

I agree with the Minister that councils responded poorly when the committee was sitting. I do not agree with the Minister's interpretation of the statistics he presented, but they do indicate a poor response to the matter. The Minister could and should give his opinion of the statistics that were obtained by the Select Committee and add that, since the committee sat and its findings were printed, much more material became available. I know that I can be shot down in flames for saying that, because there must be a cut-off date after which the committee does not receive submissions. In this instance not many replies were received before the cut-off date. I understand how the Minister feels about the poor response to this measure from councils. However, it involves an issue that is more important than the replies received at the time indicated. The information now available is much more expansive, and there has been a much better response to the issue.

West Torrens council probably played a part in increasing the information that became available by stating to other councils what it believed to be the interpretation of the information submitted by the Local Government Association. A letter circulated among members of Parliament states:

I have been directed by my council to draw your attention to the evidence recently submitted by the Local Government Association of South Australia Incorporated to the Select Committee on the Local Government Act, Amendment Bill (Adult Franchise), and which submission is purported to have been made "on behalf of local government in South Australia". The submission as made, of course, does not represent the views of my council relating to adult franchise, and these were made known by council in both written and oral evidence to the Select Committee. More importantly, however, and at a recent Executive Committee meeting of the association, sufficient opposition was expressed by representatives of other councils in attendance, to indicate some doubt as to whether the submission made by the association was, in fact, a representative opinion of local government, so that to clarify this point my council resolved to ascertain the views of individual councils throughout the State.

The responses of some councils to the questions that were asked should be recorded in *Hansard*. In its letter to members, the council goes on to say:

To date, and of the 134 local governing authorities within the State, 102 replies have been received.

I regard this as a reasonably good response to a circular. It indicates a reasonable amount of interest in the subject. The letter continues:

These indicate a substantial majority of councils, either who oppose adult franchise or, whilst in favour of the concept, do not agree with the amendment Act in its present form.

It further states:

For your information, the following is a summary of the replies:

Three metropolitan corporations, including the City of Adelaide, supported the principle of adult franchise but did not support the Bill in its present form, and three country corporations and six district councils gave the same reply. The principal qualifications expressed by these groups were as follows:

(*a*) Subject to tax levy.
(*b*) Compulsory voting.
(*c*) Weighting of vote for ratepayers.
(*d*) Clause 27 (ratepayers only to nominate).
(*e*) Voting not to be compulsory.

Of those bodies that were undecided or had no view to express, four were metropolitan corporations (there were no country corporations) and there were five district

councils, a total of nine. The interesting portion of the report concerns corporations and councils opposed to adult franchise. There were eight metropolitan corporations, seven country corporations, and 49 district councils, a total of 64, which were opposed to adult franchise. One metropolitan and one country corporation expressed some agreement with the principle, whilst not supporting the amending Bill. In favour of adult franchise were six metropolitan corporations, three country corporations and eight district councils, a total of 17. The letter concludes:

It is quite apparent, therefore, the submission made by the Local Government Association does not reflect a majority opinion of local government and, accordingly, my council would seek your assistance in endeavouring to have this Bill defeated.

There are two important issues to which I will refer. First, as the real interest of local government has been aroused and as local government has concentrated on the principles involved in the Bill and on what is at stake, it is clear what the majority of councils think. Secondly, this information reflects the position of corporations and councils, but what is the position of individuals? What is the position of ratepayers? How many ratepayers favour adult franchise? I believe that, if this matter were taken out into the wider field of ratepayers, the whole argument would have expanded to a far greater degree in relation to opposition to adult franchise, because it is basically ratepayers within council and corporation areas who provide the funds to keep local governing areas solvent.

From the point of view of local government authorities, as constituted authorities (in view of the summary I have just given to the House), there is a clear-cut majority of "Noes" against adult franchise at this time. I do not wish to canvass the material presented to the House by the member for Gouger, but I do wish to make two final points. The member for Gouger has pointed out what he believes to be the statistics concerning witnesses who appeared before the committee. He gave his interpretation of the details of the committee's report. I should like to state clearly that, as far as I am concerned, the minutes of the last meeting (page 2 of the minutes) concerning the question "That the draft report be the report of the committee"—and that question was put—were questioned by the member for Gouger and me. When it came to the final vote, it was a vote on whether the minutes of the previous meetings were correct; it did not concern the philosophical matter or the principles that we were discussing. It is clear from the minutes that we divided on every issue, and the division resulted in a four to two split with monotonous regularity. No-one is denying that.

The member for Gouger and I believe that we have been true and loyal to our principles in voting as we did. Therefore, the final vote taken by the committee concerned whether the details of each committee meeting were correct, not the principles of the Bill. It is no use for anyone now to say that the final vote concerned principles, because, when the member for Gouger and I asked for clarification, we were told by the Minister then that the final motion concerned the correctness of the minutes. I will stand by that position at any time, as I will stand by the member for Gouger when he asserts that that was the position.

Mr. Keneally: The Minister did not say that it was a unanimous vote.

Mr. WARDLE: Of course, there was a unanimous vote that the details of the minutes were correct. We agree that the minutes were correct. At that stage we did not believe in any way that we were dealing with basic principles. Further, I agree with the Minister that the amendments recommended by the committee are good. My time on the committee was profitable from many aspects; it was time well spent. It may finally come out of this House and another place, and come into force in this State, a much better Bill as a result of its having been to a Select Committee. I will commend most of the amendments to honourable members in the Committee stage. However, at this time, I am compelled to agree with the member for Gouger that I do not consider the entire details of the committee's report as being correct.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This afternoon in this House we saw one of the most shameful exhibitions that has ever been seen in this House, certainly in my time, by a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. Langley: You haven't heard the member for Davenport, I take it.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Unley is intent on perpetuating this afternoon's farce. It was a shameful exhibition.

Mr. Langley: Shocking!

Dr. TONKIN: The Government and the Ministry obviously do not treat Parliament with the respect and regard it expects and deserves, and the Minister of Local Government, without doubt, is the worst offender. There are inaccuracies in the report. That is the first fact, and there is no way around it. The Minister tried, unsuccessfully, to have a change made in the report while he was talking to the motion, and that cannot be refuted. However, the Minister, in a totally shameless way, shows that he does not much care, as long as he gets his own way in the matter. He indulged in personal abuse of the member for Gouger, whom he accused of asking for a further meeting of the Select Committee only in order to benefit financially; that was petty, miserable and shabby. I should have thought that the Minister would be ashamed of himself. A little later, he went on to say that the member for Gouger could lie his way around a corkscrew. Fortunately, the Minister has chosen, of all members, one whose reputation is absolutely unsullied and unassailable.

Mr. Keneally: Unlike yours!

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister and his colleagues, by continually interjecting in a loud-mouthed, abusive and arrogant way, have done little service to the Parliamentary system today. It is always possible to tell when the Minister is on uncertain ground, because he blusters, reacts, interjects, and indulges in personal criticism and abuse: that is exactly what he has done this time. I repeat: the more uncertain he is, the more he reacts, and there is no question of that in this matter. He is most unsure of himself. If it is possible to say so, he has been at his blustering best. Paragraph 4 of the committee's report is the matter most in question. The Minister sought to change the City of Henley and Grange to the City of Walkerville, and he carefully justified his position, having heard only a minimum number of representations from local government. He has carefully put the position that Parliament should consider legislation based only on what attitudes were expressed to the Select Committee, not on what is the true situation.

It is no credit to local government that its views were not fully expressed to the committee, and I make no excuse for that fact. However, the fact remains that its views were not expressed, as evidenced by the attitudes now shown in the letters that have since been received. I think that the Minister has received them, and members on both sides have received them. Letters have been received from

the district councils of Barossa, Clinton, Walkerville, Freeling, and the South-East Local Government Association, whose letter sets out a list of the associated councils (Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Beachport, Lacepede, Lucindale, Port MacDonnell, Robe, Millicent, Penola and Tatiara). Other letters have been received from Yorketown, Owen and Moonta. Obviously, their concern must be considered. It does not matter that the committee has run out of time or that some councils did not make their submissions by the due date: the fact remains that there is strong and deeply felt opposition in the community to the legislation.

Clause 4 is the major bone of contention, and the Minister has already admitted that it is incorrect. Perhaps, with the change that he wanted to make, technically it is correct, but it certainly does not reflect the current situation. Obviously, it suits the Minister to press on in the way in which he has done and ignore the new evidence that has come forward. Why, in any court of law it is a matter of legal principle, a fundamental principle of justice, that new information, if available, should be brought to any court. In this regard, a Select Committee is just as important as is any court, and if there is new evidence it should be heard. When this matter was first ventilated, it was suggested by various members (and I pay a tribute to the members for Gouger, Murray, and Goyder for the work they did on the committee) that, when the report was first handed down, and inaccuracies and shortcomings became apparent, it was considered whether or not a motion of no confidence should be moved in the Minister for his misleading the House in that report. However, that action was not taken, because there was an overwhelming feeling that the Minister would surely acknowledge, as Opposition members on the committee have done, that the report was not accurate, but that it was a genuine mistake.

No-one minds if a genuine mistake is found, and acknowledged and corrected, but for the Minister to stand up here arrogantly and shamelessly to try to take advantage of the situation and, therefore, associate himself by implication with a deliberate attempt to mislead the Parliament is shameful. It is disgusting behaviour. Clearly, the Minister does not intend to correct the situation. Undoubtedly, the only course to be followed is one which is the subject of a contingent notice of motion, which I shall be moving at the first opportunity. This whole matter must go back to the committee to be considered again, inaccuracies righted, and the full picture presented to the Parliament: until that is done, the report is worthless.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I point out that the committee received its charter in February, 1976, and concluded its substantive work on June 2, 1976.

Mr. Keneally: That's the only accurate statement that's come from your side in this debate yet.

Mr. BOUNDY: When the Bill was before the House, prior to its being referred to a Select Committee, members may recall that I spoke in favour of the second reading. I was appointed to the committee, as a member of the Liberal Movement, and for the whole of the committee's deliberations I was a member of that Party. It was the first Select Committee of which I had been a member. I listened with interest to the evidence submitted, and was greatly interested in the committee's work. I placed great weight on the evidence that the Local Government Association presented to the committee, and the fact that fewer than 20 people wanted to give evidence, from a total of 133 councils.

Mr. Harrison: Whose fault was that? That was not the fault of the Select Committee.

Mr. BOUNDY: The honourable member is right. It was not the fault of the Select Committee and, as other members on this side have said, it does no credit to councils that they did not bother, at their first opportunity, to express alarm at this measure. They did not take the opportunity given them. I took note of the 11 councils in my district and many of them stated, when approached on the matter, that full adult franchise did not appeal to them but its justice was difficult to deny, given the fact that money was available from sources other than rate revenue and given the possibility that that revenue from other sources might well increase.

I refer now to the submission made by my local District Council of Minlaton. That council stated that it was reasonable that full adult franchise be granted for council elections provided voting was not compulsory. The council stated that nearly all adults paid taxes in one way or another, and indirectly a portion of their taxes came to the area through Government grants, subsidies, etc.

The council had objections about other clauses in the Bill, but I took note of the aspect that many in my district and across the State appeared, either by default or evidence, to indicate that they were not bitterly opposed to the principle of adult franchise. I also took note of this statement in the submission of the Local Government Association:

The social justice of adult franchise as enunciated in this Bill is recognised and supported in broad principle.

The association went on to claim at the tail of the submission that the effects of some elements of the Bill were more acute in the Adelaide City Council area than in any other. The association also stated:

Whilst this council is an active member of the association, it has been mutually agreed that the Adelaide City Council shall make a separate representation on its own behalf.

I accept that in some ways the Adelaide City Council is unique and that perhaps there is a case for special sections in the Local Government Act to cover that situation. In the light of the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, qualified by my personal philosophy, I supported the adoption of the clauses and the report of the Select Committee, and I do not resile from that view. Undoubtedly, the detail of the Bill has been improved by referring it to a Select Committee. It is a better Bill coming out of the Select Committee than it was when it went to the committee, and I pay a tribute to the work done and the evidence submitted by Mr. Douglass, the Electoral Commissioner, on the machinery necessary to implement that part of the measure.

Subsequent to the completion of the committee's deliberations, it has become apparent that the report does not clearly indicate the true measure of disagreement that there is with it. Following the action of the West Torrens council, interest and objection have become apparent and doubt has been cast on the validity of some evidence given by the Local Government Association. On the Minister's own admission, there are inaccuracies, but I take my share of the blame and odium for missing the errors in relation to paragraph 4 to which my colleagues have referred. In the time available from June 9, the community has had the opportunity (and local government has had the opportunity) to consider this matter further, and I believe that the Select Committee and the Minister have had time to accept that there now exists a substantial body of opinion contrary to the earlier belief of the Select Committee.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you think from February until June was not a reasonable time, when we advertised and did all sorts of things?

Mr. BOUNDY: I have stated that the lack of interest shown by local government does it no credit. I believe that, if the Minister is fair, he will accept that there is now a case for further investigation of the matters that have been raised since the people have had access to the Select Committee's report.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I want to say one or two words about—

Members interjecting:

Mr. COUMBE: It is about time we heard from the Government side: Government members all run for cover. I spoke on this Bill before the Select Committee was appointed and supported reference of the Bill to the committee. Members who have been interjecting may care to look at what I said then, because I went to the trouble of speaking not only on the franchise part of the Bill but also on the other important aspects of it. Those matters certainly needed improvement and I, as one who has served in local government, can speak from experience.

When I spoke at that time, I canvassed both sides of the argument, and I consider that I presented the case fairly and fully. I dealt with the case as presented in the Bill for an amended type of franchise, and I dealt with the case for the present system. I supported reference of the Bill to a Select Committee to take evidence and report back to the House. I looked forward to receiving the report, and when I received it I read it with interest and surprise, because immediately I knew there was something wrong with it. I knew the feelings of the four councils in my district, and one of them was not even mentioned in paragraph 4. That happened to be the Corporation of Walkerville.

The further I delved, the more I realised that the report was not a genuine one. When the Minister started to speak today, I thought he was making a restrained speech, almost an apologia. He spoke calmly and quietly, which seemed strange for him. Usually, he is not afraid of calling a spade a spade. The Minister outlined the steps taken after the Select Committee was formed; advertisements were published calling for witnesses who might wish to give evidence. The Minister also said that the matter was referred to in the local government bulletin issued from the Local Government Office.

When I read the report, I was surprised at the small number of witnesses who came forward to give evidence on such a fundamental right in connection with local government. The number of witnesses was particularly small in the light of the large number of witnesses who gave evidence to the Select Committee on council boundaries, which aroused much interest. The Select Committee on council boundaries visited many parts of the State to save council representatives the trouble of coming to the city, but the Select Committee on adult franchise did not make such visits. Some of the responsibility for the small number of witnesses must lie with local government itself. Councils and council officers were tardy in coming forward to make their views known at the proper time, but the matter goes further than that. From inquiries I have made, I believe that some councils did not realise, at the time they were informed of the Bill, the full implications of the provisions relating to adult franchise until it was too late to give evidence to the Select Committee.

Mr. Harrison: That is no fault of the Select Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: True, as the honourable member said before. As a former member of the Woodville council, the honourable member is correct. Councils did not realise the implications until it was too late. Further, some councils did not realise the position until they received copies of the Select Committee's report, which was tabled in this House, I think last June; this is one of the reasons for difficulties in getting a full cross-section of council's views. Members of several councils have said that some councils were not aware of the views expressed by the Local Government Association, supposedly on their behalf, until it was too late; there can be no cavilling about that. Even some members of the executive of the Local Government Association have expressed that view to me.

Mr. Harrison: Is the Local Government Association fully representative of the councils involved?

Mr. COUMBE: The association has not had the happiest of experiences in recent years. Some councils broke away some years ago, and some councils have come back to the association. Further, a different Secretary has been appointed to the association. Since the report was tabled and since councils have ascertained the views expressed by the Local Government Association, speaking supposedly on behalf of all constituent councils, some councils have strongly objected to those views. Further, they have said that the association, as a body, had no right to express the views it expressed, because those views were completely contrary to the views of some member councils of the Local Government Association. Some councils have said that they did not know that those views were being presented. I am talking only about the franchise clauses.

It seemed to me that the Minister's approach today was different from his normal approach. He has not been having much luck with changes in local government that he has tried to introduce into this House. First, he tried to change council boundaries, and we know what a furore arose, resulting in no changes being made. The Minister then tried to introduce compulsory voting in council elections, and we know what happened to that proposal. The Minister then tried to introduce night sittings for council meetings, and that was a fiasco. Now, we have this report of the Select Committee. So, the Minister is certainly not having much luck in achieving major changes in local government. He has, however, been successful in getting through some administrative changes in connection with local government, with the support of both sides of the House. Being an engineer, I know something about elementary mathematics. This afternoon, the Minister referred to the submission of the West Torrens council; the figure quoted was 64 councils opposed to adult franchise. The Minister said, "That is an increase of 10." He had previously cited about four or five councils that opposed adult franchise. The Minister said that with 64 councils opposed to adult franchise, as against about five councils that came before the Select Committee, that meant an increase of 10. That is the weirdest piece of mathematics that I have heard. Perhaps I had better lend the Minister my electric computer so that he may get the correct answer. For a Minister of the Crown, supposedly a responsible Minister, to ask members to accept that sort of ridiculous assumption is for him to reach the ultimate in idiocy and effrontery. How can he say that he is holding down the portfolio of local government, and then put forward such tripe and expect us to swallow it? Even his own back-bench colleagues are embarrassed by such an assumption.

Mr. Keneally: They're amused.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not blame the honourable member for being amused. That is what the Minister tried to say: with a total of 64, when he had cited five, that was an increase of 10.

Mr. Keneally: Are you trying to hang your hat on that?

Mr. COUMBE: I am merely paraphrasing what the Minister has said. In effect, based on the information that has come in during the Select Committee's hearings and following the making of its report, many sections of local government will, if this Bill is passed, have foisted on them a type of system which they do not want and to which they have expressed opposition. Is that what this Parliament should do—foist on local government a system to which an overwhelming majority of councils has expressed opposition? That will be the effect of passing this Bill.

As member for Torrens, I represent sections of four councils. Some members opposite who also represent some of those councils would agree with me that there are widely differing complexions in the make-up of those councils. There would be no argument about that. I have in my possession letters from each of the four councils expressing, in one way or another, opposition to the Bill and to the adoption of the Select Committee's report. Some of them have opposed it completely; others have opposed aspects of the franchise provisions in the Bill and in the report. I should think that those four councils would represent a fair mixture of metropolitan councils. They contain probably the largest council in South Australia, that is, the Adelaide City Council, and probably the smallest metropolitan council, the Corporation of Walkerwille.

Mr. Langley: The Adelaide City Council wasn't fully against it.

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Unley obviously has not been listening. I said that the four councils have, in one way or another, expressed objections.

Mr. Slater: You said they were a mixture.

Mr. COUMBE: I said that this represented a fair mixture of metropolitan councils. In between those councils are the City of Enfield and the City of Prospect, which represent fairly large sections of the metropolitan area. The member for Unley referred to the Adelaide City Council. It stressed this point in a letter that was read out in the House. The letter to which I refer is signed by the Lord Mayor, Mr. Roche. We are indeed fortunate to have a man like him as our Lord Mayor. He is taking an advanced look at this city's administration, for instance, in relation to co-operation regarding the Rundle Mall, as well as to legislation relating to the City of Adelaide Development Plan that is to come before us. This forward-looking Lord Mayor said the following:

In view of these opinions, expressed in detail in the submissions made to the Select Committee, it is not a fair statement for the Select Committee to say that the Adelaide City Council supports the principle of adult franchise for local government elections.

I could quote the whole of that letter, but I will not do so as it has already been referred to. So, that is the answer to the member for Unley: the Adelaide City Council does not support fully the provisions of this Bill.

When I spoke on this Bill originally, I canvassed fully and fairly the points of view that have been expressed in the community regarding the advantages or otherwise of full adult franchise. I pointed out some anomalies in the existing legislation, and canvassed the points of view of those who believed that the present system should be retained. I did so deliberately at that stage because of my experience in local government, having spoken to members of the community on the subject, and because this Bill was being referred to a Select Committee. Although I was looking for guidance, I regret to say, the report having been made, that that guidance for which I was looking is not there, because the report is not full or correct.

I am greatly disturbed that so many councils have, since that report was issued, expressed a view contrary to that expressed by the Select Committee. It is that aspect which causes me grave concern. I say this dispassionately, because we could have many country and metropolitan councils throughout the State which have expressed opposition to sections of this Bill but which will, if the Bill is passed, have foisted on them against their will sections of this legislation, parts of a system, to which they violently object. As the member representing part of the Adelaide City Council area, I receive from it a copy of the council's minutes after each meeting.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Where do you get those?

Mr. COUMBE: I happen to represent the city of Adelaide, and that is why I get a copy of the council's minutes. This council recognises that it has a member who does his work, gets off his tail and looks after its interests.

Members interjecting:

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Adelaide (the Minister of Labour and Industry) probably gets a copy of the council's minutes, but whether he reads it is another matter. I do read my copies, and the copy that I have in my possession is printed in red and white! One can see, therefore, that I represent the North Adelaide section. I found the following interesting point therein:

A deputation to the Minister has expressed the council's opposition to a number of the proposals in the Bill, and evidence has also been placed before the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill. The proposals contained in this legislation will come before the council again in the new municipal year.

That meeting was held on June 28, 1976. The letter from the Lord Mayor of August 2 was after the report had come out. Not only in my district, but in those of many other members, strong opposition is being expressed to this viewpoint, and councils are objecting strongly to the provisions of the Bill being foisted upon them. Further, they object to the words being used by the Local Government Association representatives. They object violently, and they do not agree. The report leaves a great deal to be desired. If I may say so, without disrespect to individual members of the Select Committee, it is one of the worst Select Committee reports I have seen in this House.

Motion carried.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the report of the Select Committee be recommitted to the committee.

I take this rather unusual step for reasons which have become apparent during the course of the debate. My motion has been initiated because of the most unsatisfactory nature of the report, the fact that it contains inaccuracies, and the fact that it has not considered, rightly or wrongly from matters of time, the evidence which has come forward from other local government bodies since the report was presented to the House. It centres basically on clause 4.

It is most important, since that evidence has come forward, that it be considered by the Select Committee. It is not enough for the Select Committee to come down with a report based on evidence presented to it if, indeed, there is further evidence to be considered. I repeat my analogy with a court of law: if new evidence is available and has a bearing on the case, it must be admitted, and the court proceedings should be opened up again to hear it, especially if it has a chance of influencing the decision which otherwise would be reached. In this case, the evidence which has come forward from other councils has come forward after the Select Committee has brought

down its findings. For that report to be entirely accurate and to reflect the views of local government bodies and of the community generally, these matters must be considered. I repeat that it does not matter how lax these bodies have been in not putting forward their evidence at the appropriate time. I am certain that this Government and this Parliament want the best possible result. If that is to happen, we need every bit of evidence that is available to the Select Committee. If the Select Committee has not heard all the available evidence it should meet to hear it.

By and large, what the committee then does will be in its own hands. It can determine when it will meet, what it will consider, what new matters should be opened up, what correspondence should be heard, and once again what its report will be. It is not necessary for it to start again; it can simply take on from where it has left off. In the interests of justice and in the best interests of this Parliament and of the community, I believe that is exactly what the committee should do.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I move to amend the motion by adding the following words:

. . . for the purpose of correcting any inaccuracies contained therein and for considering the correspondence submitted to the Minister of Local Government since the report was presented to this House.

The Leader's motion is quite open-ended. It could be moved at any time, because always the point could be raised that more evidence has come forward or more views have been placed before members of the committee or members of Parliament. When I addressed the House this afternoon, I drew to the attention of members those matters that had occurred since the report had been presented. I made no bones of the fact that some minor errors had occurred, but I stressed that they had no bearing on the overall outcome of the committee's report. I was rather heartened, after listening to some of the allegations made about inaccurate reports and the inefficiency of people, to listen to a statement from one of those organisations which had been omitted. The expression was used that, due to an oversight, the name had been omitted. I thought that was a fair and reasonable approach.

Mr. Coumbe: They are very good people.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: They are reasonable people and I think the member for Torrens represents most, if not all, of the citizens of the City of Walkerville. I thought that a fair and reasonable approach. I was interested to hear the letter from the Lord Mayor of Adelaide being quoted. Members might be interested to hear what the council said when it came before the committee because, rather than say, as the letter did, I think, that it was not fair that they should be regarded as supporters of adult franchise, or words to that effect, this is what was said:

The council does not disagree with the basic aspects of the philosophy the Bill seeks to implement.

I am pleased to have the letter from the Lord Mayor, because it will be interesting to see whether he is expressing one view to the Leader of the Opposition while the Town Clerk, for whom I have the greatest respect, is telling the Select Committee that the council does not disagree with the philosophy. It continues:

It recognises that there are people who live in a municipality or district whose lives are affected by the actions or non-actions of a council but, because they are not an owner or occupier of ratable property, they have no say in how their area is to develop or what services should be provided. The councils does not therefore disagree with the proposed extension of the franchise in this context particularly as the council's complete reliance on rates has been alleviated by the State through taxation funds.

What a different story that is from what we were given this afternoon. In the light of all the circumstances, I think it is appropriate that we should go back to the Select Committee, reconstituted, so that we may correct this situation and record precisely the attitude of each member of the committee, and then bring the report back here so that there will be no recriminations of what someone said happened or did not happen. Let us have it all on paper and brought back here with whatever minor errors are contained in the report corrected.

Mr. Coumbe: Would you repeat the amendment?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The amended resolution will read:

That the report of the Select Committee be recommitted to the committee for the purpose of correcting any inaccuracies therein and for considering correspondence submitted to the Minister of Local Government since the report was presented to this House.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the motion. I am sure that members realise that the Minister has accepted that the report contains inaccuracies.

Mr. Keneally: He said that in his first contribution on the motion.

Mr. RUSSACK: The Minister a few moments ago referred to the inaccuracies as being minor errors. I do not consider them to be minor errors. I therefore consider that the Bill should be recommitted to the Select Committee and that an opportunity should be afforded to any interested party to bring forward further evidence before the committee so that the matter might be further aired and a true opinion of councils be determined.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I cannot accept the Minister's amendment: it is far too restrictive. It goes without saying that any inaccuracies in the report would be corrected if the Select Committee were to sit again. After all, the affairs of the committee are in the committee's hands. If the committee believes that inaccuracies exist in the first report, obviously those inaccuracies must be corrected and the committee would act to do so. If the Select Committee is to meet again it should be able to meet and to take whatever action it desires. If it wishes only to consider the correspondence that has been received, that is up to the committee to decide. If it wishes to re-open the hearings to hear verbal evidence, it should be able to do so. Because I believe the amendment is too restrictive in that regard, I oppose it.

The SPEAKER: The question is "That the amendment moved by the Minister be agreed to".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say something on this motion.

The SPEAKER: No. The mover has replied to the amendment.

The House divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Broomhill. No.—Mr. Allen.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

Motion as amended carried.

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

That the date for bringing up the report be October 26, 1976.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I should like to say a word or two on this motion. I presume that I am in order in doing so.

The SPEAKER: Order! We had better make sure of the date first.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, we had better get the date right before I waste my words.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I seek leave to withdraw the motion.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO moved:

That the time for bringing up the report be November 2, 1976.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that the date for bringing up the report is now November 2. I also understand that the Minister forgot that the Constitution Convention is on and the—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I didn't even know it was on.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It shows what communication there is on the front bench of the Government. I hope indeed that the time that we are intending to allow by this motion will be sufficient for the Minister and the other members of the Select Committee to fix up what apparently must have been a botch in the first place. That is what I would have said if I had been in order before, on the other matter. However, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going back to that debate. I merely make clear that the motion we passed a moment ago, which is the subject of the report we will receive on November 2, should clear up the mistakes which should never have occurred in the report in the first place.

Of course, it would have been folly to have allowed an open-ended reference to the committee. I merely wanted to make those points clear. That is why I had to support the amendment. I hope the support I gave to the Government on the last occasion will be put to good use when we get that report on November 2, and that it will not be necessary to fix yet another date to get it right.

Motion carried.

LEVI PARK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 10. Page 141.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This Bill is a simple one, and I indicate the Opposition's support for it. The Bill makes the fees payable to members of the Levi Park Trust more appropriate since they were last fixed 30 years ago, the Chairman receiving the munificent sum of 25 guineas a year, and trust members receiving 12 guineas a year. At least we are trying to keep up to date, apart from the effect of inflation. Instead of the fees payable being written into the Statutes, they will be determined by the Minister, as is done under several other Acts.

Apart from any definition of "the Minister" given to him tonight, the definition is amended by this Bill as has been done in the Acts Interpretation Act. Several honourable members have asked where is Levi Park? The history of the park is that it was started in 1948 by Act of Parliament and, although it is not that long ago, it was set up to provide for the development, care and control of a bequest of land and funds by the Belt family, which was a pioneer family of Walkerville. The Belt family was well known in Walkerville. There are some good ovals there and it contains one of Adelaide's largest caravan parks. For that reason there are many people there and there are many itinerants in the area.

Mr. Mathwin: They play lacrosse there, too.

Mr. COUMBE: We can play those games, whether it be Australian or English rules. Levi Park is situated on the bank of the Torrens River. The controlling board consists of Mr. Lewis, Tourist Officer, Royal Automobile Association, Chairman; Mr. Correll, South Australian Tourist Bureau; one councillor from the City of Enfield; and two councillors from the City of Walkerville. A little while ago there was a move to have Walkerville council representation only on the board because the park is no longer split between the Walkerville (it is completely contained in that council area) and Enfield areas. However, it has been decided that the representation will stay as it is. The Levi Park Trust is now self-supporting, its income from caravan fees being sufficient to carry out extensive improvement and above all, it can maintain a credit balance in its books. I support the Bill.

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

LIBRARIES (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 5. Page 458.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I support the concept of this Bill. It is proper that, where we have facilities already available such as those at many high schools and schools with resource centres, where we have institute libraries that are in some financial difficulty and in cases where the cost of establishing public libraries is a deterrent to local government, the measures contained in this Bill are the sort necessary to provide a composite of the three situations; wherein one can use school resources, and local government finance, this finance being subsidised by Government finance. The result is that we get an integrated library system incorporating the total resources of the community. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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

HOUSING ADVANCES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 9. Page 926.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): The Opposition supports the Bill. As the Premier has said in his second reading explanation, the Bill is essentially a machinery measure that cannot, of itself, create housing funds. No doubt, many members hoped that there was some method of making housing funds at present, because of the overall shortage of money available at a reasonable interest rate. That is a subject with which, I believe, most Australian Governments should concern themselves, namely, how to arrive at a basis of making money available to all income groups at reasonable rates of interest, leaving the opportunity for a greater interest payment in cases where people move into a higher income group and can afford to pay a higher interest rate.

The Bill sets up an account in the Treasury to facilitate the advancing of certain funds for housing. For example, it contains retrospectivity provisions to take in the $20 000 000 advanced to the State Bank and the Housing Trust last year. The account is to be a revolving or self-generating fund, and it is important to note that provision is made for the possible winding up of the account in future, if the need for housing funds diminishes, by a gradual crediting of repayments of loan and interest to the Loan or Revenue Account. The Bill, which the Opposition supports, may help the Government in its administration and assist people to obtain housing perhaps more readily.

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

WAR FUNDS REGULATION ACT REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 9. Page 926.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill, which repeals the principal Act, the War Funds Regulation Act, 1916. Under the Bill, it is proposed that the funds now held in a trust account in the Treasury and amounting to about $4 800 will be passed on to the War Veterans Home at Myrtle Bank. Having communicated with the home, I understand that it will receive the money with open arms. Having contacted the Returned Services League, I understand that it does not object to the Bill, although it had a problem in knowing anything about the Act. The principal Act states that the war referred to is the First World War, which commenced on August 4, 1914, and involved Germany and its allies. The principal Act requires revision in order that this money may be passed on to the right body.

If one examines the background of this legislation, one will see that in December, 1916, His Excellency the Governor in Council was pleased to appoint the Hon. Crawford Vaughan, M.P., Treasurer and Minister of Education, and the Hon. Reginald Poole Blundell, M.P., Minister of Industry, Minister of Mines, and Minister of Marine, to be Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively of the State War Council under the provisions of the War Funds Regulation Act. That situation did not last long, because on September 27, 1917, the Hon. Crawford Vaughan resigned and his place was taken by the Hon. David John Gordon, M.L.C., Minister of Education and Minister of Repatriation, as Chairman of the State War Council. There was argument during the debate on that matter in relation to the available funds. One will see by the original Act that the Transvaal Patriotic Fund, as a war fund, was to be included in the Act. To relate briefly part of the discussion that took place and to indicate the marvellous manner in which the people of South Australia, in particular, and Australia generally supported the fund, I point out that the Hon. D. J. Gordon said:

Next to the magnificent manner in which a large portion of the manhood of this country has recognised its duty to the Empire there is nothing we can admire more than the generosity of the public of Australia in responding to the many calls that have been made on it. Up to the present voluntary contributions in the various States within the last two years have exceeded £5 000 000 sterling, and of this amount New South Wales has contributed towards various causes over £2 000 000; Victoria, £1 500 000; and the other States about £500 000 each, including South Australia. I am somewhat afraid, however, that a Bill of this nature is apt if not to dry up these reservoirs of generosity, to somewhat interfere with them, but I know that is not the object of the Government.

It was a long debate over many days, and attempts were made to include several amendments to the Act to include the South Australian Soldiers Fund. Eventually, the Bill was passed after a long and serious debate. The Act, although it has done its job, has not been used for a considerable time. I can think of no better place to which to hand the $4 800 than the War Veterans Home. I support the Bill.

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

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from October 7. Page 1411.)

Remaining clauses (2 and 3) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FIRE AND ACCIDENT UNDERWRITERS' ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (CHANGE OF NAME) BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill has become necessary in consequence of a change in the constitution and name as well as the identity of the unincorporated body formerly known as the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia, which was an association that has in the past been recognised by legislation as representative of a wide section of the insurance industry in this State. By resolutions of the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia in June last year, the name of the association was changed to Insurance Council of Australia (South Australia Branch) and the association adopted a new constitution and rules which made it possible for the composition of the association also to be altered. Both resolutions took effect on August 26, 1975.

A Federal body known as the Insurance Council of Australia was formed at the same time and the newly formed body has now become representative of the collective interests of the substantial majority of the non-government owned general insurers in Australia. Although the Insurance Council of Australia has a branch in this State, known as the Insurance Council of Australia (South Australia Branch), that branch now has very limited functions and the council conducts its operations in this State mainly through a Regional Director for South Australia, to whom the council delegates its main functions in this State.

The purpose of this Bill is to confer on the Insurance Council of Australia, acting by itself or through its Regional Director or other agent in South Australia, the powers and functions which had previously been vested in the now defunct Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia and to validate the performance

of all functions and duties and the exercise of all powers, etc., by the council or its agents which, if they had been performed or exercised by the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia, would have been lawful, valid and effectual for the purposes of any Act or law.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 (1) provides for the amendment of three Acts specified in the schedule, and I shall explain those amendments when I explain the provisions of the schedule. Clause 2 (2) is a provision built into the Bill which would have the effect of repealing any amendment made by the Bill to any Act where that Act (or that Act as amended) is repealed by or by virtue of some other Act but that amendment and any provisions of this Bill which are ancillary to that amendment have not also been repealed by that other Act. For example, there is a Bill before Parliament which, if it becomes law, will repeal the Bush Fires Act, one of the Acts to be amended by this Bill. If that Bill should become law, the amendments by this Bill to the Bush Fires Act will also, by virtue of clause 2 (2), immediately thereafter be repealed, thus cleaning up the Statute Book of dead wood without the need for further corrective or consequential legislation to be passed.

Clause 3 (1) has the effect of interpreting all references in legislation or in documents to the now defunct Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia as references to the Insurance Council of Australia. Clause 3 (2) has the effect of validating the performance of functions and duties and the exercise of powers, etc., by the Insurance Council of Australia or its duly appointed agents resident in South Australia which, if they had been performed or exercised by the defunct association, would have been lawful, valid and effectual for the purposes of any Act or law.

THE SCHEDULE

Amendments to the Bush Fires Act, 1960-1972:

The first amendment to section 14 substitutes a reference to the Insurance Council of Australia for the reference to the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia in subsection (3). When a vacancy last arose in the office of member of the Bush Fires Equipment Subsidies Committee who had to be appointed on the nomination of the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia, that association had been superseded by the Insurance Council of Australia and that council had made the nomination instead of that association and the appointment was made on that nomination. Accordingly, the second amendment to section 14 adds a new subsection (5) to that section which has the effect of validating the appointment of the member who had been nominated by the Insurance Council of Australia.

The first amendment to section 21 substitutes a reference to the Insurance Council of Australia for the reference to the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia in subsection (2). The second and third amendments to section 21 are consequential amendments which substitute for the reference to "that association" in subsection (2) and the reference to "the said association" in subsection (3) a reference to the Regional Director for South Australia, or other agent, of the Insurance Council of Australia resident in South Australia. This is in line with the administrative procedures adopted by the Insurance Council of Australia which conducts its operations in this State mainly through the Regional Director for South Australia.

Admendments to the Commercial and Private Agents Act, 1972:

The first and second amendments to section 7 substitute references to the Insurance Council of Australia for the references to the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia in subsections (2) and (3). When a vacancy last arose in the office of member of the Commercial and Private Agents Board who had to be appointed on the nomination of the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia, that association had been superseded by the Insurance Council of Australia which had made the nomination instead of that association and the appointment was made on that nomination. The third amendment to section 7 accordingly adds a new subsection (4) to that section which has the effect of validating the appointment of the member who had been nominated by the Insurance Council of Australia.

Amendments to the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund Act, 1949-1975:

Subsection (2) of section 3 of the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund Act provides, *inter alia,* that one of three trustees of the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund is to be appointed by the Governor from a panel "nominated by the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia". Subsection (3) of that section provides, *inter alia,* that every trustee shall hold office for five years. The present holder of the office of trustee appointed from the panel nominated by that association was appointed for a five-year term in 1974, expiring in 1979, but, since his appointment, that association has been superseded by the Insurance Council of Australia and, although his appointment as such was a valid one, some question could well arise during his term of office as to whether that member continues to represent the sections of the insurance industry which had been represented by the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia after that association had ceased to exist.

Accordingly, section 3 of the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund Act has been amended by inserting in subsection (2) after the reference to the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of South Australia the passage "or by the Insurance Council of Australia". This will enable all successors to the present member to be appointed from a panel nominated by the Insurance Council of Australia. The second amendment to that Act adds a new subsection (3a) to section 3 which has the effect of confirming that the present member shall, subject to the Act, continue to hold office as such, notwithstanding that the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association from whose panel he was appointed has ceased to exist.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I am so sickened by matters here today, associated with this State, the Chamber and this Government, that this evening I will speak about matters that are not local matters, and that is very unusual for me. Recently I was astonished to read a publication entitled *Industry News,* which by some devious means got into my hands. An article, headed "Senator Cotton attacks private sector", in that publication states:

The Minister for Industry and Commerce, Senator R. C. Cotton, delivered a scathing attack on private enterprise in an address earlier this month to a group of Brisbane business men. In a speech titled "Private

enterprise under challenge", the Minister said the greatest demonstrations of confidence in the future are coming from companies from overseas who show confidence where Australian companies do not. He said the challenge facing Australian industry today is getting the word "enterprise" back into the private sector.

"If there is one thing we have all learnt from the past three years, it is that private enterprise in Australia is not invulnerable. Possibly as a result of this and possibly as a result of a partially unenterprising private sector, there has arisen, even in the business community, a belief that the case for private enterprise is going by default."

"This can be observed very easily by simply examining the appalling extent to which the average Australian, both employer and employee, expects the Government to come to his aid when the going gets tough."

Senator Cotton said if private enterprise ignored its responsibility and made no effort to pursue economic rationalism based on community responsibility it would open the way for broad direct Government intervention in private economic activities.

The Minister said the election of the Liberal-Country Party Government was not a signal for private enterprise to demand and be given exactly what it asked for in the way of protection and hand-outs. "Let's make no mistake about it, even following the verdict of December 13, 1975, I believe the people of Australia still have not fully accepted private enterprise forever as the preferred method of achieving results. Let me make this clear; it is the belief of the Government that when it needs to intervene in the private sector it will do so judiciously as a stabiliser to forestall disruptive tendencies, to apply quickly remedies with moderation and skill to avoid suffering."

"Industry needs to realise that the high levels of support currently enjoyed in some areas must come to a gradual end if there is to be a future for an efficient private sector in Australia. Industry must learn to play its part in supporting activities from which it draws most benefit. Industry in Australia must become more enterprising if it is to retain its independence," Senator Cotton said.

I am astonished to read the Senator's remarks. Formerly, I considered him to be something of a cross between Simon Legree and Bjelke-Petersen. Apparently, however, he is not quite that bad because then, to my astonishment, Mr. J. Tomlinson, President of the Construction Equipment Manufacturers of Australia, said that he was dismayed by Senator Cotton's attack on Australia's business sector. Mr. Tomlinson said that his members have little incentive to invest without having a reasonable expectation of finding a market for their products. He continued:

Some months ago, we called for an increased level of activity in Government capital works programmes such as power stations, dams, waterfront development, airports and roads, which would return to C.E.M.A. members their largest markets. Without these projects, we have to rely on mining and other private enterprise projects; with world demand for minerals at a low ebb, and commercial building at its lowest level for years, this is no time for government to withdraw from the market place.

It seems to me that what these two gentleman have said, and what I have interpolated in the meantime to make it slightly more readable, indicates that we are still faced with only one project: we in Australia must face up to getting back to working hard, as good socialists, so that we earn what we get. I assure members that I work for what I earn. This is one way out of this long and tortuous problem. I agree thoroughly that this is the only answer to the problem that is facing us all today. I hope that most members join me in this respect. If they do not, they can tell me now why they are not willing to do so. I am prepared to answer them now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): A matter relating to advanced education in South Australia concerns me greatly. I refer especially to planning which is proceeding in some of our colleges of advanced education and which, to me, seems illogical. Speaking not only as a member of this House but also as a Parliamentary representative on the South Australian Institute of Technology Council, I find it quite incredible that the Board of Advanced Education in South Australia has decided to expand the course in radiography to the Sturt College of Advanced Education, to the possible detriment of the course presently being conducted (and which has been conducted for some years) at the South Australian Institute of Technology. As I understand it, from next year a handful of students will be enrolled in a course to be set up at considerable expense at the Sturt college, while at the Institute of Technology the approved intake for 1977 will be 38 students. The institute has facilities at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which students use for their practical work and which would satisfy the State's requirements for many years. Up to 60 positions are available; there is no quota problem relating to this course.

The board has decided to duplicate the course and to allow the Sturt college to take in a handful of students to work with the Flinders Medical Centre. Good luck to the Sturt college and to the Flinders Medical Centre, but the proposal seems illogical and incredible. In New South Wales and Victoria, the States with the larger populations, only one course is conducted for the training of radiographers, a necessary section of paramedical training in any community. With a smaller population, South Australia is to duplicate the facilities. I believe the decision of the board to approve the additional course is completely against the spirit of what the Minister of Education announced as some of the criteria and guidelines in the Anderson committee's inquiry into post-secondary education which the Minister set up and which is beginning to conduct its inquiry. The guidelines included course rationalisation and attention to financial implications.

It would appear that South Australia is giving lip service to this principle but is condoning unnecessary and expensive duplication of the radiography course at the Sturt College of Advanced Education. I do not want any member to think that I am having a shot at the Sturt college, but we should be sensible with our money. The Minister has been approached on this matter, and I think he has been poorly advised. A bit of a bungle has occurred, because the Anders committee was set up to avoid this very situation. Unfortunately, duplication has occurred in some cases, unnecessarily, to the detriment of the State, and at considerable expense. Associated with this radiography course at the Institute of Technology are courses in nuclear medical technology, which is most important, and in radiotherapy, all of which involve expensive equipment and staff. Those students are proceeding from the advanced certificate to the associate diploma in that course.

I want to develop that aspect further to take in the general philosophy regarding tertiary education, especially in relation to colleges of advanced education. I have been associated for several years with this subject. I know, too, that the Minister of Community Welfare has been associated with it for some time. The example of radiography is somewhat symptomatic of what is happening in South Australia and in some other States in tertiary institutions.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is there new equipment at Flinders?

Mr. COUMBE: The Royal Adelaide Hospital already has equipment. I have said that radiography is an example and is symptomatic of some of the cut-throat competition that is developing among some tertiary institutions in this and some other States in what I can

describe as a mad scramble to obtain certain student numbers and increased status in some of the courses offered. This is in the interests of the self-glorification of the institute concerned. Unfortunately, the standard that we expect from some of these courses could fall as a result of the mad scramble. I make a plea not only with regard to the Institute of Technology regarding the radiography course but also in relation to all tertiary institutions, including universities. I know an example of the Adelaide University and the institute running similar degree courses.

I hope there will be a sensible rationalisation of resources, manpower and funds available to all tertiary institutions. We all realise that a problem we are facing in South Australia is that we have too many teachers colleges. That trend is a reversal of what happened a few years ago when South Australia desperately needed teachers. Now we have too many teachers and the student population of secondary schools has gone down slightly. The Minister of Education will have quite a job to place all the students from teachers colleges. As a member of the Public Works Committee, with other members of that committee I was shocked when it was realised that there now seemed to be too many tertiary institutions in South Australia, especially where the population is fairly static, if not reducing. Student populations in both primary and secondary schools are dropping, as the Minister confirmed only today. What we must do is consider closely all future courses and enrolments at all tertiary institutions.

That is why I welcome the setting up of the Anderson committee. I only hope that it works properly and avoids the expensive duplication to which I have just referred in the radiography course, which is to be upgraded at the Institute of Technology. It is really a breakdown in the system whereby two courses have been set up for this purpose. I could allude to other courses, but I believe that what I have referred to is sufficient to make my point. My interest is in the promotion of the best educational facilities possible for the greatest number of worthwhile students in this State. I believe we can offer those facilities only by conserving our funds, resources and manpower and thus avoiding duplication.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): Many times in this House I have heard members opposite say that they are willing to sit for long hours and that the Government does not sit long enough. I believed it might be a reasonable exercise to consider the sitting times under both Liberal and Labor Governments during the time I have been a member of the House, which dates back to 1962. During that time I have ascertained that the Labor Party at all times has sat for much longer hours than the Liberal Party when in Government. The following chart shows the number of sitting days and the hours of sitting in my time in this place.

Session	No. of sitting days	From meeting to adjournment	
		Hrs.	Mins.
1962	48	334	37
1963-64	52	359	21
1964	37	207	46
1965-66	82	549	00
1966-67	73	506	35
1967	57	421	01
1968-69	68	465	19
1969	64	441	38
1970	3	30	19
1970-71	75	576	46
1971-72	74	582	16
1972	54	394	45
1973-74	69	411	01
1974-75	74	448	26
1975-76	45	295	46

From 1962 to 1964 it was not unusual for honourable members to go to the Melbourne Cup, because we got up at the beginning of November and did not come back until June in the next year. In 1965 we saw a Labor reform Government in this House and, instead of sitting for about 810 hours, as we did from 1962-64, from 1965-67 we sat about 1 279 hours. How can honourable members opposite say that the Labor Government does not sit long enough? During the term of the Hall Government, in 1968-69 the House sat for about 776 hours. That was about a normal sitting. In 1970, our good Labor Government again won power, and in the years 1970-72 it sat for a total of about 1 318 hours, yet members opposite are always complaining that we do not sit long enough. Certainly, members opposite can come forward and dispute these figures. I remember the position as it used to be—

Mr. Rodda: What will be the position next year?

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Victoria knows that the Premier has 73 per cent support in this State. That will reflect on candidates, and we will have a wholesale win at the next election. Certainly, the member for Rocky River could be easily in trouble. He has paid enough to ensure his pre-selection. However, I remember once before when this sort of thing happened. The member for Mitcham would have become the member for the Commonwealth seat of Boothby, but he went to El Alamein military camp (near Port Augusta), and tickets were sold, so he did not win pre-selection. The member for Rocky River, I am sure, wishes the member for Mitcham was not here, because every time that honourable member interjects, he gets into too much trouble. The total number of hours sat in 1973-75 was about 788 (about the same sitting time as that of the Hall Government). I am sure that Steele Hall was progressive.

Mr. Rodda: Who is he?

Mr. LANGLEY: He is what they call a "dead'n". He has moved right away. They fixed him. I assure the honourable member that they would love to fix the member for Mitcham, but they have no possible hope of doing that.

Mr. Venning: They've got him.

Mr. LANGLEY: No, they have not. If the member for Rocky River liked to stand for Mitcham, I assure him that he would be back on his farm. In 1975-76, we sat for 295 hours and 46 minutes, during which time 103 Bills were introduced. If the Opposition examined the number of Bills before the House during a Labor Government compared to a Liberal Government, it would find that we have been most progressive. I assure the Opposition that, when Labor came into power in 1965-66, 260 Bills were introduced, but I cannot guarantee that they all passed another place. I have examined the list and, if the Opposition wants to rebuke me on this matter, I point out that the list is an official document.

If the document is wrong, then I am wrong. We are willing to sit and we have sat longer hours than has any Liberal Government that I can recall. The member for Tea Tree Gully has spoken in the House about another place, which did not sit 40 hours during an entire session. However, another place is doing differently now. If the Opposition wants to sit longer, it should think about what things were like when it was in Government. I assure the member for Rocky River that Sir Thomas Playford, whom I greatly admire, waved the magic wand and said, "I don't want any of you to speak." The colleagues he addressed

sat down as though it was the end of the world. Only a few of today's sitting Opposition members were members in those days. The member for Victoria was one victim.

Mr. Rodda: What about the time I voted against him?

Mr. LANGLEY: I did not hear what the honourable member said. I received a letter recently from the Young Christian Workers, from the reading of which it seems that something has gone wrong with the Australian Government as regards unemployment. That Government often talks about bludgers. I am sure that the Opposition has received the same letter, which is non-political, and, if one reads the letter, one will find that it contains much truth. The Opposition cannot blame anyone but its own confreres in this matter. I hope that, after Christmas, this type of activity will continue, because the present Australian Government is giving the young people away.

Motion carried.

At 9.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 13, at 2 p.m.