

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION BILL

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

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION:
RESIGNATION OF LEADERSHIP**

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL: This explanation concerns my resignation this afternoon as Leader of the Liberal and Country Party. As it is a somewhat lengthy explanation, Mr. Speaker, I seek your indulgence to complete it. One of the major responsibilities of political life is to make decisions, however hard they might be. The one that I have made this afternoon in resigning my leadership of the Parliamentary Liberal and Country Party is one of the hardest decisions I have had to make in 13 years of political involvement. However, I cannot continue to lead a Party that will not follow; I cannot lead a Party which has lost its idealism and which has forgotten that its purpose for existence is to govern successfully for the welfare of all South Australians. Our Party is still deeply cleft by the persuasive influence of a number of its members in the Legislative Council. They have implanted in a number of our Assembly minds the idea that the preservation of our numbers in the Legislative Council is more important than winning Government in the Lower House. This cleft has now widened to such an extent that early this afternoon our Assembly Party changed the system of Cabinet selection from one previously entirely in the hands of the Party Leader to one where the L.C.L. Leader will now have his Cabinet in a future Government elected for him by Party vote.

I will not accept this decision, because it weakens the strength of leadership in this Party. I find this a very strange decision indeed at a time when our Party, both Federal and State, is demanding stronger leadership. However, it is not only the public image of the Leader's strength which is at stake. The

Leader must have the right to hire and fire his Ministers if he is to assert and maintain proper discipline in his Cabinet structure. This is a right which I have used in office and which I would have used again in office if I had been elected to the Premiership, and if Ministerial discipline was required. This, in short, is my conception of the Leader-Cabinet relationship. It is the conception which has been supported federally and in this State by our Party during all its relevant history, and I am not going to stand by now, silent, whilst the strength of the Leader is undermined.

However, this practical view of the Party's action is subordinate to the real problem it faces. This morning in our Party room the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) moved the motion which has resulted in my resignation. Whilst I had not informed Party members generally that I would resign if it was carried, I had made Mr. Brookman clearly aware of the consequences. Therefore, he knew the carriage of the motion would mean my resignation. He was supported by at least one member who spoke on behalf of the views of the Legislative Council. And it is here that the crux of the problem lies in our Party. Without the controversy that has existed between the Assembly and the Council, this motion would not have seen the light of day.

Finally, a number of members were concerned that I might not select Mr. DeGaris in a future Cabinet that I might form, and they believed that this motion would take the matter out of my hands and put it in the Party's hands, and therefore safeguard his position. I assured my Party before the vote was taken that, as long as I was Leader, no person was pre-selected for Cabinet rank, that it had to be earned, and that it would not be awarded on the basis of personality. This, apparently, is not sufficient, and the Legislative Council was successfully able to extend its influence into our Assembly Party room. Over the last three years I have been subjected to a great deal of disloyalty on a continuing basis, the detail of which need not interest this House at this time. In fact, I had hoped this afternoon to move a motion of no confidence in the Government; instead, I found our Party had moved a vote of no confidence in itself.

It is sufficient to say that our Party is now in a very difficult situation. It has publicly acknowledged the fact that it will not follow me in my endeavours to govern and legislate for the broad section of the South Australian community. It prefers to bind itself tightly to the ambitions of a few individuals who will

put Party before State. This I cannot accept, and it provides the background and reason why I have vacated the Leader's seat and speak from this position at this time.

I express my sincere appreciation of the support that I have received from the thousands of members of the Liberal and Country League during my Parliamentary Leadership, which has been made all the more arduous because of the internal difficulties of the league itself. I have enjoyed immensely the work in the Premier's Department, and at Parliament House as Leader of the Opposition. I particularly want to thank my own staff and the staff of the House, who have been most helpful and considerate. Perhaps the fault of our Party is basically that it cannot take the long-term view of its political environment. It is suffering a decline after almost 40 years of political success. Its thoughts are too often with the good old days of the Playford era. I have tried to lengthen its view of these matters. I have publicly discussed issues of major importance to this State by involving myself in subjects that are important, such as regional development and foreign investment.

At this stage, however, our Party will not accept the view that it must be a little ahead of public opinion; it prefers to stay behind. I hope that the repercussions of my leaving will be great enough to bring home to the league the magnitude of its problems, so that it will take some remedial action.

QUESTIONS

ABORTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether the Government proposes to accept and act on the recommendations in the second annual report of the Abortions Advisory Committee? Although I have not seen the report, an article in this morning's *Advertiser* sets out the matter at some length. The report refers to a number of recommendations under the heading "Special facilities 'urgent' as abortions soar". Several of the matters which are the subject matter of recommendations have been urged by some members of this House and by members of the community from time to time. I refer particularly to a matter considered essential and urgent by the committee: the provision of special accommodation and facilities in one of the three teaching hospitals, or, less desirably, in a special centre set up independently. The question of more family planning clinics and the question of contraceptive advice are also mentioned, and

I regard the latter matter as urgent. Now that the Government has had the report, I put this question to the Premier as a matter of urgency in the community.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question of providing additional facilities to cope with the demand for abortion is being examined at present. However, it is not possible for the Government to make an announcement at this time, because there has not been time to consider the matter fully since the report was received. Regarding the work of family planning clinics, only a week ago the Government markedly increased the financial support for those clinics in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: By how much?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the exact figure, but I will provide that information for the honourable member tomorrow. We believed that it was vital and urgent that we increase the amount, and we have in fact done this. The question of contraceptive services is also being examined.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation obtain a report setting out the number of national parks and open spaces purchased by the Government in the last two years?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be happy to prepare a report on this matter.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government has abandoned any idea of increasing the per capita grants to independent primary schools? Also, can he say whether there is any possibility of a further increase being made apart from that recommended by the committee that dealt with the matter, and whether he will inform the Commonwealth Party Leader, Mr. Whitlam, of the position? On February 23, 1972, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Whitlam said:

The fact is, since the Minister mentions this, that in South Australia the needier schools get more per pupil from the State Government than any school gets per pupil from any other State Government.

This seems to be grossly incorrect because, as I understand the position, independent primary schools receive a \$10 per capita grant from the Government. Additionally, the Government set up a committee that categorized the schools into four groups—A, B, C and D. The most needy schools were placed in category A, and these schools received a per capita

grant of \$24. So, the total for the most needy schools in South Australia is \$34 a head. Regarding the other categories, in category B they get \$30 a head, in category C \$25 a head, and in category D, \$20 a head. That is, of course, counting the across-the-board per capita grant, whereas I understand that in New South Wales the same class of school (independent primary schools) gets \$50 a head and in Victoria \$40 a head, both of which amounts are more than that granted in South Australia. In Western Australia such schools get \$30 a head, which is more than many of our schools receive, and in Tasmania they get \$24 a head, which is less than we give in two categories and greater than we give to those independent primary schools in category D. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether the Government is likely to consider making further per capita grants outside the work of the committee that we know colloquially as a means test committee, and I also ask the Minister whether he will tell the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition what is the correct position.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament is capable of taking care of himself.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has asked his question and he should listen to the reply. He has done enough damage for one day already. So far as the independent primary schools are concerned, the position, as the member for Alexandra would know, is that before the last election independent primary schools in this State received \$10 per capita, and the grant was the same in 1970. At the time of the election campaign the present Opposition indicated that, if it became the Government, it would increase that amount from \$10 to \$20. After the election the member for Alexandra moved a motion in this House in 1970 that for 1971 the amount of extra assistance paid should be an additional \$10 on a flat per capita basis. That motion was not accepted and the Government decided that a higher amount would be paid (about \$250,000) and distributed on a needs basis. For 1972 the Budget provision for independent primary schools was an additional \$300,000 over and above the base \$10 per capita and, consequent on discussions between the committee and me, the committee's final recommendation, which the Government accepted, involved an allocation of \$400,000 to independent schools, so the

position now is that the sum distributed over and above the \$10 per capita paid for 1970 is almost twice the amount that the member for Alexandra proposed should be paid in 1971. The amount being paid this year is an increase on the amount paid last year and on the amount proposed in the Budget last year. I point out to the member for Alexandra that we are operating in an area here which has had a relatively short history and, if one wanted to make a true comparison between what happens in South Australia and what happens in other States, one should consider that fact.

HOLDEN HILL HOUSES

Mrs. BYRNE: As some of the original owners of Housing Trust houses at Holden Hill are still occupying the houses, can the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, say, for the information of these people, whether, at the end of the five-year maintenance period laid down by the trust, these people may purchase the properties? If they may do so, can he say on what conditions and whether the trust will inform all occupants to this effect at the expiration of that time? On February 26, 1968, the Premier wrote to me about defects in South Australian Housing Trust houses erected at Holden Hill. The letter states:

The trust has agreed in cases where houses in the Holden Hill area have cracked substantially due to abnormal soil movements to make good the faults for a period of five years after the purchase by the original owner. In some instances it may be necessary to defer the repairs until such time as, in the opinion of the trust's inspector, more satisfactory results may be achieved. Alternatively, the trust is prepared either to repurchase the properties and permit the occupants to remain in occupation as tenants of the trust, or to repurchase the properties and arrange the sale of a trust property to them in another area.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is giving a rather lengthy explanation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter and let the honourable member have a reply.

GAS

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier, as Minister of Mines, any information regarding the blow-out at the Moomba gas field in the Far North? Will this blow-out affect the proven resources of the gas field or the gas supply to South Australia and the proposed pipeline that has been negotiated to supply natural gas to the metropolitan area of Sydney?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At about 10 p.m. on Saturday, March 11, 1972, a flanged joint on the wellhead of the above well failed and the ability to maintain complete control of the well was lost. This failure followed a well "kick" in which some mud was lost from the hole. The well was shut in with the blow-out preventers and satisfactory progress was being made in bringing the well back under complete control when the flanged joint failed.

The well is currently flowing gas at rates variously estimated between 20,000,000 and 100,000,000 cub. ft. a day, but the figure is probably nearer the lower end of this range. The flow is accompanied by large amounts of artesian water which, fortunately, is keeping all equipment cool and wet and is preventing the possibility of the gas catching fire. Unfortunately, the artesian water is bringing with it quantities of sand thought to be from the Hutton sandstone aquifer. This material is very abrasive and the life of all wellhead equipment is therefore limited. To assist in bringing the well under control, Delhi International Oil Corporation has contacted "Red" Adair, who recently brought the Marlin blow-out in Bass Strait under control. One of his assistants was expected at the location at about midday Tuesday, March 14, 1972. Provided that the wellhead is not too badly eroded, it is anticipated that the well can be brought under control. If this cannot be done, drilling of a relief well, as at Della No. 5, will be necessary to kill the well.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier inform the House of his intentions regarding proceedings of the House during the latter part of this session? Will the House sit on Thursday evenings and does the Government still intend to finish the session before Easter? There is still much business on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Most of the legislation for this part of the session has already been introduced. It is not expected that there will be additions to the Notice Paper hereafter except for the introduction of legislation concerning licensing, the Board of Advanced Education, national parks, and conservation. In these circumstances we expect to finish the session before Easter. I intend to give time to members to debate the disallowance of certain regulations and other private members' business will simply be given voting time only. I expect that at our present rate of dealing with business it may be neces-

sary to sit on Thursday evening next week. However, I hope to finish before Easter, and that is the Government's present intention.

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I recently asked about progress being made in respect of legislation relating to flammable clothing?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Further to the reply I gave to the honourable member's question last week in the House, I have now received additional information and am pleased to report that in recent months the Standards Association of Australia has made considerable progress towards developing standard requirements on the use of flammable fabrics in clothing. That association has recently published a standard which details test methods for determining the flammability of textiles from which clothing may be made. The standard, which is No. AS 1176, covers tests for ease of ignition and the burning rate. The S.A.A. has also prepared a draft standard to establish the performance requirements of fabrics described as of low flammability. To be so described, the draft standard provides that the ignition time of the fabric must be not less than five seconds and the burning time must be not less than 15 seconds. The draft also incorporates requirements for durability of flame-resistant finishes to cleansing processes and sets out marking requirements of fabrics which meet the performance requirements. It appears that this standard, if adopted, can form the basis for uniform legislation throughout Australia to control the use of flammable fabrics in clothing which will be considered at a conference of Ministers of Labour in July.

NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about traffic hazards on the North-East Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Investigations of pedestrian and traffic hazards on the North-East Road are still continuing, and consideration is currently being given to the provision of a pedestrian refuge near the Windsor Hotel. The relocation of lighting poles is not related in any way to these investigations. As one result of investigations to date, the Corporation of the City of Enfield has been informed that the zebra crossing near Windsor Grove should be converted to a press-button traffic signal facility to increase protection for pedestrians using the crossing, and also to minimize delays to motorists.

Mr. WELLS: Has the Minister a reply to my recent question about traffic signals on the North-East Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Conversion of the existing zebra crossing on North-East Road near Queensborough Avenue and Windsor Grove to pedestrian-actuated traffic signals has been approved in principle by the Road Traffic Board and the Corporation of the City of Enfield is currently preparing detailed plans and specifications of the installation for formal approval.

ADELAIDE TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is intended to set up a committee to inquire into an alternative site for the Adelaide Technical High School sports ground? If it is intended to establish such a committee, will he say who will be its members and whether representatives of the school council or the parents and friends association will be asked to participate? I think the Minister is well aware of the difficulties and the fears that arose among some parents connected with the school when it was recently proposed that the area of the Adelaide Technical High School oval should be rezoned and thus subject to possible redevelopment by industry in relation to the mineral complex there. There are difficulties concerning the present oval; certainly it is a distance from the school, and there is always the possibility of future development there, even though the Burnside council rejected the proposals for rezoning. As I have an idea that the establishment of a committee is being considered, I welcome the Minister's reassurance that representatives from the school will be members of that committee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The committee that has been established concerning this matter is representative of officers of the various Government departments involved in the use of the land according to the plan prepared by the Director of Planning (Mr. Hart). The decisions to be made involve the Government's use of the land, and it is not appropriate that representation on the committee should be extended beyond the present departmental representation. Although I do not intend to accede to the honourable member's request, I point out that it was as a consequence of the difficulties experienced in relation to the priority given to the planning of the Adelaide Technical High School that the initiative came from the Education Department to establish the committee in order to get a more ordered and more reasonable

allocation of land for various functions in that area. I think the honourable member can inform the school council that its interests have been absolutely paramount in the action taken in this matter by the Education Department and that any solution of the problem satisfactory to the department will, I am sure, be satisfactory to the school council.

KINDERGARTEN SUBSIDIES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Education outline to the House details relating to subsidizing the costs of kindergartens? The only information members have on this matter at present is what we have read in the press. As the Minister has frequently told us that it is unwise to take as gospel anything that we read in the press and so that members can better inform their constituents of the ramifications of this proposal, I ask the Minister to explain the way it will work and to tell us when it will be implemented, together with various other relevant details.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position is straightforward. There will be three broad ways in which assistance will be given in regard to establishing kindergartens. First, a \$1 for \$1 subsidy will be payable towards the capital cost of kindergarten construction, and this will be determined on the basis of the requirements of the kindergarten in question. The kindergartens to receive a subsidy will be determined on a priority basis and, in the first instance, applications should be made by the local kindergartens to the Kindergarten Union, which will establish priorities after consultation with me. The honourable member may smile.

Dr. Eastick: I was merely reciprocating.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The purpose of the subsidy is, first, to provide assistance in establishing kindergartens in those areas that are poorly serviced as to kindergarten facilities. I do not think I need detail those areas, either in Adelaide or elsewhere in the State, although I think most members know that the provision of kindergarten services at present covers only about 16 per cent of children in the State of pre-school age. In addition, the existing kindergartens are concentrated relatively more in the better-off suburbs of Adelaide.

The second way in which we will consider the provision of assistance in establishing kindergartens will be by providing wooden rooms that become available from schools as a consequence of the replacement programme proceeding within our schools. This is largely a matter of timing, depending on when wooden rooms become available and on who wants

them. There have been instances in the past where assistance of this nature has been given, and we hope that the kind of assistance that can be given in this way can be extended considerably as a result of the larger replacement programme now taking place.

The third way in which assistance can be given is in certain instances where a primary school has ample land available; some part of the primary school property can then be set aside for kindergarten use. As the honourable member will appreciate, the policy can apply only in certain areas. The Education Department must decide whether the primary school site is more than adequate for its existing purpose when working out whether land for the primary school site can be made available for kindergarten purposes. Broadly, I have outlined the department's policy.

GUMERACHA COUNCIL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether a grant can be made available to the Gumeracha council to assist it to meet expenses associated with fire-fighting activities, having regard to the use that the Woods and Forests Department makes of these facilities. With little subsidy the Gumeracha council has spent about \$30,000 in providing fire-fighting equipment. The Woods and Forests Department uses the council's equipment, including its radio equipment, which is expensive. I have explained before in the House the difficulty this council has in raising revenue, and I believe that a strong case can be made out for the grant.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

GOVERNMENT ACCOMMODATION

Mr. BECKER: I wish to ask the Minister of Works a further question about the pre-occupational rental office accommodation required for various Government departments. I first asked a question on March 1 about this, and yesterday I received a reply to my question on notice about it. Can the Minister now say why the figures he gave yesterday do not add up to the illustrations in the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1971? In my question of March 1, I said that the total pre-occupation rent involved in the four illustrations in the Auditor-General's Report totalled \$129,746. In reply to my question on notice about how much pre-occupational rent had

been paid for the year ended June 30, 1971, the Minister said that the sum involved was \$126,302. In my question yesterday, I also asked about the total amount for cleaning paid by the Government for buildings not occupied, during the financial year ended June 30, 1971, and the answer was "Nil". However, the Auditor-General's Report states that in two cases the Government made payments for cleaning in respect of buildings not yet occupied.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will appreciate that I did not personally compile the figures but, as it would appear from his explanation that there is some discrepancy, I will have the matter checked.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr. RODDA: Does the Minister of Works intend to table the Sangster committee's report on water rating, and the Bennett committee's report on the water resources of the State? Last week, we had the scare of amoebic meningitis being connected with our water supply. In addition, people in country districts are concerned about the water supply and would like to know the result of the examinations being conducted at present. As there is much public interest in the reports of these two expert committees, I ask the Minister whether he will table those reports.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In explaining his question, the honourable member referred to the quality of water, but I point out that the Sangster report deals not with the quality of water but with the cost of any quantity of water used. I have explained to the House before (much to the delight of the member for Mitcham) that currently I have a committee evaluating the Sangster committee's report; it will probably be two or three months before that committee completes its evaluation. The Government will then examine the evaluation, deciding whether or not the matter should be placed before Treasury officials, and finally we will decide whether the report should be made public. I repeat that that report has nothing to do with the quality of Water but has only to do with rating. As I have said before, I do not intend to decide yet whether to table the report, because the Government has not yet made any final decision about it.

Mr. Millhouse: In other words, you are hastening very slowly in secret.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member sounds like the Commonwealth member for Angas (Mr. Giles).

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Commonwealth Minister for Health (Dr. Forbes).

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham was out of order in interjecting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He is usually out of order. As far as I am aware, there is no reason at all why the honourable member and members of the public in South Australia should not examine what is in the Bennett committee's report. The honourable member will appreciate that, since the receipt of that report, the Government has set up a detailed investigation into underground and surface water resources in the South-East and other parts of the State. Although the Bennett committee refers to that matter, I point out that the investigations established were not really established as a result of that committee's report. I will look at this matter and let the honourable member know whether I will table that report. As I say, I do not see any reason why I should not table it.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Following his trip to Clare last weekend, can the Minister of Education say what action he intends to take with regard to the road which is near and which approaches the new Clare High School? Some time ago I asked the Minister of Works and the Minister of Education questions about the danger existing at this point where children, who are coming to and going from the new school, have to circumnavigate this part of the road at the top of the hill. Although I was told that a report was being prepared and that action might be taken, I have heard nothing further about the matter. I understand that, when the Minister visited Clare last Friday evening to open the continental, he looked at the situation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I had a most enjoyable time during my visit to the Clare High School last Friday evening, when representations were made by the school council about the danger to children, caused by traffic passing the school, and the need either to get a report on the speed limits outside the school or to have some kind of reconstruction work done on the road so that the whole situation could be made much safer than it is at present. On Friday evening, I indicated to representatives of the school council that I would take up the matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport so that a thorough investigation of the whole problem could be made by the Road Traffic Board, and a suit-

able solution found. I assure the honourable member that I will do my best to see that a solution is found as soon as possible.

OAKLANDS INTERSECTION

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the intersection of Morphett Road and Oaklands Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Corporation of the City of Marion has approved the plans for the traffic signal layout at the Morphett Road and Oaklands Road intersection. However, some minor reconstruction of the intersection is necessary prior to the installation of the signals; this work will be completed by the end of April, 1972. Tenders for the supply and installation of the signal equipment were called on March 3, 1972 (and I think that the honourable member will be aware that I made a press statement at that time), and it is expected that installation will commence in the 1972-73 financial year.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, explain the need for the large amount of personal detail required from applicants applying for fishing licences? Can the Minister assure this House and members of the public that, if such information is necessary (a matter I hope to debate later this session), such information will remain absolutely confidential?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The question raised by the honourable member has already been asked by the member for Hanson and the reply was that any information in respect to a class A or class B licence is treated as strictly confidential. The information is required to establish the *bona fides* of the person applying for the licence and provides information on whether the applicant is a part-time or full-time fisherman. It was also pointed out that the information is used to compile statistics to try to determine how many fish of the various types are caught annually. However, this information does not involve individuals and certainly no information is divulged to income tax authorities or any similar authority. The department is currently considering whether all the information currently required is necessary and whether some modification can be made to the information required on the application form. I will obtain a full report for the honourable member as to the first part of his question on the need for the information and, regarding the

second part of the question, I assure the honourable member that that information is treated as confidential.

MOUNT GUNSON MINE

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say what action the Government has taken in an endeavour to stop the Mount Gunson copper mine from closing down, and is it likely that this mine will be reopened?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am unaware of any action that this Government could have taken to stop the Mount Gunson copper mine from closing. The reason for the closure of the mine was that the price of copper on the world market fell below the cost of copper production at Mount Gunson. It is as simple as that. We had discussions with directors of the mine and every facility has been given to the company by this State. However, it was impossible for us to introduce a subsidy for copper mining in the area. If the world copper price improves, as I hope it will soon do, Mount Gunson will again become a viable project. There is still a considerable body of ore there.

OLD GOVERNMENT HOUSE

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of March 1 about Old Government House at the Belair National Park?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Old Government House, the summer residence of the early Governors of South Australia, was completed in 1859 and occupied between 1860 and 1880, when Marble Hill became established. From 1886 to 1958 the house was occupied by the officer-in-charge of the Woods and Forests Department nursery at Belair, during which time a number of structural alterations and repairs were made. These included replacement of the damp course on the eastern external wall. In 1958 the building and surrounding land was exchanged for an area adjacent to the Woods and Forests Department nursery. The then National Parks Commissioners decided to restore the building and open it for public inspection. Old Government House has a B rating with the National Trust. Because of the lack of funds, only a piecemeal approach to restoration could be made. However, extensive repairs to the interior were made, particularly in the bathroom-swimming pool section of the house. Over the past 10 years the salt damp in these walls has become considerably more extensive and the plaster has fretted away over a fairly

considerable portion of one wall. One theory on the apparent escalation of the salt damp is that restoration work on the bathroom floor may have bridged a former damp course.

Following a visit to the house last year, by a representative of a company specializing in the treatment of salt damp, the company has offered to treat the affected areas with the latest electro-osmosis method at no cost to the National Parks Commission. Following tests on the soil in the vicinity of the house, it was found that the soil particle size was very close to the critical level necessary for this treatment to be effective. As this method involves considerable effort to install the copper rods and strips in the wall itself, it was felt that only a small section of one wall should be treated and the technique evaluated before proceeding with the remainder of the building. A 10ft. section of the north exterior wall was treated on January 28, 1972. Evaluation will not be completed until mid-winter, although preliminary observations appear to suggest that the treatment is quite satisfactory.

The courtyard and balustrade wall are in a very poor condition as a result of water having entered the inside of the retaining wall through cracks in and between the paving tiles which were originally laid on sand. As a result a large section of the wall has collapsed and many of the tiles have been broken. The wall and courtyard have been examined by the Public Buildings Department and members of the National Trust. As many of the old bricks of the balustrade wall have fretted very badly, the only satisfactory treatment for this part of the house is one of complete restoration. Detailed plans have been prepared for this work and an order has been placed for the manufacture of plain and single ended splay bricks to the original specifications, as well as the 6in. by 6in. red paving tiles. The dark 6in. by 6in. tiles, having been glazed, are in a satisfactory condition for re-use. Fortunately the original working drawings of the building including the balustrade wall are preserved at Old Government House and the National Parks Commission technical staff will reconstruct the balustrade wall and courtyard from the original specifications. It is hoped that actual construction will commence in two or three months time.

SCHOOL OVALS

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works say who accepts the responsibility and determines whether the preparation of a primary

school oval and its grassing has been satisfactorily carried out? Is it an officer from the Public Buildings Department or the headmaster of the school concerned? Recently, I visited two primary schools and during both visits my attention was drawn to the state of the school oval that had been recently grassed by a contractor, but in an unsatisfactory manner. The question was raised concerning who is responsible to say whether an oval has been satisfactorily grassed prior to handing over.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The answer to that question is that I or an officer of the Public Buildings Department would be responsible, because that department is responsible for letting tenders in the first place, so an officer of my department would be responsible for accepting the final result, one way or the other. However, doubtless he would not do this if a headmaster expressed dissatisfaction with the final result. I am most unhappy about the number of complaints, not only from the honourable member but also from the member for Florey and others, about the condition of ovals being developed at various schools. I think I have said in this House previously that our biggest problem is lack of choice in the matter of contractors. Evidently, only one person in this State is interested in the work of developing ovals, and this makes our problem extremely difficult. However, we have tried in several ways to get other people interested in tendering for this kind of work and whether our efforts have been successful remains to be seen in future. I will inquire about this matter for the honourable member and let her know.

VICTORIA SQUARE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say how the Victoria Square building project is getting on? Earlier this session announcements were made and there was discussion here about the Government's project to have a big hotel built on the site in the south-western corner of Victoria Square, with the assistance of interests outside this State. My information is that since then, although several persons have indicated that they have some interest in the matter, none of these has been satisfactory. If memory serves me correctly, we were to hear something about this, as we were about dial-a-bus, before Christmas, but so far as I am aware there has been no announcement and no progress in the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My memory does not tell me that the honourable member was to hear anything before Christmas, as, in fact, the time for closing of submissions was the end of December. The submissions having been made, they were referred to a working committee. The provisions for any hotel on the site would involve a complicated indenture, as the honourable member would realize. There has had to be full examination of the proposals that have been placed before the Government. Certainly, I have not had a report from the working committee examining the proposals that no satisfactory proposals have been made.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you had any report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been told that there are satisfactory submissions but I have not had a report on them yet, because they are still being evaluated.

AMERICAN RIVER WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Works make any forecast about the decision on the American River water supply project? The Public Works Committee has examined the proposals for supplying water to American River, and these involve connecting American River with the Middle River main. I understand that the Engineering and Water Supply Department considered two proposals. The cheaper one, which involved a shorter line, went through many farming properties and many of the property owners were not keen about having the water or being rated for it. On the other hand, the alternative proposal, which was more expensive and involved a longer line, took a more southerly route and almost all the properties it was to go through wanted water badly. In those circumstances, it seems that a decision must be made and, whichever way the matter is dealt with, it is urgent, in the interests of the American River township, that this project be continued with. That is because, although tourist activity on the remainder of the island is increasing greatly, American River, which is at least as famous as any other part of the island for tourism, is under great disability through not having an assured water supply.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received a letter from the Chairman of the Public Works Committee stating that the committee has made a decision on the matter but that it will be some time before the committee's report is submitted. The Chairman was telling me of the decision in advance. The committee stated that it had examined

the proposal submitted by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which I think would cost \$326,000. This proposal would have involved taking the water through holdings or over land where people did not require the water, but these people nevertheless would be rated. The proposal would be of great benefit to the township that it was designed to serve. The committee also considered an alternative scheme submitted by the department. However, the essence of the committee's decision is that it has asked me to have the Engineering and Water Supply Department examine the technical aspects and go into far more detail on alternatives. I have just seen the letter briefly and have not had it examined yet, so I am not certain whether the committee means that we should be looking for some alternative other than the one that has been submitted. However, the committee has requested that the department make further investigations. I am now having the letter examined and, when further investigations are carried out, I will let the honourable member know.

STRZELECKI TRACK

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government has plans to upgrade the Strzelecki Creek track? Residents in the area have approached me, pointing out the growing importance of this road, which serves the area from Lyndhurst in the north to the far north-eastern corner of the State, where the oil and gas fields are situated, and, when these fields are brought into full production, the volume of traffic on this road will increase.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will consider the matter and bring down a report.

CRIMINAL INJURY COMPENSATION

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question regarding payments made under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Since the operation of the Act, nine claims have been paid out. Of these, maximum awards have been made in four cases. The total expenditure has been \$7,213.

LAKE BONNEY

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Works a further reply to my recent question about insecticides and fertilizers affecting the water in Lake Bonney?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No tests have been carried out for the presence of

traces of fertilizer and pesticide residues in Lake Bonney. Regular analyses are maintained on water in the Murray River and pesticide residues are not detected or are at negligible levels. The effects of fertilizer are not easily defined as they are only one of the contributors to the general nutrient level, and evidence indicates that they are minor in relation to human and stock wastes.

COOBER PEDY SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Education say when the new Coober Pedy school will be completed so that the staff and children can occupy this much needed building?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There have been problems at Coober Pedy, particularly in relation to the initial contractor of the project who has refused to continue with it. Discussions have been held between the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department and special arrangements are being made to get the work completed as soon as possible. I am sure that the honourable member will appreciate the kind of difficulty that can occur in getting any site works or construction undertaken at Coober Pedy. The only thing I can say off the cuff is that the matter has been given urgent and detailed attention. I will see whether I can provide a more detailed reply for the honourable member next week.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY TRANSPORT

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently about transport to and from Flinders University?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The special transport arrangements made for students enrolled at Flinders University when it was opened in March, 1966, included a licensed bus service between Brighton Road, Brighton, and the university via Sturt Road. Connecting regular bus services from Glenelg, Glengowrie and most other western suburbs provided students living in these areas with a reasonably direct public transport service to and from the university. Because of the small number of students initially enrolled at the university, the special bus services were not at first well patronized but they were retained in anticipation of increased patronage in the following years as enrolments built up. However, despite an increase to 2,145 enrolments in 1971, patronage on the Brighton bus service did not improve and, as a consequence, this service was discontinued in 1971. In the

circumstances there would appear to be little demand for a public transport service between the western suburbs and Flinders University. Nevertheless, the university itself provides for the benefit of students a free bus service between Marion shopping centre and the university, and as there are connecting bus services at Marion from most of the western suburbs, including Glenelg and Glengowrie, students who wish to do so can still travel by bus from these areas to the university via a reasonably direct route.

NOARLUNGA ROAD

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of March 2 concerning the Noarlunga road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The route of the Happy Valley to Noarlunga arterial road has been defined as a guide to assist future planning and development of subdivisions, schools, and reserves, etc. The project is of low priority in relation to other road works and it is not expected to be implemented for some time.

ELECTRONIC WEIGHBRIDGE

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about an electronic weighbridge?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The problems associated with the weighbridge were directed to my attention a few months after the Government assumed office and since then continuous efforts have been made to overcome the difficulties. I am sure the honourable member will be pleased to know that these efforts have not been in vain as I am now told that the problems appear to have been resolved and therefore the way is now open for the installation of the weighbridge and subsequent checking by the National Standards Commission. However, I draw the attention of the honourable member to the fact that the tender for the purchase of the weighbridge was accepted on July 18, 1969, and accordingly I do not think he should expect me to accept responsibility for the sins of omission of the former Liberal and Country League Government.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier explain the significance of the dramatic drop in the number of tertiary studentships awarded by the Government for the current year? This question is supplementary to the reply which was given by the Minister of Education yesterday and which appears

in the *Hansard* pull today, wherein lists of scholarships and studentships are given. Appendix I, which lists studentships awarded, indicates that in 1971 there were 118 studentships, whereas in 1972 there are only 38. The drop has been dramatic since 1969 when there were 84, and 1970 when there were 114. In recent years there has been an average of 21 Public Service Board scholarships awarded, but in 1972 no such scholarships were awarded. Appendix III shows an increase in teaching scholarships, but in the other disciplines of tertiary education there has been a dramatic drop in numbers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a reply from the Public Service Board, but I think the answer almost certainly lies in the fact that this year the Public Service recruited only a very small fraction of its normal intake. As I forecast last year, because of the present economic climate there have been far fewer resignations from the Public Service than usual and therefore far fewer vacancies. Whereas normally we take in some hundreds, we were only expecting to take in 30 extra people at the beginning of the year. As a consequence, we did not have the people at the beginning of this year applying for studentships who normally apply to come into the Public Service with studentships.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Education say how many scholarships the South Australian Government awarded to secondary students this year? What was the average amount granted for each type of scholarship? I know the nominal sum is \$200 or \$300, but I should like to know what amount the students have received. I know that one of my constituents, who has six children dependent on him, will receive only \$44. Although I admit that he has an income, I know (having once had six children dependent on me) that not too much would be left out of my constituent's income to send the six children through secondary school. I wish to find out what is the average sum paid by the Government in respect of each scholarship.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get the information that the honourable member requests (I will not try to give a reply from memory). I will also find out how many students on either a fifth-year scholarship or a rural secondary scholarship receive the maximum sum, because I think that would be a useful statistic to have. The case referred to by the honourable member has been brought to my attention, and I have checked the

detailed application in that case. I assure the honourable member that the sum calculated (\$44) is correct in terms of the provisions that have been applied, even though there are six children. It may well be that the father of the lad in question did not realize that the means test applied to the family income and that, therefore, his wife's income was taken into account as well before the \$1,800 was deducted on account of the six children to determine the assessed income for the purposes of working out the rate of assistance that is applied. The means test that is applied in relation to the scholarships is similar, although not identical, to the means test that applies in relation to the living allowance under the Commonwealth scholarships for university training. If the honourable member wishes to see the detailed information in the case referred to, I shall be happy to provide it for him on a confidential basis.

PENOLA COURTHOUSE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Attorney-General say whether he or his department has any plans for upgrading the courthouse at Penola or for building a new courthouse? This matter was discussed last year, but the situation has not improved and, as winter is approaching, witnesses who will have to stand in the rain are also concerned about this matter.

The Hon. L. I. KING: Following my recent visit to Penola, I had some discussions with the Local and District Criminal Court officials, as well as with the Minister of Works and the Public Buildings Department. As I cannot tell the honourable member just what is the current position, I will find out and let him have a reply.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE ACCOMMODATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker. Will you say what plans exist for altering the room I occupy?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't you expect to occupy another one?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A few minutes ago I went out to speak on the telephone and found in my room two men, one of whom is on the staff of Parliament House and whom I know quite well. They told me that they were there to measure up the room for the alterations which are to be made to extend it out, I think, to the big column. I remember that about a month ago you spoke to me, suggesting that the room was not suitable for me and that I should get a better one. When I further

inquired of you, I found that the idea was to convert the Assistant Clerk's room into a room for people waiting to see the Premier and to move the Assistant Clerk down into my room. I explained to you, by letter of February 16, that I was quite happy with the room as it stands. Now that this development has occurred, having heard nothing from you in the meantime, I ask what has happened and what are the plans for extending this room.

The SPEAKER: I informed the honourable member for Mitcham that, as a result of staff requirements, a thorough reorganization of accommodation was needed. True, I put a certain proposition to the honourable member. Although I have made certain suggestions, no plan has yet come to hand regarding what will happen in future.

Mr. Millhouse: The blokes are there now.

The SPEAKER: The matter is in the hands of the Minister of Works now. I cannot tell the honourable member what is planned, as I have not had a reply to my request.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At your invitation, Mr. Speaker, I put the question I asked you to the Minister of Works. I do not think for one moment that what is happening has anything to do with the event of today, because I do not credit the Government with moving at anything like such speed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I listened to the honourable member's question to you, Sir, with great interest. In reply to the Acting Leader of the Opposition (and I take it he is acting, because we heard of the resignation of his Leader this afternoon), I do not know whether I should move at all at this moment. If the Acting Leader claims that the Opposition moves with a speed that he does not give us credit for, the problem may resolve itself because he may be appointed Leader of the Party and occupy the Leader's office; on the other hand, he could be sacked as Deputy Leader, and that would solve the problem, too. True, requests have been made by the Speaker to me, as Minister, for renovations and alterations to this building brought about by the need to provide a waiting room for the Premier (I believe this is desirable and necessary) and, at the same time, for alternative accommodation to be found for the Assistant Clerk (Mr. Dodd), who I believe should be located on the ground floor of this building. I point out to the Acting Leader that the alternative accommodation that may be provided for him (my understanding of the situation is that Mr. Dodd will move from his

office to the office now occupied by the Acting Leader)—

Mr. Millhouse: I said I didn't want to move.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have not finished my reply yet. The Acting Leader's office will be extended so that it will be suitable for Mr. Dodd, and suitable and comfortable accommodation (much better than that which is provided for some other members) will be provided for the Acting Leader on the same floor (the basement) as are situated the offices occupied by the Minister of Education, the Minister of Environment and Conservation, and me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I point out in conclusion that although I am responsible for the renovations or alterations to the building, you, Mr. Speaker, are responsible for the allocation of office space, and I have no doubt that your judgment in that matter will be as sound as it is on any other matter.

SCHOOL BOOKS

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Education now give me a reply to the question I asked, I think last week, about books provided at secondary schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although there was a change of mind by certain parents at some schools about participating in the book scheme introduced at fourth-year and fifth-year levels, none of the schools concerned admitted to any confusion or chaos. Books had been ordered in 1971 on the total estimated enrolment in 1972, so that a change of mind involved chiefly a change of procedure. School orders appear to have been placed in good time, and supply to schools was better than for many years past. However, the economic conditions that could have been responsible for the increased enrolment at fourth-year and fifth-year levels would have resulted in an under-ordering of text books at these levels. Heads of schools have been consulted and managers of book-selling agencies are agreed that this year was the best for many years past regarding the supply of texts. Schools generally appear to have got off to a better and earlier working start. There are still students waiting for books, some of which are locally produced, others being printed in the United Kingdom or Hong Kong. However, the number of students concerned is relatively small.

CLARE SEWERAGE

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about financing country sewerage schemes, referring especially to a scheme for the township of Clare?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will recall that I said, in reply to a question asked earlier, that I would be meeting the Minister of Health and the Minister of Local Government. This meeting has taken place and, as a result, the State Government's scheme of subsidies to local government bodies for the installation of common effluent drainage has been extended to cover the whole State. The subsidy now available for approved schemes will be where the level of rating in respect of each connection each year will exceed \$30 for houses and \$12 for vacant allotments. It is no different from what it was previously. The Public Health Department will prepare preliminary plans and estimates of capital, as well as details of operating costs for the councils, free of charge. This is basically what the position was previously. Where councils employ private consultants, the charges will form part of the capital costs. In other words, councils will seek permission from the Minister to borrow the money necessary to employ consultants to draw up plans, but that cost will be embodied in the total cost of the scheme and will attract a subsidy if the rate exceeds \$30 a house or \$12 in respect of a vacant allotment. The Local Government Act currently provides that, before councils seek the Minister's permission to borrow money for schemes of this kind, the plans must be produced. It is a little difficult to engage consultants to draw up the necessary plan if they are not paid. Therefore, the current provision will be amended, I hope during this session, to provide that where consultants are involved permission can be sought to pay the consultants without producing the plan to the Minister of Local Government. This means that the scheme at Clare, about which the honourable member is concerned, will be eligible for subsidy. I hope that this policy will be an incentive to other councils throughout the State, in areas where a common effluent scheme is desirable and where sewerage is not practicable, to implement schemes of this kind in order to protect the health of the people who live in the towns and to make the towns better places to live in.

PARA HILLS EAST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether a decision or recommendation has been made by the Public Buildings Department about access from Milne Road or from the northern direction to the Para Hills East Primary School? The Minister will be aware that I asked questions on this subject on July 22 and November 10, 1971.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will check the matter for the honourable member and give her a reply as soon as possible.

SCHOOL RESIDENCES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the building of school residences on school property?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is the practice, when an order for a new residence is placed with the Housing Trust, for the residence to be erected on trust land, provided a site is available from the trust in the area concerned. The Housing Trust owns one allotment at Greenock that has been inspected and passed as suitable for the erection of a departmental residence by the Public Buildings Department. Plans are now proceeding by the trust preparatory to calling tenders for the erection of this residence. If a new residence is required in an area where the trust does not hold land, or where the land held is not regarded as suitable for the erection of a residence by the Public Buildings Department, investigations are carried out to see whether a suitable privately owned site for a residence can be purchased. If neither trust nor suitable privately owned land is available, the Public Buildings Department is requested to investigate and report whether a suitable residence site can be defined within the grounds of the school concerned. It is considered that the interests of the school and those of the teacher are best served by the provision of a residence outside the schoolyard. It is not thought that the building of a house away from the school will have an adverse effect on the supervision of the school. The headmaster cannot be regarded as a caretaker. In addition, a residence would require about a quarter of an acre of the best of the schoolyard for siting, and the loss of this land could do a disservice to the school and the children.

BELAIR SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently about run-off water from the Belair Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A firm of consulting engineers retained by the Public Buildings Department has recently reported on the drainage problems at the Belair Primary School. The consultants' recommendations for the satisfactory disposal of the stormwater are being pursued. It will be necessary to negotiate with an adjoining property owner for an easement through his property to dispose of the stormwater. The whole matter is receiving priority and, subject to agreement to the easement, the work will be undertaken at the earliest possible time.

GLENELG HOSPITAL

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to give me or the board of the Glenelg Community Hospital a reply in answer to a deputation that I led to the Chief Secretary on February 2 about the possibility of extending the hospital? The board presently has before it plans to extend the hospital, but it was thought that larger extensions would be needed and, with that in mind, I led the deputation to the Chief Secretary, who agreed that the matter was urgent and said that he would give me an early reply.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPORT

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Local Government say what plans the Government has to extend local government to areas of South Australia which are not at present served by councils, and when the report of the committee inquiring into the matter will be released?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In the second part of his question, the honourable member indicates that the matter is currently being investigated by a committee; that committee's report will be released when it finishes its work.

POINTS DEMERIT SCHEME

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider introducing legislation that would provide for demerit points lost by drivers to be restored if such drivers were required subsequently to attend driver-training courses at the new road safety centre, on its completion? A scheme along the lines I have suggested is recommended in the Pak Poy report on road safety.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to study the matter.

LAURA RAILWAY CROSSING

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what has happened to the investigation into and report on the railway crossing at Laura? On August 31 last year, I asked the Minister a question about this matter. On the weekend before I asked my question, there had been a bad accident at the crossing as a consequence of which, at the request of a member of the council, I inspected the crossing. In reply to my question the Minister said:

I will certainly have the matter investigated and find out what remedial action can be taken if the situation is as the honourable member has described it.

I ask what has happened to that report, for which I asked seven months ago.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is one of the answers which I have brought here in vain and for which the honourable member has not asked. Thus, I have taken it away again, but I will have a look for it.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, explain the arrangement whereby Housing Trust houses are made available to members of the R.A.A.F. in certain areas? It would appear from the allegations made that the rental charged for these houses depends on the rank of the tenant. For instance, a five-room house would cost a squadron leader \$41.60 a fortnight, whereas a warrant officer would pay only \$38.80 for the same house.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is worked on a percentage basis.

Dr. EASTICK: I thank the Minister for his interjection, which is pertinent to the question. Will the Premier say whether this policy of rentals is acceptable to the Government? Is it laid down in a written agreement with the Commonwealth Government or is it merely an arrangement of convenience?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is an arrangement of convenience with the Commonwealth Government, which lays down the conditions that were originally incorporated in the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The terms of that original agreement in respect of the Armed Forces have been repeated in the present arrangements. It is not a normal standing agreement as the old agreement was, but it is Commonwealth Government policy.

FOOTWEAR

Mr. BECKER: Mas the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question concerning the branding of footwear uppers?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Since replying to a question last week regarding the branding of uppers of footwear, I have received a report that the permanent heads of the State departments of labour have agreed on the amendments which will have to be made to the footwear legislation which is similar in all States. When the State Ministers of Labour at their conference last July decided in principle to extend that legislation to also apply to branding requirements of the materials used in the uppers of footwear, they asked their permanent heads to confer and report on what amendments would be necessary to the legislation. There was insufficient time for any State to introduce legislation last year but I hope to introduce amendments to the Footwear Regulation Act in the next session.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say when work on resealing the grounds of the Morphettsville Park Primary School will be commenced? I understand that tenders have been called and, as the Minister would be aware, it would be most desirable for this work to be completed before the coming winter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain the information the honourable member requests and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

PLYMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Education say what stage plans for the redesign of the Plympton Primary School have reached and when rebuilding will commence? About nine months ago the Minister accompanied members of the primary school committee and me on an inspection of the school, during which time we discussed the lay-out of the school. The buildings are on three blocks of land with roads running between the blocks, and the Minister said that he would try to have plans prepared as soon as possible.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member's account of what happened is incomplete. As he will appreciate, the consolidation of conditions at the Plympton Primary School requires some road closing. This planning has to be carried out so that the precise road closing required can be determined. Once that stage is reached, but before any further progress can be made, we will have to complete the specific road closures. The honourable member will also appreciate that this will take time. However, I will check on the position reached on the building lay-out in general in a consolidated school

and find out whether or not it has been determined precisely what part of the road or roads in question should be closed, and whether or not my officers agree with the proposed plan of the school committee as to road closures.

WRITING ON THE WALL

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Attorney-General yet been able to come to a conclusion regarding Volume 1, No. 6, of *Writing on the Wall*? On December 16, 1971, almost exactly three months ago, I wrote to the Attorney-General enclosing a copy of the publication to which I have referred, suggesting that it was likely that the publication came within section 33 of the Police Offences Act. I asked the Minister whether he intended to take any action on this matter. On January 6, 1972, he acknowledged my letter, but since then I have heard nothing further. I know that the Attorney-General is in great difficulty regarding any policy decision on censorship. However, as three months has elapsed since I put the matter to him, I suggest that that should have been sufficient time for anyone to come to a conclusion on the matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am not aware that I am in any difficulty, great or small, propounding a policy on these questions. Indeed, I have done so and the matter has been elaborated a number of times in this House and in addresses which I have given and which are available (and I shall be happy to send the honourable member a copy of a recent address on this topic which sets out my policy, if he would be interested in reading it). However, I acknowledge that actual decisions are attended with great difficulty, and this would be acknowledged by the member for Mitcham, who has also had to make such decisions in the past. Regarding the publication to which the honourable member has referred, I recall his raising the matter; I recall seeing it; and I recall asking the Chief Secretary to have the police look into the nature of the publication and its distribution. To the best of my knowledge, I have received no further information on the matter. I will now ascertain what is happening.

BRIGHTON MEMORIAL ARCH

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Marine use his good offices to try to expedite the cleaning of the Memorial Arch of Remembrance situated adjacent to the Brighton jetty? About the middle of last year workmen from the Marine and Harbors Department were repairing the Brighton jetty and apparently, in

the process, they had to melt down some tar for this work. It seems that one workman forgot to take off the lid or remove the bung from the barrel of tar and an explosion occurred, part of the memorial arch being defaced by tar. Since then, nothing has been done. I think an attempt to clean the arch with solvents was unsuccessful. I ask the Minister whether something can be done about this, because my constituents, many of whom are members of the Brighton Sub-branch of the Returned Services League, are concerned about it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have the matter checked and see what can be done.

BUS ROBBERIES

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport investigate the matter of reimbursing Municipal Tramways Trust one-man bus drivers who are robbed? A constituent has written to me about one-man bus drivers being robbed in the past. I understand that there have not been many such cases but that the Tramway Employees Union has had discussions with the Chairman of the trust board, the General Manager of the trust, and the Industrial Officer. I have been unable to find out whether the union has discussed the matter with the Minister, but my constituent has told me that the only concession arranged so far is that, if a one-man bus driver is robbed, the trust takes the amount from his pay at the rate of \$1 a week. My constituent wonders how a man with a young family who is robbed of \$80 or \$100 could pay this amount. The letter from my constituent states:

I definitely feel that this is an injustice, as I have been in business for myself and have had to bear the loss.

My constituent asks why the trust cannot bear some of the loss in cases where these drivers have been robbed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have been aware that the honourable member might raise this matter and I was pleased to be able to get information that will not only take the wind out of his sails but also show clearly that he is more concerned about stirring up trouble than about looking after his constituents.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The situation is that the bus operator to whom the honourable member refers made a report on Monday, December 27, 1971, at the Kilkenny "down" Armdale recorder clock. Whilst he was out of his bus recording at stop 24, three youths who had been passengers on his bus from the city

ran from the bus. The operator reported that one of them grabbed a roll of notes (\$9) from his outfit box and that the three youths made off down Kilkenny Road. The operator immediately radioed the marshal, who gave particulars to the police and instructed the operator to await the arrival of the police. The operator did this and provided the police with descriptions of the youths. The police then went in search of the youths in the area. As the driver had passengers on his bus for Hanson Road, he radioed the marshal that he would proceed. The recheck of his revenue showed that an amount of, I think, \$12 was missing. I do not want to quote this incorrectly, so I will check.

Mr. Becker: Whose wind are you cutting now? You were going to take the wind out of my sails.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member keeps quiet, I will do just that, because I am reading from the report that this person submitted to the trust. The principle followed by the trust in cases such as this (and I have particulars of two cases at present) is that the employees must be held responsible for the cash funds or property in their care and they must take adequate precautions to protect this cash and property.

Mr. McAnaney: Have they got a gun?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the driver of a bus that carried the honourable member had had a gun, a fatality might have occurred. Where it is considered that an employee has not taken adequate precautions, he is held responsible for any loss. One-man bus operators are provided with specially designed fibre glass boxes in which they can keep notes and surplus coins which are not required to give change to passengers. These boxes can be closed and fastened. Buses designed for one-man operation are also fitted with devices which allow both the front and rear doors to be closed so as to prevent entry or exit by the public or passengers. When drivers leave the driving seat, they are expected to use these features to protect the cash and property which is in their care. Before the trust would meet the loss of an operator, the trust would require to be satisfied that the operator had taken adequate precautions to protect the cash or property in his possession, and that the money or property had been stolen, and would require to be satisfied of the amount of money or the items of property stolen. If these requirements were met, the trust would stand the

loss involved. The final point I make is that all this information has been explained to the member for Hanson previously by the General Manager of the trust. Apparently, the honourable member does not accept the General Manager's word. Furthermore, the employee concerned has not applied for remission. I wonder whether the honourable member even has the authority of the employee to raise the matter.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. BECKER: In the question I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport concerning reimbursement to be made by one-man bus drivers who had been robbed, I was seeking policy but, as he has referred to discussions between the General Manager of the trust and me, and the fact that he had information concerning my constituent, I should like to read the final two paragraphs of the letter from my constituent:

The trust puts a doubt on these losses and, in my case, I know they sent an inspector out the next night on that run to ask and as luck would have it there was one passenger on that when I was robbed. But this is one of the reasons they are loath to do anything about these losses as usually they occur while the bus is empty and therefore theft cannot be proven. Thanking you and hoping you can get something done, as we seem to be up against a brick wall.

That is why I wish to get a statement of policy from the Minister of Roads and Transport on the reimbursement by one-man bus drivers who are robbed.

ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works say whether any in-depth examination has been made of the cost of architectural services, as between normal architectural fees and a package deal construction arrangement? In referring to normal architectural fees, I mean the fees charged when a private architect is engaged, the fees associated with inservice architects, as opposed to the situation where a contractor is given responsibility for the total design and construction, which I understand is a package deal arrangement.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member may know that only recently, for the first time, the Public Buildings Department engaged Civil and Civic on a package deal. Two high schools were involved, namely, the Para Vista High School and the Para Hills High School. This was done after much investigation. One may term it an in-depth

study if one likes, comparisons having been made in every area. I thought it important that the department get experience of this type of operation so that the department could develop techniques whereby we can operate what we call package deals; in other words, one way to do this was to get into the field and see how people managed a project. The reply to the question is that there has been much investigation of the matter. However, to spell the position out in more detail, I think I should give the Director of the Public Buildings Department (Mr. Dunn) an opportunity to give me a report, which will benefit not only the honourable member but also all other members. I think that what has been done is a step in the right direction and that it may lead to an overall saving to the department, and thus to the Government.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. MATHWIN: Last November, I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the Government intended to extend travel concessions to full-time students over the age of 19 years. The Minister gave me a very brief answer: "Yes". I now ask the Minister, "When?"

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I can understand the concern of the honourable member on this question. I remember waiting for over two years for a reply when I was in Opposition and I did not get one at all. I assure the honourable member that I will do better than that. As soon as a decision is made I shall be delighted to let the honourable member know.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Code, 1967-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seems hardly necessary for me to explain this Bill, because shop trading hours have been the subject of discussion in recent years in this House and in the press to a much greater extent than most public issues. In fact, it first became a live public issue during the term of office of the Liberal Government between 1968 and 1970 but notwithstanding the representations made and the consultations which took place at the time, that Government did nothing. It was one of the first issues with

which the new Labor Government grappled. We found that with the growth of the metropolitan area it was untenable to have restrictions on the trading hours of some shops but not others within the metropolitan area, the area of which had not been altered since 1926. That situation we corrected so that the same trading hours now apply in the whole of the extended metropolitan area. This Government has been in the forefront in removing restrictions on services in South Australia in the whole term of its office. As the Premier said in this House earlier this session, there is considerable public demand for additional shopping facilities. However, we came to the conclusion that an extension of shopping hours must be introduced in such a way that it was not detrimental to the working conditions of shop assistants.

When the matter was being debated in this House towards the end of last year, the Premier said (and this has been well publicized) that we were engaged in consultations with the worker organizations and organizations of traders concerned. Since then I have had numerous discussions with representatives of the associations of storekeepers and of retail employees and I know that representatives of the employers and employees had many discussions between them. We have tried to arrive at arrangements which would be acceptable to both the retailers and the unions, because it is the employers and employees in the industry who will have to make any new trading arrangements operate satisfactorily, not only for themselves but for the benefit of the public. Unfortunately, it did not prove possible to reconcile the differing views.

It is therefore necessary for the Government to introduce this Bill in the terms which it considers are in the best interests of the majority. In recent months both the Premier and I have several times stated that the Government would introduce legislation to permit shops to trade until 9 p.m. on Fridays, and the Bill so provides for the extra trading hours within the metropolitan area, as defined in the Act. There has been no demand for the extended trading hours to apply in country shopping districts. We are determined that the extra 31 hours trading to suit the wishes of the public should not be introduced at the expense of the working conditions of the shop assistants who are the ones who give the service to the public. Accordingly, as well as providing for the extended trading times on Fridays, the Bill provides that shop assistants in the metropolitan area are to work their

normal working week between Monday and Friday. They are one of the few groups in our community that until now have not been able to obtain a five-day working week.

The Government considers it appropriate that the five-day week which applies to almost every other employed person in the State should be granted to these employees, who will be expected to give additional service to the public in the metropolitan area with the longer trading hours. In fact, the granting to shop assistants of a five-day week was accepted in principle by the organizations of shopkeepers. The disagreement occurred as to whether the five-day week should be limited between Mondays and Fridays as applies in other industries or whether shop assistants could be required to work on a roster under which in alternate weeks their ordinary week would be between Tuesdays and Saturdays.

Although it has been suggested that the amendments contained in this Bill will cause substantial increases in costs and therefore in prices, it must be recognized that any extension in trading hours would involve some increase in costs. However, with the profits being made by larger retail stores we cannot accept that there is no room for absorption of some of the additional costs which will be involved, and we do not accept the suggestions that this legislation will cause substantial increases in prices. Persons engaged in butcher shops (both employers and employees) have to work considerable overtime before opening their shops to the public and after closing times, particularly on Fridays, which I understand is their busiest day. The Government has therefore agreed with the representations received from both the employer and employee organizations in the meat industry that there is no need for butcher shops to open any longer than at present. I will now explain the Bill in detail.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act proposed by the Bill to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. It is clearly necessary that some time should elapse between the passage of this measure and the formal introduction of the extended hours. This period will no doubt be utilized by the shopkeepers in making the necessary arrangements for late-night shopping and will also enable appropriate modifications of awards and industrial agreements to be made to give effect to proposed new section 221a of the principal Act. Clause 3 is intended to ensure that a place or yard used for the purposes of selling goods will be a shop for the purposes

of the principal Act. This is not clear from the present context of the Act and is intended to resolve a question that has arisen as to whether, say, secondhand car yards are shops.

Clause 4 amends section 221 of the principal Act which deals with closing times for shops. The amendment proposed at paragraph (a) provides that the present closing times will apply in shopping districts outside the metropolitan area. The first amendment proposed at paragraph (b) provides that in general the closing hours for a shop situated within the metropolitan area will be 5.30 p.m. on week days other than a Friday, 9 p.m. on a Friday, and 12.30 p.m. on a Saturday. Subclause (1b) of this amendment provides, in effect, that butchers' shops will close at 5.30 p.m. on every week day and 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays except that, in the case where a butcher's shop is conducted in conjunction with any other sort of shop, say, as part of a supermarket, that supermarket if it is situated in the metropolitan area may remain open until 9 p.m. on Friday if the part that is a butcher's shop is kept closed to the public between 5.30 p.m. and 9 p.m. on a Friday. Thus the closing hours for butchers' shops operated exclusively as such are unchanged by this Bill. The amendments proposed at paragraphs (c) and (d) effect similar changes to the closing hours of hairdressers' shops which in the ordinary course of events close at 6 p.m. on week days.

Clause 5, in effect, provides that the ordinary hours of work of shop assistants will be worked between 8.30 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays inclusive, except in the case of shop assistants who are hairdressers where the time within which ordinary hours shall be worked is extended to 6 p.m. Mondays to Fridays inclusive.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PHARMACY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.
This Bill which arises from a submission from the Pharmacy Board of South Australia deals with a number of disparate matters that perhaps can best be considered in relation to its specific provisions. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 merely enacts a definition of a "friendly society" to avoid needless repetition in the body of the Act. Clause 4 is an amendment consequential on a later

amendment that provides for a formal practising certificate for pharmaceutical chemists. Clause 5 gives protection from suits or actions in their personal capacity to members of the Pharmacy Board acting in the executions of their functions under this Act and extends the same protection to the registrar and officers of the board.

Clause 6 repeals and re-enacts section 17 of the principal Act, which deals with registration of premises from which the business of a pharmacy is carried on. Previously this section merely provided that the location of the premises should be registered and did not provide for the control by the board of the type of premises registered. In the board's view this provision is not now adequate and control over the type of premises from which the business of a pharmacy is conducted should be vested in the board. The requirements as to type or kind of premises will be set out in the regulations which, in the nature of things, will be subject to the scrutiny of this House. Premises registered under the provisions of the present section 17 of the principal Act will continue to be registered premises for the purposes of the proposed provision. Clauses 7 and 8, again are consequential on the proposal that there shall be a practising certificate for registered pharmaceutical chemists. Clause 9 repeals and re-enacts the whole of Part IV of the principal Act which deals with registration of pharmaceutical chemists and enacts the following new sections:

Section 21 continues in force previous registration under the principal Act. Section 22 sets out in some detail the requirements for registration in this State. Paragraph (a) of this section sets out the requirements for a person who has graduated and has been trained in this State. Paragraph (b) sets out the requirements for a person who has graduated and been trained in another State or Territory of the Commonwealth. Paragraph (c) provides for oversea graduates and paragraph (d) is intended to cover other persons who may be qualified for registration. Section 23 sets out the formal registration procedure and is, I suggest, self-explanatory.

Section 24 provides for a practising certificate. Previously the registration of a pharmaceutical chemist was, as it were, kept alive by the registered person taking out an annual certificate of registration. It is, in the board's view, desirable that registration as such should be separate and distinct from the right to practise as a pharmaceutical

chemist. This view seems to accord with the accepted basis of professional registration. Accordingly, the former certificate of registration will now become a practising certificate.

Clause 10 deals with a matter that has been causing some concern to the board, that is, the ownership of pharmacies by persons who are not registered as pharmaceutical chemists. Members will be aware that pharmaceutical chemists are trained in the handling of drugs and are subject in their work to stringent legal and professional controls. In the board's view, and in the Government's view, it is undesirable that chemists should be subject to the control and direction of persons who are not subject to these legal and professional controls. Accordingly, proposed section 25a provides that on and from the passage of this amendment persons other than registered pharmaceutical chemists will be prohibited from owning or taking part in the management of pharmacies. Subsection (2) provides that businesses at present owned by unregistered persons may continue to be so owned so long as there is a registered pharmaceutical chemist in charge of the business.

Clause 11 is a drafting amendment consequential on the extended definition of a "friendly society" inserted by clause 3. Clause 12 provides in some detail for the manner in which the name of the owner of a pharmacy is to be exhibited. Clause 13 is again consequential on clause 3, and clause 14 makes minor drafting amendments to section 26f of the principal Act. Clause 15 makes a consequential amendment to section 15 of the principal Act, following the creation of practising certificate, as does clause 16. Clause 17 sets out a formal regulation-making power relating to the type and construction of premises that may be registered under the Act. Clause 18, in effect, converts the old certificate of registration into a practising certificate. Clauses 19 and 20 repeal a provision of the Pharmacy Act Amendment Act, 1965, and a provision of the Age of Majority (Reduction) Act, 1970-1971, both of which purported to amend section 22a of the principal Act which had, in fact, been repealed in 1952.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): As the Attorney-General has just stated, the need to introduce this Bill arises from requests and representations made over many years, I believe, by the Pharmacy Board, and I understand that the measure has the support of those engaged in all aspects of official pharmacy in South Australia. The Bill is short and is, in the

main, self-explanatory. Clauses 1 to 5 deal with matters that do not require much comment by the Opposition. These matters relate to formal amendments, as well as to one or two amendments consequential on amendments made later in the Bill. The first clause that has some effect on current practice is clause 6, which deals with the registration of premises. Under the present Act, only the location of a pharmacy needs to be registered. Obviously, the provision in the Bill is designed to give greater control by the Pharmacy Board over the type of premises in which a pharmacy is conducted. I hope the board is not too demanding in its requirements. I fully understand that, with the drug situation as it is today, some form of properly constructed premises are obviously necessary. However, I hope that the requirements are not so strict that they will be beyond the economic resources of a business. Over many years, my experience has been that the Pharmacy Board is made up of reasonable men. However, undue requirements should not be imposed on pharmacists.

Clauses 7, 8 and 9 deal with the registration of pharmacists. Clauses 7 and 8 are simply consequential on clause 9, which contains a complete redrafting of Part IV of the Act. The new Part IV spells out in much greater detail the requirements of a pharmaceutical chemist. South Australian graduates are those who hold a degree or diploma in pharmacy granted or conferred by the university in this State or by the South Australian Institute of Technology. Other provisions deal with people who have graduated in other States or overseas. The new provisions are much broader than are the present provisions. Clause 10 is undoubtedly the most controversial clause in the Bill, and much was said about it in last week's newspapers. Much concern has been expressed about it. As the Attorney-General has said, it provides that only registered pharmaceutical chemists may own a pharmacy. A few days ago, one newspaper reported the fact that 60 per cent of pharmacies were owned by non-pharmacists. I think that anyone who has had anything to do with pharmacies knows that in most of these cases the pharmacy is owned by the wife, the husband being a registered chemist appointed be her as manager. It is common knowledge that this is done for tax avoidance reasons, although I stress that this is tax avoidance and not tax evasion; tax avoidance is legal, but tax evasion is not.

In most cases, this has been brought about by the fact that the husband and wife cannot register themselves as a partnership or a company and own the pharmacy in that way in order to lessen the tax impact. Grocers and people in other forms of business can make their wife a partner or form a company. This raises the matter of the position that a pharmacy holds in the community. Perhaps a pharmacy is in rather a peculiar position in that much of a pharmacist's work is of a professional nature, as he dispenses prescriptions that have been written by doctors. Another section of the pharmacist's business is not of a professional nature but is simply in the form of ordinary shop business, and this includes cosmetics, toiletries and patent medicines; similar lines to these are sold by other stores. This situation has obtained for some years. To try to lessen the tax impact, pharmacists sell their business to their wives and remain as manager. I submit that, if that is all that happens, it is of no real harm or consequence.

However, I can see why the board wishes to have this provision inserted in the Bill, as it obviously sees the need for control over the owners of pharmacies. Although the board has control over pharmacists, it obviously has no control over non-pharmacists. A pharmacist who manages a pharmacy owned by an unqualified person could perhaps be subject to two sets of rules. As the board has no control over the premises owned by non-pharmacists, the manager of the pharmacy finds it difficult to know which authority he must take notice of—his boss or the board. Obviously this is the reason for the provision in the Bill. Having said that I can see the reason for the clause, I would also say that I see some anomalies arising from it. I am most concerned about the situation of the widow of a pharmacist. To a certain extent, the situation is covered by section 31 of the Act, which provides:

Upon the death of any registered pharmaceutical chemist carrying on business at the time of his death, it shall be lawful for his executor or administrator to continue the business for the benefit of the estate of the deceased for a period of six months only, unless the business is continued under the management of a registered pharmaceutical chemist. While any such business is not under the management of a registered pharmaceutical chemist, no person who is not a registered pharmaceutical chemist shall in the course of the business dispense any drug or medicine on the order or prescription of a legally qualified medical practitioner.

Although the provisions of this section safeguard the interests of an estate left to a child who is expected to study pharmacy later and eventually to take over the business, with the estate continuing under the control of the executor, the same situation does not necessarily apply in the case of a widow. A pharmacist's widow may be in real difficulty.

If she wishes to continue the business for any length of time, she must carry on as the executor of the estate. In other words, once the estate is wound up she is governed by the provisions of the Act and must sell the business. Of course, this fact could become known and, to a certain extent, there would be a forced sale. Regardless of whether she had to sell the business immediately or within a set period of, say, two years, the same situation would apply: people would know that she had to sell the business, and this could have a detrimental effect on the price she could obtain for it.

The question of a practising certificate, as distinct from an annual certificate of registration, is a minor point. As the board considers that this is in line with the position regarding other professional bodies, I have no argument about it. Regarding clause 10, in his second reading explanation the Attorney-General said that pharmaceutical chemists were trained in the handling of drugs and were subject in their work to stringent legal and professional controls and that in the board's view and in the Government's view it was undesirable that chemists should be subject to the control and direction of persons who were not subject to these legal and professional controls. I have canvassed that point earlier: it is obviously the reason why the board has asked for this legislation to be introduced. While the Attorney-General was giving his second reading explanation, I received a submission from the Pharmacy Board concerning another matter it would like to have raised. However, I think it would be better if I did not canvass the new matter now but mentioned it in Committee, because the submission arrived a little late for me to study it before I spoke to the second reading.

I again stress that I should like to see in the Bill some protection for the widow of a pharmacist who could be placed in a most invidious position if the Bill is passed as it stands, but I can see no real way around it. I think it was said by a member in another place when the Bill was being debated there that he considered that a widow should not attempt to continue to run a pharmacy, that experience had shown that the business suffered

and declined, and that she would be more likely to suffer if she held on to it than if she sold it immediately. That is a sweeping statement because, obviously, situations vary. In the case of a large pharmacy already being run by a large staff, the widow should be allowed to continue to run it. If the pharmacy had been run by a staff of, say, two or three or five registered chemists, including the original owner, there would be no reason why the widow should not be allowed to continue to run it as an investment, but I see difficulties in writing this provision into the legislation. With the reservation that I should like to study the suggested amendment I have received from the board and perhaps having to say something about it in Committee, I support the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light) : I support the second reading. Obviously, it is a forward-looking Bill in that many of its provisions will permit the Pharmacy Board to undertake a change in the type of management and in many aspects of pharmacy conduct as new pharmacies become registered and as new persons enter the field for registration. I, in common with members elsewhere and with the member for Flinders, hope that the situation does not arise whereby the regulations which are to be promulgated and of which we have no knowledge will not be such that they will place at ransom, or prove costly to, a registered pharmacist by insisting in an almost unbending way that he upgrade his premises. This will depend on the regulations and on the way they are applied.

The member for Flinders was frank in indicating the method of management applying at present. I see no reason why the premises in which the business is conducted may not still be maintained by an unregistered person or that in these premises, which belong to the widow, the business may not be carried on. The member for Flinders has pointed out that it is a matter not of tax evasion but of organization within the scope of the Commonwealth taxation legislation. The method I have briefly outlined would not give the degree of opportunity the present method gives but, obviously, it would give a measure of relief. In his second reading explanation the Attorney-General said that the board was the instigator of the provisions in the Bill. Having had considerable contact with the board over many years, I am happy to accept its recommendations and I know, from examining the documents before the House, that they have

been made in the best interests of the pharmacy profession in this State.

We still have the unfortunate situation whereby a Bill introduced into the House is required to be processed with a minimum of delay and of a member being denied the opportunity, before voting on the matter, of checking out the ramifications of a recommendation that has been forwarded to him by the board. If the Attorney would agree to my having leave to continue my remarks on motion, I should be most appreciative.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Later:

Dr. EASTICK: I thank the Attorney for permitting the debate to be adjourned for a short period while certain investigations were carried out. I note that there is a minor alteration in respect of the definition of friendly societies. It does not interfere with the present situation. One could hardly suggest that the change corrects an irregularity; rather, it changes a slight looseness in the definition at present. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Prohibition on unregistered persons owning etc., business."

Mr. CARNIE: I consider that this clause will give rise to anomalies. However, I can see the reason for it and I do not intend to oppose it, although pharmacists should be advised to examine their wills to ensure that their widows will be adequately protected, in view of this new legislation.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I can see that difficulty may arise in some cases, but it is the same sort of difficulty as is experienced in the estates of medical and legal practitioners and other professional people.

Mr. Carnie: There is a difference.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The difference arises only because a pharmacist combines with his strictly professional work the business of store-keeping. This is perfectly legitimate but, if he dies, it is still necessary, in the public interest, that the obligation attaching to a professional person should prevail. The importance of this in the case of a pharmacy is self-evident; the very stock under the control of the pharmacist makes it necessary for a registered pharmacist to be in charge. I consider that it would be most undesirable for a pharmacy to continue for any great length of time under the control,

either direct or indirect, of a person who did not have the professional and legal obligation of a registered pharmacist.

Although there is a problem on death, I do not think it is as acute as the honourable member thinks. Section 31 of the principal Act provides authority for an administrator or executor to carry on the business for six months without its being managed by a registered pharmacist. After that period a pharmacist must be in charge. If the executor who winds up the estate would have to sell the business at a give-away price, he would not be obliged to sell. His duty as executor would be not to sell.

Mr. Carnie: What if the wife is the executor?

The Hon. L. J. KING: She would be simply in the position of having an asset she could not sell at a reasonable price at that time and there would be nothing to stop her, as executor, from carrying on with a registered pharmacist in charge until she could sell at a reasonable price. An executor would be failing in his (or her) duty if the business did not realize a reasonable price. If the wife, as executor, could find a buyer at a reasonable price she would doubtless sell; if not, she would be entitled to carry on for six months without a registered pharmacist being in charge. I do not mean that she would be entitled to carry on in the hope that the general market for pharmacies would improve, but she would certainly have sufficient authority to carry on for long enough to find a buyer at a reasonable price so that she would not have to sell at a give-away price. So obviously some, though not very serious, inconvenience would be involved.

There is the inconvenience to the pharmaceutical profession, of course, that under this provision future pharmacies will not be able to engage in the sort of arrangement that provided taxation advantages in the past. No doubt, that is a misfortune for them but it is a misfortune shared by other professions. It is a disadvantage that one must accept if one seeks to carry on any profession that depends upon personal skill, qualifications and standards. It is not possible to enter into partnerships with non-professional people or to hand over the control of the practice or business (as the case may be) to people who have not the legal and professional qualifications of the professional man, and that applies not only to the pharmacist but also to others who cannot derive the taxation advantages that non-professional people can avail themselves of.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Branch business."

Mr. CARNIE: During my second reading speech, I said I had received word from the Pharmacy Board about an amendment proposed to be moved. It concerns this clause, which amends section 30 of the principal Act. From memory, I think I said at that time that I had received a submission from the board, but the point arose from my asking the board for its feelings on this matter, and the letter I received was in reply to that question. This suggested amendment resulted from that question. However, I thank the Attorney-General for his indulgence in allowing this matter to be adjourned for a short time while I looked at it. After examining the amendment, I have decided not to proceed with it at this stage.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (17 to 20) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PACKAGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 8. Page 3710.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill, which I do not think is very controversial. The Packages Act, which was introduced in 1967, resulted from many conferences between the authorities in the various States in order to gain some measure of uniformity. When the legislation was introduced it appeared that it would control mainly things such as misleading labelling, etc., which are now part of the legislation. However, it goes much further than that. It deals with the question of whether objection can be taken to a word or phrase that may lead people into thinking that they are getting a bargain that does not really exist; but it also provides that people will get the right weight and the right volume in the commodities they buy. I had some early doubts about the legislation, parts of which I thought were a little steep.

I administered the legislation for a couple of years, when I learnt that a good officer, such as our Warden of Standards, could make legislation work which, in the hands of a narrow-minded, bureaucratic person, could be rather onerous. The bureaucratic type of person could be a nuisance to people trying to get on with their business. Mr. Servin has had the full confidence of people in trade and commerce; such people used to ask him how to proceed, and he was able to help them.

It was a classic case of an officer administering the law fairly while at the same time being helpful and sincere. New section 32 (3a) provides:

Where the true weight or measure of an article is found by an inspector to be less than the weight or measure stated on the pack containing that article the packer of that article—

(a) shall be deemed to have sold that article to that inspector at the time at which and the place where the inspector so found . . .

That provision seems a little peculiar. Whenever the word "deemed" is used in legislation it has a rather wide meaning, and one should always be a little suspicious of it. When legislation dealing with an incident says that the incident is "deemed to have taken place", such legislation has to be studied very carefully, because it can become ridiculous. Over the years we have heard complaints about a definition in the Fisheries Act; that definition says that "weight" includes length and size. So, an underweight whiting would be one that is less than 11in. in length. One needs to be careful when using definitions of that kind. Nevertheless, I can see why the word "deemed" is used in new section 32 (3a), and I have no objection to it. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

The effect of subsection (2) of proposed new section 42a is to extend the period within which proceedings for offences against the Act may be brought. It is felt that this extension is justified because of the peculiarity of weights and measures administration; in the nature of things (for instance, a considerable period often elapses between the time that goods are packed and the time that they come to the attention of the authorities), the period of time between the formal commission of the offence and its impact on the public can run into some months.

I can understand the case that the Minister has made out, but I foreshadow an amendment that I should like the Minister to consider. My amendment provides that the prosecution—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot allude to an amendment at this stage.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will suggest that a prosecution should not take place more than two years after the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed. I hope the Minister will consider this matter because, during the Committee stage, I shall ask him whether he considers my suggestion to be reasonable. Extending the period within which proceedings for offences may be brought may make it a little

harder for people than it ought to be. I support the second reading.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): This is a straightforward Bill, and the member for Alexandra has adequately dealt with those matters of detail that require attention. In his second reading explanation, the Minister traced the history of the legislation; he said that such legislation was introduced originally to bring some uniformity between the States with regard to control of packaging of goods. He said that in many instances legislation enacted by the South Australian Government had been followed by other States for the purposes of uniformity. Over the years the Government has discovered that the legislation has needed amending. In 1969 the principal Act was amended and now it again needs amending. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, because the Bill needs amending the opportunity has been taken to re-examine the legislation generally and to effect some other minor amendments that appear to be desirable. New section 21 (4) provides:

For the purposes of this section the regulations may provide— . . .

- (b) for the marking of a prescribed article or a prescribed article of a class, with the day on which that prescribed article was packed or an indication of that day.

This stems from the fact that over a long period of time manufacturers have used some kind of code to denote the date on which prepackaged goods have been sealed and supplied to shops and supermarkets for people to purchase. A little more than a year ago I asked the Minister a question concerning the freshness of foodstuffs. That question was based on a well-researched report in the *Advertiser*, written by Bruce Guerin, who pointed out that the rather abstruse code included perforations through packages or labels which were perhaps understood by the retailer but not by the unfortunate purchaser, who had no idea what they meant, and that they applied to a wide variety of foodstuffs in tins and various packages. I followed up this matter and found out in one or two supermarkets what these perforations meant. I found out that what was said in the article was perfectly correct and that in some cases articles were being sold at least 15 days after the date on which they were considered to be fresh. I asked the Minister whether, in the interests of the health of the community, the Government would ensure (as happens in other countries in the world, where far more stringent regulations apply than in Australia) that the date should

be stated in no uncertain terms and that, instead of a coded date, the actual date of packaging should be shown. The Minister replied some time later, and said:

The Act also provides that foods shall be of the substance, nature and quality demanded by the purchaser or of the substance, nature and quality which they are represented or purported to be.

I have quoted that question and the Minister's answer, because I am pleased that this provision has been written into the Act. I believe that, in the interests of good public health and the protection of the consumer, this is a worthwhile amendment to the principal Act. I have risen to speak to this Bill simply to say that I am gratified, as I am sure the public will be, that in the future packages will clearly show how fresh the goods are, that the shopkeepers and retailers will have to be careful that goods are not sold after the date when they will no longer be considered fit for human consumption, and that the goods must be removed from the shelves. This will safeguard the purchasers of these goods. I support the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I thank members for their support of the Bill, which deals with weight and not quality. The identification of the date when goods are packed applies only to those packages marked "Net weight when packed". Although this may be indirectly of assistance to people in establishing the freshness or otherwise of food, it really refers to the weight, and it will facilitate prosecutions because it will enable the date of packing to be ascertained.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"General provision as to offences."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

In new section 42a (2) after "later" to insert "but no such prosecution shall be presented more than two years after the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed".

This will bring a certain amount of relief to a provision that is a little harsher than applies in ordinary law. The law generally restricts the time in which an action can be brought, but this period is extended by this new provision. The amendment is to correct that position.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I do not oppose the amendment.

Perhaps we will never need to use that provision. I endorse the remarks of the honourable member about Mr. Servin; the Warden of Standards. I should have been happy to leave the provision as it is, knowing that Mr. Servin would exercise his judgment and authority with common sense and great discretion. He has done a first-class job for this State and is the envy of every other State in this field.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (10 and 11) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RURAL INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 8. Page 3710.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): This Bill contains a very proper amendment to the principal Act, an amendment to which I give my wholehearted support. As the Minister of Works said in his second reading explanation, the purpose of the Bill is to ensure that any rehabilitation loans made to displaced farmers cannot be included in their assets should those farmers be declared bankrupt. In other words, a bankrupt farmer who has been forced to leave his property for economic reasons may receive a loan of \$1,000. I believe that sum to be inadequate, as it is given to the farmer not as a gift but as a loan, repayable with interest over 25 years. Also, it is granted not on the assets of the individual but on his own security and, of course, an individual may well default.

On the other hand, the committee that administers the Act examines each applicant carefully. Those responsible want to ascertain what is an applicant's position and what he expects to do with the money he receives in order to rehabilitate himself. All this information is sought before a loan is granted and, depending on the circumstances of the individual concerned, a loan of the full amount of \$1,000 may or may not be granted. I believe that action has been taken by the respective State Governments to have the maximum loan increased to \$3,000.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: To \$2,000.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Even \$2,000 would be more realistic than the figure of \$1,000 provided for in the Bill. It is important that there should be no delay in passing this legislation, because people are already being granted these loans. For the reasons given in the second reading explanation, it is important that any money advanced be protected. There is no point in either the Commonwealth Government or any State Government lending money to a person who needs assistance, only to find that, instead of assisting the farmer concerned, the loan is really assisting his creditors. Of course, that is not the intention of the legislation. In supporting the second reading, I indicate my support of the Minister's foreshadowed amendment, which is also very important.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I join with the member for Mallee in supporting this Bill and, in doing so, refer to a case that was recently brought to my attention. One of my constituents, having been granted a loan, found that his creditors were going to try to obtain the money he was to receive. Having obtained a position with a firm as a traveller, this man had to provide his own motor car to enable him to obtain a living for his wife and family. However, until this Bill is passed, my constituent will not be able to obtain his loan. I therefore support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

New clause 5—"Exemption from stamp duty and registration fees."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move to insert the following new clause:

5. The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 25 thereof—

25a. Stamp duty shall not be payable upon—

(a) any document made or executed by any applicant for assistance under this Act or under the scheme in connection with an application for such assistance;

or

(b) any document made or executed by any person for the purposes of giving security for the repayment of any advance under this Act or under the scheme,

and no fees shall be payable under any Act for the registration of any document in relation to which pursuant to this section stamp duty is not payable.

It would be a ludicrous situation for the Government to advance a loan to a person in order to assist him and then to turn around

and tax him on that transaction. This amendment avoids the possibility of this happening.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COMMUNITY WELFARE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 1. Page 3562.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I think all members have been looking forward with great anticipation to the introduction of this Bill. It is a matter that has been concerning the community for a long time and is, I think, a worthwhile measure generally. I say at the outset that it is right and proper that many of the objectives and aims in social welfare, as such, are set out clearly in the Bill. In his second reading explanation, the Minister of Social Welfare, referring to the Bill, stated:

Its purpose is to provide the statutory framework for the implementation of the Government policy in relation to community welfare. This policy is based upon the principle that citizens of the State, as members of a single community, owe to one another the obligation of concern and support in the other's problems and difficulties. The State, which is the politically-organized community, must therefore assume responsibility, where necessary, for the welfare of those of its citizens who are in need of welfare support.

That is one way to put it and it is a true point of view, but I suggest that, in one way or another, it reflects a rather Socialist way of putting things, or, perhaps, a Socialist policy, where the State is paramount. In this case, as the explanation puts it, the State assumes the responsibility for the welfare of its citizens in rather a paternalistic way. One is almost reminded of a benevolent dictatorship. I do not think that this was necessarily intended, but the explanation perhaps reads this way, coming from a Socialist Government.

Of course, social welfare is not new: the concept is very ancient. It certainly is necessary, and I think that it stems basically from Christian teachings, and extends even from before then. Social service is based on a recognition of variations in individual capacities and in community structure, and the overall objective of social service is to help the individual to use his own abilities for his own welfare and, of course, for that of the community. Once again, these abilities vary from one individual to the next.

The formalized approach to social welfare results in the provisions made by Governments or voluntary organizations to meet

income problems and other social welfare problems, and these developments are of relatively recent origin. Going back a little further and following my remark about Christian precepts, the activities of the church in the field of social welfare have been well known for centuries, as one would expect. Government responsibility, or at least public responsibility for people, I think was first found in 1601, with the passage of the Elizabethan Poor Laws. Voluntary involvement of private organizations increased from that time until, with Government activity (the Workers' Compensation Act was passed in England in, I think, 1892) there developed a loose partnership between Government authorities and voluntary organizations established in the field of social welfare. The most important feature that I consider to have developed from this is the growing community awareness of the need for community social health and welfare, and this is dealt with in clause 7 (f) of the Bill, which speaks of promoting generally an interest in community welfare. This could be the most important or most significant provision in the measure.

Awareness has been developing very gradually. Ideas change with changing generations, and an acceptance that the basis of social maladjustment is two-way and the result of an inter-action between an individual and his community environment has been essential for this understanding. With this understanding comes not only the acceptance of community responsibility, but the acceptance, too, of the individual's need to be helped to use his own abilities. Wherever possible, he must be helped to maintain and restore his self-respect by being helped to help himself. It is not enough, I think (and I think most people would agree with this), to take over all responsibility and leave the individual with no scope for individual effort. As I have said, that will destroy his self-respect and may engender feelings of resentment against the State and the community generally.

I do not have to tell students of social welfare or welfare work that social work is an applied branch of sociology. The two terms are not interchangeable, although "social worker" and "sociologist" are becoming interchangeable. There is a vast difference. Sociology is the study of man and society, based on the fundamental fact that the human infant, at birth, is born into and depends for his survival on a social group. The broad subheadings cover, too, the study of social organization, social psychology, social change,

social disorganization, and even human ecology and population.

Scientifically, sociology is not concerned with modifying social values, proposing reforms, or designing or administering social welfare programmes, or even promoting a better social order but, of course, with understanding and predicting human conduct and social phenomena.

The people who apply and advance the theories demonstrated by sociologists are many. They include even legislators, as well as educators, clergymen, union leaders, and social workers. Applied sociology includes studies in criminology, juvenile delinquency, education, communications and marketing, industrial relations and family counselling. Of course, social workers may deal with several branches of applied sociology.

Mr. Payne: Even eye specialists.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, even eye specialists. I am at last tempted to reply to an interjection. I consider that there is a tendency for the public to confuse social welfare with Socialism, and I think I have dealt with this matter previously in this Chamber. They are two vastly different things. A belief is abroad in some sections of the community that, merely because the Australian Labor Party is the Socialist Party, its members are necessarily the only people who stand for social welfare. However, this is far from being true. The A.L.P. has no monopoly on social welfare, and I am extremely pleased to say this. The Liberal and Country League is just as much concerned with the needs of the individual as is the A.L.P., and I think we are probably better qualified to do something about it.

The Hon. L. J. King: The member for Gouger does not seem to entertain that view, judging by his statement this afternoon.

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot really follow the Minister's train of thought, but I suppose he had to bring some reference to that incident into the House sooner or later. I hope that there is no tendency for a Socialist point of view (that is, when the State is supreme) to destroy an individual's self-respect by taking away his chance to help himself, by taking over all responsibility for his welfare. Social welfare must take account of and encourage the individual's need to help himself, and assistance must be made available, but this assistance should be given by helping him, so far as is necessary, to achieve that end; in other words, it should facilitate self-help.

As a Party, we support the principles set out in the Bill and have supported them, I

add, over the years. Our chief concern is about the implementation of the principles that have been set out. It is the task and objective of legislation such as this not only to set out the principles of social welfare (which I have said earlier I believe has been done very well in the Bill), but it is necessary to set out in detail the steps whereby the principles of social welfare may be put into practice. This Bill must then be examined and judged in that light. How are these objects, which we all agree are so necessary, to be achieved in our community? What effect will this legislation have on the individual, and what effect will it have on the community as a whole? Will the steps outlined in this legislation achieve the results that we all desire?

I say here and now that I believe that many of the provisions will achieve these results, simply because much of this Bill is tried and proved. Many of these provisions have been operating in one form or in one Act or another for a long time now; they have been covered under the terms of the Social Welfare Act, the Children's Protection Act, and the Aboriginal Affairs Act. Although some of my colleagues and I may have some comments about various parts of this consolidation (that is basically what the bulk of this Bill is about), we generally approve of what has been done. The amalgamation of the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Departments is, I believe, probably a sensible provision. I had the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of this as a member of the Social Welfare Advisory Council. There is nothing very startlingly new or controversial about these matters.

Part I contains preliminary provisions, and Part IV relates to family care services. Part V deals with special provisions relating to Aboriginal affairs, and Part VI deals with maintenance obligations. Part VI is long, as those members who have read it will understand; it encompasses clauses 92 to 235, or pages 38 to 112 inclusive of the Bill, so that 75 pages of a total of 119 in the Bill are taken up with the maintenance provisions. No doubt the provision for child care centres to be licensed by the department will cause some discussion, debate or even controversy, but generally speaking most of the Bill involves a rewrite and consolidation of existing provisions. I have no doubt that in this case the provisions will continue to meet the criterion that we have set down of achieving the results desired.

However, as members will agree, this is not the main source of the considerable interest and anticipation that has been shown by the community (especially by those involved in social work) in regard to the introduction of this Bill, and there has certainly been great interest shown. I think the important Parts of this Bill in that respect are Parts II and III (the promotion of community welfare, and the provision of community welfare services). I have dealt with the fact that the objectives of social welfare are well set out and, because they are so well set out, I intend briefly to go through them. Clause 7 (a) provides:

to promote the well-being of the community by assisting individuals, families and sections of the community to overcome social problems with which they are confronted and to promote the effective use of human resources and the full realization of human potentialities;

This is the community aspect of the objectives. Clause 7 (b) relates to the family aspect, and I do not think I need say how much I agree with the concept of the family as the fundamental unit of society. Paragraph (b) provides:

to promote the welfare of the family as the basis of community welfare, to reduce the incidence of disruption of family relationships and to mitigate the effects of such disruption where it occurs;

That is a laudable aim indeed, but not always one that will be easy to carry out completely. Under paragraph (c) we move from the family or parent side of it to the children, and this provision states:

to establish, promote and co-ordinate services and facilities within the community designed to advance the well-being of children and young persons;

Paragraph (d) then provides:

to collaborate with agencies engaged in the provision of assistance to those in need or distress and to promote rationalization and co-ordination of the assistance provided for those persons;

This, of course, provides for co-operation between voluntary, local government and Government agencies, and I may add that it is not the first time that the words "rationalization", "co-ordination" or "collaboration" appear in this Bill. Those three words appear 25 times in the first nine pages of the Attorney-General's second reading explanation, and I think it is some measure of the importance that he and the department place on the integration of community services for the general good of social welfare. Paragraph (e) provides:

to promote research into problems of community welfare and to promote education and training in matters of community welfare;

This is right, especially in legislation such as this, where we are breaking new ground and feeling our way. I have only to recall many conversations I have had with officers of the Social Welfare Department relating to the lack of adequate research and library facilities to know how important this is, and I hope that this provision will not simply remain in the legislation as a provision but that it will be acted on to the benefit of the department and its officers and to the benefit of the community as a whole. Paragraph (f) provides:

to promote generally an interest in community welfare.

As I said before, this is possibly the most important Part of the Bill: everything else hinges on it. If we had more interest in community welfare, perhaps we would not have to pass all this legislation. There is an old teaching, and it is summed up in the one commandment: love thy neighbour. While dealing with page 9 of the Bill, I must be honest and say that I am a little puzzled by the wording of clause 8 when I read that the "Minister of Community Welfare and his successors in office shall be a corporation sole". It reminds me somewhat of the next course at the Lord Mayor's banquet. I am not sure why this has been changed, but no doubt there is some good reason for it.

The Hon. L. J. King: It is because the present Minister has a "sole".

Dr. TONKIN: If the present Minister spells his "soul" that way, I feel sorry for him indeed. Levity aside, it is little wonder that people in the community are enthusiastic about these proposals; they are desirable objectives, and it is a great credit to the people who have worked so hard to put them in this form. This enthusiasm is not only evident now: it was evident some time ago. In fact, in July, 1971, there was a Conference on the Future Pattern of Community Welfare in South Australia, held at the University of Adelaide, and the report is available (the reference is National Library of Australia card No. ISBN 85578 048 7). The report makes excellent reading, because it not only has a speech by the Minister of Social Welfare but one I made, too, on the same subject.

I thought that while I was listening to the Minister's second reading explanation it began to ring bells and I thought I had heard some of it before; indeed, I had, but it lost very little by the repetition. I am not quite sure whether the Attorney-General was looking for a paper to give at the conference last July and chose the second reading explanation, or

whether he was looking for a second reading explanation to give to Parliament and chose the paper he gave at the conference. Perhaps he will be kind enough to let us know.

The Hon. L. J. King: I thought you were so impressed by the address at the conference that it would be worth repeating.

Dr. TONKIN: I only regret that I did not have the same opportunity the Minister had to give my paper *in toto*. I think that I pointed out in my paper that I would not mind being in the shoes of the Minister of Social Welfare. This conference was arranged by the Department of Adult Education of the University of Adelaide and the South Australian Council of Social Services. The title of the Minister's paper was "Interdependence of Health and Welfare". He took the opportunity (probably wisely) to put forward the Government's proposals for this legislation. One cannot say that he took the opportunity to try it on the dog, but he certainly gave the people in the community some idea of how he was thinking. I understand that last May the Director of Social Welfare placed the general proposals before representatives of welfare agencies. The Minister gave much of his second reading explanation to the conference at the end of July, and the reaction was generally favourable.

The reaction of most people was that it sounded good, although there were a few misgivings. For instance, the Town Clerk of the Adelaide City Council (Mr. Arland) said that, as far as he could see, the plans for the new Community Welfare Department did not provide for local government assuming a greater role in community welfare, as recommended by the recent report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee. It also seemed strange to him that plans for the Community Welfare Department had been made without waiting for the recommendations of the Legislative Council Select Committee on Public Relief for the Aged, or the Bright Committee on Health Services. The Minister replied that the State Government believed the amalgamation and reorganization of the Departments of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs should not wait any longer; and that the Bright committee would have to take note of the Government's plans for the Community Welfare Department. I think that, perhaps unwittingly, the Minister gave the idea that his main concern was the amalgamation of the two departments rather than a consideration of the widely differing and significant details of community welfare. In summarizing his remarks, Mr. Arland said:

I must admit to some fears that the proposals put forward by the Minister of Social Services

last evening will result in somewhat of a shotgun marriage. I recognize that this is the product of the current Parliamentary system, but there must be a way out. Alluding again to the illustration of marriage, in the introduction of a service of this nature there should be a proper courtship, followed by a proposal which would result in a happy marriage. In a question to the Minister, I pointed out the confusion that exists in the minds of many people in local government over the current welfare administrative proposals, and I think they will be shared by some voluntary agencies.

That is true, and I think that the view is shared by people in voluntary agencies. The Director of the Victorian Council of Social Service (Mrs. Marie Coleman) said that there was need for much more public information about Government social welfare planning in Australia, where the custom is for the responsible Minister to announce Government intentions when all details of such plans have been worked out. In her view, Governments should publish White Papers about developments in social welfare and encourage public discussion of such plans before deciding on their final form.

In this respect, I think that the Minister could say that he put forward his proposal in the form of a paper delivered at a conference of perhaps the most interested people in South Australia. Therefore, perhaps Mrs. Coleman's criticism was not entirely justified in this case. The point I am making is that many people, having heard the Minister's paper, said that what he proposed sounded very exciting. They looked forward to hearing details of community centres moving out amongst the people where they could be used more freely. They looked forward to the whole new concept of community welfare and to hearing details about it. Mrs. Coleman's remarks tend to suggest that this was her attitude, and is was certainly the attitude of many people present. People wanted to hear details, which they presumed would be provided in the Bill, but do we now have as much detail as we would like? Certainly we have the principles, but how are they to be carried out? Clause 9 gives the answer straight away. With no shilly shallying it provides:

Without limiting in any way the powers conferred upon the Minister under any other provision of this Act—

and if we consider paragraphs (a) and (b), I do not see how the powers can be limited by any other provision—

the Minister shall have and may exercise the following powers—

(a) to employ the resources of the department in such manner as he thinks

- fit towards the promotion of community welfare;
- (b) to establish any instrumentality or facility that will, in the opinion of the Minister, conduce to the well-being of the community, and to acquire and maintain land and premises that may be necessary for the purpose;
- and
- (c) to perform any action that may be necessary or expedient for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions or objects of this Act.

I do not think anyone can deny that this provision virtually gives the Minister an open cheque to do as he likes. Although I am not sure that this is not desirable, it places a heavy responsibility on the Minister. There are no definite proposals in the clause, although I do not suppose we would expect it. In this regard, I am pleased to see clause 12 (2), which provides:

The Minister shall cause the report—

this is the report the Director-General shall submit on or before October 31 each year—to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days after the day on which he received it, if Parliament is then in session, but if Parliament is not then in session within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

I do not know why the Minister did not refer to this provision in his second reading explanation. I wonder whether he is not embarrassed by another report which did not find its way into this House. I support the provision in this Bill. I am sure the Minister recognizes its importance, as do all members. I hope that the report to be tabled will not have been altered in any way before its official submission to the Minister. I favour the tabling of the report because I believe it is tremendously important that people in the community should understand what is happening in this field. As we are feeling our way, we must be able to change or modify our ideas on community welfare, depending on how matters go as we implement these proposals.

In Division III of the Bill we start to get down to more detail, and I am pleased to see this. This Division, which is headed "Community Welfare Advisory Committees", brings to mind the Social Welfare Advisory Council which, as the Minister has said, will now no longer function. The Social Welfare Advisory Council since its inception has been a most valuable council. I can say that, because I spent two years on it, although it was in operation for some time

before I became one of its members. I found the council most stimulating and helpful and, once again, I take the opportunity of placing on record my thanks to the department's officers who were so helpful and who helped me so much in understanding the problems of the Social Welfare Department and social welfare generally. The council discussed many important subjects, such as community facilities for health, the fostering of children, the protection of children (with the battered baby legislation that followed) and the treatment of juvenile offenders (with the legislation following, which we have seen in this House only recently).

In a council such as this, although all members have a wide general knowledge and some expert knowledge in various fields, the main function is to learn to assess, collate and report. The council's members were appointed by His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council for four years, and the allowances were covered by regulation under the terms of the Social Welfare Act. Let me compare this with the proposed community welfare advisory committees. Clauses 13 and 14 deal with this matter and provide that the Minister may appoint community welfare advisory committees to advise him. Obviously, there may be more than one committee (and I think there probably will be). Each committee will be composed of experts on various subjects. I think that this is fair enough, if these experts are to advise the Minister. A community welfare advisory committee must consist of persons with a special knowledge or experience of matters to be referred to it for advice. This is good, but I hope that the experts will not be out of touch with reality at times.

Sometimes experts, whether medical, legal or otherwise, are not practical, and I hope that consideration will be given to choosing these people for their practical application of their knowledge as well. At least one of the committee's officers must be an officer of the department. I think this is a wise thing—to maintain liaison between the department and the committee. One of the features of the council was the chairmanship of the Director or Acting Director, who was able to advise council members on the practicability of proposals under the department's structure. However, sometimes I think he was handicapped by being Chairman of the council. Sometimes it might have been better and

easier for him if he had not had the responsibility of chairing the council. Be that as it may, it will no longer apply.

In his second reading explanation the Minister said that clause 14 provides for the terms of office. Members of the community welfare advisory committee shall hold office at the pleasure of the Minister and the Minister shall pay to members of such committee such allowances and expenses as he thinks fit. That seems to be wide open again, because it gives the Minister an open go. These committees may be set up to study a specific problem. If that is the case, then presumably they will meet, consider various matters and bring in a report, and then be disbanded. I hope the situation could not arise where such a committee could be forgotten, although I understand that this has happened in the past. There will be standing committees and committees on continuing subjects of interest but, in either case, a time limit should be set.

It is a simple matter to reappoint members of a committee after a two-year term, and I think that this safeguard should be written into the Bill. I believe that the powers given to the Minister in clause 9 and in other clauses in the Bill are very wide ranging and sweeping, but there should be some control. In the same way, I believe that the allowances and expenses should be subjected to some degree of control. These allowances and expenses were set out under the terms of the old Act and, as members will recall, I think a proposed increase in the allowances payable to members of the council was on the table of the House for the requisite number of days and could have been discussed by any member if he so wished, but no-one discussed it. I believe that this Parliamentary control should be exercised in this respect again in relation to community welfare advisory committees and I shall move later in that direction.

The next specific proposal we see in some detail (and I agree entirely with it) is the provision for community aides. However, again this gets back to the availability of social workers. One of the biggest problems I see (and it is obviously a problem that has been widely considered by officers of the department and by the Minister) is the availability of social workers. It does not matter how good the plans are to spread out and decentralize in the community, we must have trained social workers. Just as many other people have been trained to assist people such as dentists (I think the relevant legisla-

tion was introduced this session), doctors and many other branches of medicine, health and welfare, so I believe that the appointment of community aides would be a worthwhile proposition. As members will know, I have frequently supported the use of supplementary help. Assistant social workers approved of and chosen by the department with a case load of one or two (heaven for a social worker, if I may say that), who can give assistance to the department in looking after young people particularly, is what is required.

Again I refer to the Minister's second reading explanation, although I am not certain that this part was not actually in his paper. I refer to the comments the Minister made regarding the appointment of community aides. He said:

As we all know, there is a large number of people throughout our community who consistently and willingly assist in the work of a wide variety of welfare organizations aimed at helping all manner of persons who suffer some kind of handicap or hardship.

He went on to say that we could never hope to provide the comprehensive community welfare services, which is the Government's aim, from the Government's resources alone. I am sure that the Minister intended to pay a tribute to the voluntary workers who give such a fantastic amount of their time. I pay a tribute, too, because they do a remarkably fine job. It is wonderful the way in which the number of voluntary organizations work (and I again commend to members the *Directory of Social Resources*, prepared by the South Australian Council of Social Services, the Public Health Department and the Citizens Advice Bureau), and the help and manhours that go into voluntary organizations are remarkable. No doubt many members already use the directory. What I am concerned about is that, if these people are keen to help voluntary organizations, what will be the effect of the appointment of community aides? Are we to take this source of manpower away from voluntary organizations, particularly as clause 18 provides that the Director-General may, with the approval of the Minister, pay to community aides such allowances to reimburse them for expenses incurred or to be incurred in the course of their duties as the Director-General thinks fit?

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

Dr. TONKIN: Before the adjournment I was speaking of the fears that many voluntary organizations have, rightly or wrongly, that some of their voluntary workers

could be lost as community aides to the Department for Community Welfare. I realize that the Minister cannot do very much about this except to reassure the organizations, but the fear is widely held. No doubt one of the factors on which the success of this Bill will depend is the availability of trained social workers. I reiterate that it is necessary to be quite sure that wherever possible trained social workers are used in preference to community aides. The availability of social workers is of some concern not only in connection with the success of this Bill but also in connection with the future of medical practice and the health services of the community generally. Since the Minister referred to his paper during his second reading explanation, I shall quote one or two paragraphs from my paper. I said:

Ideally, I believe that social workers should be available not only for medical practice but for local government authorities (where they would work with both the young and the elderly in the community) in secondary schools, universities and other tertiary institutions, as well as in geriatric hospitals and other institutions. The problem, it appears, is going to be how to supply enough social workers to meet the needs of the community, and I feel that any Government will have to give close and immediate attention to attracting suitable people to social work.

I am pleased that one of the clauses in this Bill provides that the department may undertake the training and education of social workers. The provisions for research into matters of community welfare are an important part of this Bill. Much trial and error will be involved in the administration of the Bill and in the application of its clauses. Further, it may be necessary to vary, amend or even revise some of the provisions, depending on the results, and we must not be afraid to do this. We must be able to adapt our plans, depending on circumstances. Once again, the research conducted by the department will be a most essential adjunct to this part of the Bill.

Part III deals with the provision of community welfare services. Here I (and my view is held by others) find the provisions a little disappointing, because many people, especially in the social welfare field, expected to have something more concrete to discuss. The provisions are worthwhile, but no details are given. Clause 24 (1) provides:

The Minister may establish community welfare centres in such localities throughout the State as he thinks fit.

That provision is fine, as far as it goes, but there are no details. The Minister's second

reading explanation does not give us much more information than that; nor does his paper. Clause 24 (2) provides:

A community welfare centre may be used by the department, or, with the approval of the Minister, by any other person, agency or organization, for the furtherance of community welfare within the locality in which the centre is established.

That is good, and I wholeheartedly support it, but how will it be done? What will be the administration? Is this why the Minister is being given such wide powers under the Bill? Although this sounds good, I should like more details, and I am sure that other members of the community, too, would like them. Just what is a community welfare centre? At first, I thought it would be a regional community welfare office, because obviously under this policy of decentralizing the Department for Community Welfare it will be necessary to establish regional offices throughout the community, but this is obviously not so, because the Minister says that this work will be performed by the regional welfare offices of the community welfare centre or by community welfare centres, so they are obviously not one and the same thing. I understand that perhaps the terms could even be interchangeable. If that is the case, where will we finish and what are we going to find? Are we going to find that the regional community welfare office is also going to incorporate the full facilities of, say, an elderly citizens club as well as recreational facilities, chiropractic facilities, facilities for Meals on Wheels, and other amenities so essential for the care of elderly citizens? Will it include facilities for young people? Will it have the full facilities of a community youth centre? I am not quarrelling about any of these proposals, but I should like to know what is intended, and, as far as I can gather, so would many other people. We will support these measures provided they are reasonable. I have no doubt that they will be, but I should like to know what is involved. I am reminded of a passage in the Minister's speech dealing with the Children's Protection Act in which he says that several clauses have been found undesirable for various reasons and that they have been deleted. I hope that he will let us know what are those reasons, and what are those matters about which I am complaining in a mild way. We should like to know what the details are.

Dr. Eastick: They are waiting to work them out.

Dr. TONKIN: That is a pertinent interjection. I, too, suspect that the details have not

yet been worked out. I sympathize with the Minister and his officers, because it must be difficult to work out the details. I believe that we are going to establish the centres, gradually work in them, and see what happens. I do not mind that provided that it is done with reason, care, and due regard for the community which it is hoped that these centres will serve. For that reason, I intend to move that there be some limitations in establishing these centres for a set period. I believe we have to apply caution to the whole business and that we have to move slowly. By doing this we will probably achieve a much better result in the long run. These remarks certainly apply to clauses 25 and 26. Clause 25 provides:

The Minister may establish community welfare consultative councils in such localities throughout the State as the Minister thinks fit. That is wide, but at least we then have clause 26, which tells us what the function of such a consultative council shall be, and that is reasonable. Such a council can work in three ways. We find that the council can recommend or report to the Minister on matters that justify his consideration. Subclause (b) provides that a council can give advice and guidance in the rationalization and co-ordination of services designed to promote the welfare of the local community so as to achieve the most effective utilization of those services. That is reasonable. The council can report on any matter on which the Minister asks it to report.

However, when one gets to clauses 27 and 28 the matter becomes a little more difficult. Once again, it is not going to be easy to decide how these consultative councils can best function. A consultative council, it is stated, shall consist of not less than eight nor more than 12 persons appointed by the Minister. I repeat, for the benefit of the vocal member for Unley, that the Minister again has wide powers.

Mr. Langley: Yes, and he—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: Subclause 27 (2) provides:

The members of a consultative council must be persons interested in the furtherance of community welfare within the local community.

This is right, and it does not necessarily mean that they should be specially skilled. In fact, some social workers believe that councils of this sort should comprise representatives from the community itself: representatives of the people that the social welfare services aim to serve. After all, who would

be better qualified to judge the quality of the service? Clause 27 (3) provides:

The Minister shall, wherever possible, appoint to a consultative council at least two representatives of municipal or district councils whose areas comprise, or are included in, the locality for which the consultative council is established.

Once again, that is fine. However, I refer to my own district as an example. It comprises four councils. Which of those councils will send a representative? How will this be decided, and what does one say to the other councils that are not able to have a representative on the consultative council? Will these councils take it in turns to send a representative, and will representatives be appointed for six months at a time? Many details must be worked out.

Clause 27 (4) provides that at least one member of a consultative council must be an officer of the department. If the consultative council is to comprise, say, 12 persons, that means that only nine can come from the community. This is not clear, although I understand from what the Minister said in his second reading explanation or in his paper to the conference (I am not sure which) that the people to be appointed to the consultative committee will be representatives of voluntary organizations. However, that is not specifically spelt out in the Bill. If the members of the council are not to come from local voluntary bodies, where will they come from, and will the voluntary bodies in the area co-operate willingly? Who will decide which voluntary bodies will be allowed to have a representative on the consultative council? In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

In this way, they will be able to offer informed and sensitive advice to statutory and other organizations, agencies and persons who are providing or who should be providing services in that area.

Whose opinion will this be? Presumably, it will be the opinion of the council. I can foresee certain problems arising. There will be a little disquiet among those voluntary organizations, which will want to know whether they will have a voice on consultative councils, and I wonder whether they will be willing to co-operate as much as they might otherwise have done. I agree with the principle of increasing the co-ordination between the voluntary bodies that already exist.

I referred earlier to the close similarity between the paper the Minister delivered to the conference on the future pattern of community welfare in South Australia and his

second reading explanation. The two vary in small details, and in one most significant detail: where the Minister, in the paper he delivered, referring to the consultative councils, said:

Needless to say, the autonomy of the voluntary groups will be respected.

It is significant that that sentence was omitted from the second reading explanation, when so much else contained therein was similar to the paper delivered by the Minister. I hope it was done by mistake, but it was a significant omission. Does this mean that the autonomy of these groups will no longer be respected? I do not know, and neither do the voluntary groups, who are concerned about this matter. Although the proposals for co-ordination are good, they must be handled carefully and, indeed, almost with kid gloves. I will now refer to the remarks of the Mayor of St. Peters, Mr. K. J. Tomkinson, who, I understand, is quite well known to members opposite. He delivered a paper entitled "The role of local government in community welfare" and illustrated his point by a hypothetical question and answer interview, during which the following question was asked:

What do you think the reaction of local voluntary organizations might be to a stepped up role of local government in their own fields of social welfare work?

The following answer was given to that question:

Unless handled very wisely, the reaction could be disastrous. Much of the greatest practical good stems from the voluntary nature of the work of members of local organizations like Rotary and others already mentioned. The sort of people who give so much of their time and money promoting the work of their chosen group would welcome assistance, but may resent direction. Such volunteers often like to choose their own tasks and take their own credit. Great care would need to be taken to ensure that nothing of this was lost as a result of any form of Government direction smacking of petty bureaucracy. Humanly, many volunteers need pride in their job and particular organization, and a sense of belonging—not anonymity. The voluntary groups provide resources or tools to help tackle the job, and nothing must be done which tends to dismantle or weaken these voluntary services. There is no need to fear the reaction of such bodies provided councils and their suggested associated social welfare officers use tact, perception, lots of common sense and plain Australian "fair-go-manship".

Mr. Millhouse: That's a nice word!

Dr. TONKIN: It is nearly as good as the word "professionalization" in the Minister's second reading explanation, but I will do the

Minister the courtesy of saying that he probably did not write that word. Mr. Arland, whom I have already mentioned, said:

In local government we are most concerned that the efforts of voluntary agencies should not only be protected but enhanced.

Sir Keith Wilson stated:

In any change, care should be taken that the efforts of voluntary organizations should not be dried up.

This is a vital part (and I am sure the Minister recognizes this) of the care that must be taken in implementing this clause of the Bill. We cannot afford to dry up the many voluntary efforts that are made in this community. We cannot afford to risk offending, rightly or wrongly, any one of these organizations. I repeat part of the Minister's second reading explanation, in which he states:

We can never hope to provide out of the resources of the State the comprehensive community welfare service, which is the Government aim.

This is true. The Minister also states:

If the total number of hours worked by such voluntary helpers could be computed, I am sure that we would all be amazed at the figure. Most non-statutory agencies would not be able to continue to provide their many worthwhile services to the community if it were not for the willingness and dedication of their voluntary workers.

I think I have said enough on that subject, and I am sure the Minister realizes the need for great tact and care. Once again, because I consider that we are breaking new ground, I believe that we should put a limit on the operation of these consultative councils, and I intend to move an amendment regarding that.

I think this is a good time to mention the South Australian Council of Social Services. This organization, with which I am sure most members are familiar, was formed in 1946. It developed from the Youth Co-operating Council, which had been set up towards the end of the Second World War to co-ordinate and develop welfare work for youths. Sacoss, as it was called, was an extension into the promotion and co-ordination of all social welfare work. During its existence it has inquired into the needs of the people of this State and has assisted (and I think this is remarkable) in establishing the Good Neighbour Council, the Marriage Guidance Council, Phoenix Society, South Australian Association for Mental Health and, in co-operation with the latter, the Citizens' Advice Bureau. Mr. R. J. Coombe, a former magistrate in the Juvenile Court, was the first Chairman. Miss

Mary Smith, Miss May Wills and Mrs. Amy Wheaton (all well known in the community) were foundation members.

At present there are about 120 member organizations. The council is continually assessing the requirements of the community in the light of the development of this State and the changing pattern of social needs. Sacoss is a State branch of the Australian Council of Social Services. In turn, it is a member of the International Council of Social Welfare. This organization has been co-ordinating for years in this community, and I hope that it will be given every opportunity to continue the fine work that it does. I hope the provisions of this Bill, especially those relating to consultative councils, will not in any way impair or inhibit the activities of Sacoss or of its member voluntary agencies.

I was rather disappointed, too, to find no reference in the Bill to health services as part of the proposals for community welfare. The Minister will know very well that he and I both gave papers that were entitled "The Interdependence of Health and Social Welfare". I spoke at the time about the changing nature of medicine and the changing role of the general practitioner and referred to the plans for community health. I spoke of the plans for a new medical graduate who will be well versed in community medicine. It has been disappointing to many members of the medical profession and the community generally that the building of the Flinders Medical School has been such a protracted business. Happily, plans are now being drawn up, but it is unlikely that graduates from the Flinders Medical School will be working in the community before 1980. I believe this community attitude to medical studies and to future medical practice may well be as important as the development of the concept of preventive medicine although, of course, this will simply be an extension of that concept.

This is the overall concept of total patient care, involving the health and welfare of the community. Looking at things from the health point of view, the doctor must have the help of social workers as members of the medical team, and, looking at things from the social work point of view, the social worker must have the help of a doctor: it is very much a team effort. Dr. Jeanette Linn, working in research under a grant made by the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, has produced some fine results on the use of a team in general practice to look after the general health and welfare of the

community. To sum up my disappointment at the lack of provision for health services, I quote what I said in the paper as follows:

It is interesting to hear of the plans that the Community Welfare Department has for the regionalization of its services. In this, it is following the pattern which has already been established in hospital services, and I believe it will also follow the tendency which is now developing for medical and hospital services to be made available to patients in their homes. Thus, regional community health and welfare centres could contain general and psychiatric hospital services, geriatric units and day centres, and social work services, serving patients both in the hospitals and at home, in co-operation with the local medical practitioner, and perhaps in association with the practice itself. Where the need exists Government subsidies to local councils and other voluntary agencies, for example, Meals on Wheels, Red Cross, the St. John Ambulance Brigade, church organizations and elderly citizens centres, would ensure that these services are available to all who needed them.

Above all, I think serious consideration must be given to the integration of the various Government departments directly concerned in the health and welfare of people in the community. Under the control of the Minister of Health, there are departments relating to hospitals, to public health and to mental health, each with a number of well-defined activities and branches, and all aimed at improving the general health and welfare of the community. We have all come to take for granted most of these services as we enjoy the high standards of living which have come to us as a developed country. Other benefits have resulted from specific Government action in the public health and preventive campaigns which have been waged against various diseases. Prevention of emotional breakdown in crisis situations by the early diagnosis and treatment of the existing situation is just as much a part of preventive medicine as in the X-ray campaign for tuberculosis and other public health activities.

That is what I firmly believe. I believe that this aspect of community welfare cannot be overlooked in establishing community welfare centres and projects. There must be integration in the development of community medicine. As I say, I am disappointed that provision for this has not been included in the Bill. The Minister and other members may have seen a recent study entitled "The Future Health Care Services in the Australian Capital Territory", published by Llewelyn-Davies Weeks Forestier-Walker and Bor in November, 1970. In the priorities for development over the short term, this report states that the first priority is setting up a comprehensive health authority. Item 7.3 of the report states:

At the same time, it is essential that the medical and other health professions and the public are able to contribute to and participate

in the process of decision-making relating to the planning and development of the health services of the A.C.T.

Item 7.4 states:

Whilst the administrative re-structuring is taking place, we suggest that the first two health centres should be established on a pilot project basis. These would be "pilot" only in the sense that they would provide the necessary experience in organization and would in no way be testing the principles of the health centre concept since international experience is already available to answer this.

That is much as I see the situation regarding community health centres. I believe that we should set up one or two pilot schemes, just to iron out any administrative troubles. I do not think anyone quarrels about the aims and objects involved, but I think we should control the establishment of the scheme by starting with perhaps two pilot schemes, and that we should not establish any more until we know that they work or, alternatively, that they do not work so that we can find another way of making them work. The principles in the report to which I have referred apply equally to the Bill. We will learn by experience as we proceed.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Dr. TONKIN: Earlier today, the member for Mitcham said to me that this was a Committee Bill; I agree that largely that is so. I will bring up many matters during the Committee stage, and I am sure that I will receive the Minister's usual courteous and full answers. Most of these matters can wait. I will now refer to the definitions of uncontrolled and neglected children. The definition of "neglected child" has been changed, because the old Act is out of date. The first definition in the Bill really covers the lot: it provides that a neglected child is a child who is under the guardianship of any person whom the court considers unfit to have the guardianship of the child. That is simple and direct and says everything that needs saying. One wonders whether it is really necessary to have two further definitions, as the first definition is a masterpiece of construction.

I am looking forward to hearing from the Minister why the definition of "near relative" does not include grandparents. Although I suppose there must be some good reason for this, it seems an odd omission, as many people in the community have depended on their grandparents for their upbringing. I agree that the definitions of "neglected child" in the Maintenance Act are probably out of date, although I am tempted to wonder whether

some of those definitions should not still be spelt out for the benefit of the community. In the Maintenance Act, "neglected child" means any child who habitually begs or receives alms. That is hardly likely to apply these days. Another definition of "neglected child" is a child who wanders about, or frequents any public place, or sleeps in the open air. Although that is not common, it does occur. However, I am not convinced that the people concerned are children, as young adults seem to do this these days.

Another definition is one who resides in any reputed brothel; that is unlikely, but it could happen. Another definition is "one who associates or dwells with any person who has been convicted of vagrancy, or is known to the police as of bad repute, or who has been or is reputed to be a thief or habitual drunkard". That happens more today. Another definition is "one who sells or offers for sale matches, newspapers, or any other article whatsoever in a public place". That probably deserves to go out, because I think we have seen the day of the little match seller. Another definition is "being under the age of 14 years, and not being on any lawful business or errand, habitually frequents public streets or places between the hours of 8 o'clock in the evening and 5 o'clock in the morning". Another definition is "being under the age of 16 years, and not being the child or ward of the licensee, is, on more than one occasion and without lawful excuse found in the bar-room, or taproom of any public house or wine saloon, or is on more than one occasion served with intoxicating liquor in or upon the premises of such public house or wine saloon".

I think they are fair enough reasons and I suspect that this happens fairly often in the present community. One has only to drive up and down Hindley and Rundle Streets at about 8 o'clock in the evening to see the number of young people there. I hope that they are there on legitimate business with the full knowledge of their parents and with no ulterior motive in mind. Sometimes it is a pity that the old provisions go out and that things are not spelled out more adequately. I support this provision and I believe that subclause (a) is all that is necessary.

Finally, I refer to the uncontrolled child and the definition in the Bill. "Uncontrolled child" means a child—

- (a) whose parents or guardians appear to be unable or unwilling to exercise adequate supervision and control of the child; and

- (b) who is in need of correction and control.

The tragedy of it is that many parents in all walks of society cannot exercise adequate supervision and control of their children. I think that social workers know that very well and members would be well aware of it; it is a sad and sorry reflection on our way of life and on the breakdown in communication that occurs early in the family situation. Acts that seem to result from this could well be a subconscious call for help and understanding and, once again, this is a well-recognized factor. At this stage, the parent may find that an attempt to exercise supervision and control produces the opposite effect. The situation as it stands needs correcting, but very often the situation is too far developed. However, I believe that this is an unfortunate choice of words and I think that it is the situation which needs correction.

I am not so sure that the parents do not need correcting, but I am not convinced that the child needs correcting. To me, "correction" has an unfortunate connotation because it mostly implies punishment. In the United States of America, "correction" is a euphemism for prison—the house of correction. I believe that trust and understanding are most important in overcoming the situation. I think the attitude that young people develop to their parents in the family situation is easily transferred to society generally, and attempts to help, without understanding, can sometimes be fatal.

Control is necessary because it is necessary to protect society, but it is especially necessary to protect the child from the effects of his own actions. I prefer the use of a word other than "correction". Perhaps "care" could be used, but I am not sure that that is the right word because it tends to overlap the definition of "neglected child", although in the overall picture I suppose that both "uncontrolled" and "neglected" child are one and the same thing. These children need help and care just as much as they need control. We should include "care and control" in the new definition of the same child. We should also incorporate the definition as it appears in paragraph (a), relating to parents and guardians unwilling to exercise adequate supervision and control. I believe that paragraph (b) should state:

... who is in need of supervision, care and control.

That would adequately cover the situation without emphasis on correction or punishment. I may be pedantic about this matter, but, if

we are going to do the job properly, we may as well bring it into line with the rest of the Bill.

Clause 58 allows for the establishment of homes, assessment centres and youth project centres. This is the whole crux of the scheme for the assessment of juvenile offenders and for their treatment, and I heartily support it. I am afraid I must support clause 66, relating to child care centres, although I do not like doing it. Because of the actions of some sections of the community that do not take the care that they should take in supervising child care centres, the excellent work done by many councils and other authorities will, I am afraid, have to pass to the department. It is a pity that this has happened. The members for Mitcham and Davenport and any others who may follow still have a fair bit to deal with, and I now intend to leave the Bill. I sum up by saying that I am excited to read the details in the Bill, but I am disappointed that there are not more details of how the Bill is to be administered, and I am disappointed that there is not more mention of the integration of Government and voluntary services and health services.

I am willing to support quite happily proposals for community centres, voluntary aides and consultative councils, but with the proviso that they should be on trial to begin with. We must develop and maintain at all times flexible attitudes, depending very much on the results of research. Those facilities for research should be established before anything else is done. This is very much an experiment, and the success of the assessment centres that will report and feed back information are vital to the success of the scheme. We must be tactful and avoid impairing the present activities of community organizations, and we must allay their fears. If these things are done, this good legislation will have my support, and it deserves to pass, but I repeat that there is a need for extreme caution to ensure that we do not undo the fine voluntary work that has been done over past decades in our community. Never let it be said that this Government has been responsible for killing the enterprise of voluntary organizations and destroying all the work that has been done. I support the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): Unlike the member for Bragg, who supports this Bill with some fears and reservations, I support it wholeheartedly. I commend the member for Bragg for the great amount of work he has obviously done in preparing his speech, but I suspect

that he lacks confidence in the ability of officers of the department to administer the Bill in the best interests of all concerned. I also believe that the fears he expressed will prove groundless.

Dr. Tonkin: I hope so, too.

Mr. KENEALLY: In supporting the second reading, I congratulate the Minister and compliment his efficient and hardworking departmental officers on presenting a Bill so comprehensive in its concept of what is required for welfare services throughout the community. Through discussions with members of Parliament in other States, I know that this legislation is being awaited anxiously there. There seems to be no doubt in their minds, as there is no doubt in my mind, that the community welfare legislation that will result will set new standards in this field that they must follow.

I do not believe that any member is unmindful of the tremendous amount of work entailed in the preparation of this Bill, which covers 119 pages and 252 clauses. Nor is any member unmindful of the need that exists in this State for the introduction of a framework that will give our welfare organizations a base from which they can cope with the ever-increasing complexity of problems with which they are faced. However, the interjection of the member for Rocky River, which is clearly shown on page 3554 of *Hansard*, indicates an appalling insensitivity to problems other than those of primary producers. There is no doubt that many of the honourable member's constituents will require assistance from the Department for Community Welfare, although the honourable member seems to be completely unaware of this. The honourable member also seems unaware that not all his constituents are members of the landed gentry and, if one were to believe what he tells us, even members who are closely connected with the rural industry may be requiring assistance from the Department for Community Welfare. As I thought that the honourable member's interjection was in bad taste, I felt compelled to comment on it.

Before considering the benefits that this Bill will bring to the community, I believe it important to consider the factors that create the conditions that make this type of legislation essential. Unlike Mr. Smith, the Minister in charge of social welfare in Victoria, and I suspect unlike some members opposite, I do not believe that if people are poor it is necessarily their own fault. I believe that most of the poor in our society are a product of a social system that perpetuates the con-

ditions of our depressed minorities. If we accept the proposition that a person is poor through his own fault, we will readily accept the proposition that the Government has no responsibility towards that person. On the other hand, if it is believed that people are poor because of a malfunction within our society, one must believe that the Government has a responsibility to alleviate as best it can the condition of these people.

Who are the poor within our society? As a general rule, this group includes Aborigines, pensioners, deserted wives with families, people in fixed-income groups and those families striving to cope on a weekly take-home pay of \$50 or less. In all, according to Mr. Justice Nimmo's report, in Australia over 1,000,000 people are in this category. What is the malfunction in our society? The answer to that question is obvious. It is the Commonwealth Liberal Government: a Government that does not insist on adequate social service payments, a Government that has rejected the result of the 1967 referendum that gave it the power to legislate for Aborigines; and a Government that has refused to accept the principle that everyone is entitled to a living wage. The Commonwealth Government has fostered within our society a situation whereby the spoils go to the victor, where the measure of success is based on material wealth, where the pressure to succeed is so great that people have not time to concern themselves with the problems of others, and where there is no place for people who, through no fault of their own, cannot cope.

If we were blessed with a Commonwealth Government that would accept its responsibility by removing the financial burden placed on these people, thereby removing much of the mental anguish they suffer, the resources of the State's welfare services would not be so strained. However, if the Commonwealth Government is reluctant to do this, it should give South Australia the money, as it has a Government that is willing, anxious and well-equipped to tackle the problem of social welfare in this community. Since coming into office, this Government has been able to bring to fruition many ideas regarding community welfare that have existed for some time. I refer to the amalgamation of the Social Welfare Department and the Aboriginal Affairs Department, the regionalization of community welfare activities, the co-ordination of welfare organizations, the provision of welfare activities with a human face tuned more to the needs of the people, greater involvement

of the community in welfare work, and greater autonomy being given to Aboriginal groups in determining what is best for them. However, the State's capacity to implement its desirable policies regarding community welfare is fettered by the amount of finance available.

I am certain that, with the election of a Commonwealth Labor Government later this year, the welfare of the people of Australia will receive the priority to which it is entitled, and money will have to be made available to the State for this welfare work commensurate with the need that already exists. I suspect that the most difficult problem faced by our Community Welfare Department is that of the Aborigine, a problem for which there is no easy answer. Even if there is no easy answer, one must eventually be found, and this must not be prejudiced by lack of finance. Both Commonwealth and State Government departments must be given the authority and the wherewithal to implement a total planned programme that includes the education, housing and employment of our Aboriginal community. The piecemeal approach that is currently followed because of lack of funds merely creates one difficulty by curing another. I should like to give an example of this. Much emphasis has, rightly so, been placed on the education of the young Aborigine. In Port Augusta, 60 or more children are at present attending high school. These children have been educated and trained to expect to be able to play an active part in community life. However, on leaving school at the age of 16 years they are faced with the difficulty of obtaining employment if they have not reached a high standard of education.

Of course, there is no difficulty in placing Aboriginal children with exceptional talents, just as there is no difficulty in placing any other type of child with similar talents. However, on balance, I suspect that the larger percentage of Aboriginal children who leave Port Augusta High School would fall within the average intelligence group, as do the average number of white children who leave that school. These children will be on the market and will be looking for work. As I have said previously, it is no good people telling these children at school that, if they work hard, pass their exams and obtain a good education, they will not have difficulty in obtaining work. At Port Augusta, there is little indication of Aborigines enjoying a good standard of employment, and the same applies in most other parts of the State. It is difficult to ask the private community or the private sector of industry

to take Aborigines into their employment if the Government departments are not willing to set an example. I consider that, through our State Government and Commonwealth Government departments at Port Augusta and at other centres, we should be doing this, as an example.

We are educating children but not employing them, so we are sending on to the market an educated and articulate group of people who are not willing to be classed as second-rate citizens. Of course, they have a right to be upset about being so classed. We hear about the Black Power Movement. Unless we can actively show these people that education gives employment, we cannot blame them for their frustrations and their reactions.

Dr. Eastick: Do you believe in Black Power?

Mr. KENEALLY: The interjection, although out of order, has been answered adequately by a member on this side. Black Power does not exist in Australia, but frustrations do exist here, and people have a right to be frustrated because we are not catering for them adequately. I believe that the department that we will have will cater for them.

Another problem that concerns the Aboriginal community is housing. Our Commonwealth Government, which has the wherewithal to provide housing, has provided only two houses at Port Augusta in the last two years. I refer to Port Augusta continually not only because it is the town in which I live and it is in my district, but also because I think it is typical of the towns in which Aborigines have problems in our society. Sufficient housing is not provided.

Mr. Mathwin: You would be lost in your speech if you didn't have the Commonwealth Government, wouldn't you?

Mr. KENEALLY: The people of Australia have given the Commonwealth Government the right to legislate for the betterment of Aborigines, but that Government has not legislated, so it must accept its share of responsibility. If it was willing to accept the powers given it, the strain would not be so hard and the task of our department in South Australia would not be so difficult.

At Port Augusta, as in other places, we hear of excessive drinking by Aborigines, and this is a problem, but drinking to excess is typical not so much of Aborigines as of depressed societies. The Aboriginal has nothing to do. He loses his pride and self-respect, and the young Aboriginal has lost his cultural heritage.

He has been cut off from his cultural heritage, so he becomes an easy prey to drink.

If we give an Aboriginal a reason for not drinking, he will give it up. The difficulty is that we do not give him that reason. Our community welfare officers, or social welfare officers as they have been called in the past, are often saddled with the blame if an Aboriginal drinks to excess and creates a nuisance. However, they should not be blamed, because they are welfare officers, not law enforcement officers. I may be departing from the Bill, but it is pertinent to say that we should have more law enforcement officers in areas that require them, and we do require more at Port Augusta.

Although an Aboriginal is entitled to all the benefits and privileges to which anyone else in our society is entitled, he is also expected to accept the same responsibility. There must be a concerted effort by all concerned to remedy situations such as that applying at Port Augusta, not only for the sake of the people currently involved but also (and more especially) of the younger people. I have spoken to responsible people in both white and black groups in our community who concur in this belief. The conditions that apply in some of our country centres must not be allowed to exist elsewhere.

However, there is a brighter side (as there always is) to the problems concerning Aborigines in Port Augusta. There are many success stories in this regard and, indeed, we have a large group of Aboriginal people in Port Augusta who fit well into the community and who take an active part in community life. They are first-class citizens, and no-one would doubt that. This could apply to all Aboriginal people, if they receive sufficient opportunity. I believe that the real solution to these problems lies in the young people and that community welfare policies must be directed towards a progressive and dynamic plan that ensures for these young people an equal position in our community life.

Unfortunately, we must accept the fact that in our community we will have whole generations of semi-tribal Aborigines too old and too set in their ways for change; they are certainly too old to be educated. This group represents a challenge that could be met under the provisions of clause 83 (c) of the Bill, and I certainly hope that that challenge will be met. Clause 83 is an exciting provision, which I believe will be fully implemented, and which sets out the powers and functions of

the Minister relating to Aboriginal affairs. Paragraph (6) provides:

... to encourage and assist the Aboriginal people to preserve and develop their own languages, traditions and arts;

I am especially interested in this provision because, following a question I asked in this House last year of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, as he was then, I had a meeting with 14 surviving initiated elders of the Adnjamatna tribe, a northern tribe of Aborigines. Present at that meeting also were an officer of the Aboriginal Affairs Department and a member of the research team of that department. I think we were all saddened by the attitude of these people. Previously, two or three elders of the tribe had expressed to me their concern that their whole cultural life and tribal lore were being lost and that these elders were the only people who retained the history, that could be passed on. I was asked to approach the Government to see whether land could be set aside for these people so that they might be able to identify themselves and continue their traditions. At this meeting, held on a Monday evening, it was obvious to us that these people believed no-one today would be interested in this history. They certainly believed that future generations would not be interested in their history. They believed this sincerely. They thought it was much more important (and it is important) to have their children educated in what they considered to be the white man's way, because they thought no-one was interested in their traditions. They believed that their children had to be, in effect, black while men. They believe this sincerely, as they also believe that there is no part in this world of ours for people of their background. It is not their fault that they believe this: it is our fault, because this is what we have led them to believe.

I have tried to encourage them to retain a love of their own culture, of which they should be proud. They say that their children, who have their own problems, are not proud of the parents' culture. I assured them that their grandchildren and future generations will acknowledge this culture, because the day will come when the history of the Aboriginal will be much sought after. I could not convince them of this; they were more concerned to have their children educated in our way of life rather than in their way of life. They did not expect their children to be greatly concerned about the Aboriginal way of life. This fact saddened me and the other people there, for there is a

place for both cultures. I believe that clause 83 (1) (b) will help to solve this problem. Through its provisions, the Community Welfare Department will be able to initiate a programme that will convince these people that we are concerned about the matter and that they should retain the areas that they consider sacred to them. They should be eager for the Government to assist them to preserve their paintings and sacred emblems. Currently, they do not seem concerned about this; they say that when they die they are not worried about what happens to these objects. I am excited about this provision because its implementation will improve our relationship with the Aborigines in this respect.

Under clause 90, an Aboriginal charged with an offence will be provided with legal counsel. I am sure the member for Playford will deal with this matter in more detail than I will. Currently the situation is that, if an Aboriginal is charged with a indictable offence, he is provided with counsel, but he receives no such assistance when he is charged with a non-indictable offence. Again, I will refer to what has happened at Port Augusta where, unfortunately, many Aborigines are sent to gaol. Sending them to gaol is not the solution to the problem. I believe that, through closer contact with the court at Port Augusta, we will be able to do much more for these people. Although I know that, generally, because of the good will of the people concerned, what is provided in this clause has been unofficially practised over the years, the practice will now be implemented officially.

The member for Bragg expressed some reservation whether we should set up numerous community welfare centres, saying that we should set up one or two as a test and, if they were successful, we could expand the programme. I infer from that that, if they were not successful, the honourable member would say that some adjustment should be made to them. I believe that they will be successful in the Port Augusta and Whyalla areas, where there is a crying need for regional welfare centres because of the Aboriginal problem. I apologize for referring to it as a problem, because the total Aboriginal situation at Port Augusta is not entirely a problem. There is a great need for closer contact with Aborigines at Port Augusta and a need to cater for transients, because Port Augusta is a cross-road for people going east and west and north and south. Often people stop at Port Augusta, which is as far as they are able to go because their finances seem to run out. There is a

need for a regional welfare organization there and I am confident that the department will also see it that way.

Whyalla, in common with many other areas in the State, has a large migrant population and certain problems. I look forward to an office being established at Whyalla to study closely and efficiently the problems of the Whyalla community. As the member for Bragg also said, the Bill covers more aspects of community welfare than can be dealt with in the short time available. I appreciate that I have not dealt with the Bill in detail but that my comments on it have been somewhat superficial. I consider that what I have had to say needed to be said and that following speakers will cover many other of the more important aspects of the Bill. For my own part, I have had tremendous assistance from the social welfare officers in my district. Many problems have been brought to me which, frankly, as a member of Parliament I felt completely incompetent to deal with but, because of the social welfare office at Port Augusta, I was able to refer people to it and their problems were solved. The department, which is staffed by people of the highest character, does the most difficult of work—work which I, for one, could not possibly tackle. It is work that brings

little personal reward, and the officers do not get much encouragement from outside bodies. Their work is entirely

worth while, and I am sure that I speak on behalf of all members. I particularly wish to compliment the social welfare and

Aboriginal welfare officers in my district who have been of much assistance not only to me but to the district generally.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I regret that I cannot be as eulogistic about the Bill as the member for Stuart has been, but I hope that I can be somewhat more accurate in what I say than he was early in his speech, when he discussed the question of the amalgamation of the two departments, about which I shall say more later. When he was speaking, I could not help thinking of what happened only a few weeks after the change of Govern-

ment, and perhaps I can recall this happening.

Toward the end of our term in office we arranged a survey of Aboriginal opinion.

Mr. Kenally: I gave credit for that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Stuart cannot possibly know what I am about to say, and, by interjection, he has shown that he does not know what I am going to say.

We arranged for a survey of Aboriginal opinion—

Mr. Payne: You have enough problems of your own on your side of the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry that no member opposite seems interested in what I am about to say.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I make the same request to you, Sir, about other members.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Extraneous remarks are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry, but the member for Elizabeth thinks that I am being idiotic.

Mr. Clark: I just said that we were reacting to idiotic interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall start again, and I hope we can wipe the slate clean. A few weeks after we left office, the results of the survey of Aboriginal opinion were released by the present Minister and, naturally, under the new regime, it was a press release that was widely distributed, and it was picked up by an interstate commentator, Mr. Ellis Blain, of the Australian Broadcasting Commission. I did not hear this, but it was heard by someone who told me about it immediately afterwards. Mr. Blain went through the press release and said what a very good idea it was that Aborigines themselves were being consulted, and he concluded by saying, "Good on Mr. King for having such a good idea." I could not help being reminded of that incident when the member for Stuart was speaking.

Mr. Kenelly: I knew what you were going to say, after all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid I cannot quite accept that. I congratulate the member for Bragg on the comprehensive way in which he dealt with the principles in the Bill and the whole question of social welfare, and I do not intend to go over the ground he covered, because it was adequately covered for this stage of the Bill. In all fairness, I must say that I agree with many of the things said by the member for Stuart. However, to some extent the debate at this stage is an unreal debate. The Minister is, as all members know, still seeking the comments of outside organizations that are interested in one or other aspect of social welfare. I believe that the Minister has given the organizations until tomorrow to give their comments to him. I believe that this Bill will go no further than into Commit-

tee, and it will take the Minister some time to collate the comments and translate them, where appropriate, into amendments to the Bill. So, any member who thinks that the Bill is in the form in which it will leave this place is probably mistaken, and we do not yet know, because of this, just what the Bill will be like when the Minister has finished amending it. So, to some extent the debate is unreal and the proper place to debate some aspects of the Bill will be in Committee.

Soon after I came to office as Minister of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs two things happened: first, the then Director of Social Welfare, Mr. Gordon Cook, died and, secondly, I became convinced, as a result of my experience in office, that the amalgamation of the Aboriginal Affairs Department and the Social Welfare Department was desirable and necessary. That move was strongly opposed by many people, and most of them were public servants. However, I made the recommendation to Cabinet and Cabinet accepted the principle of the amalgamation of the two departments. I believed that the time had come when we should recognize administratively, as we did theoretically, that Aborigines were members of the community who should have, as nearly as possible, the same rights and obligations as any other person. It seemed to be wrong that there should be a separate department to deal with the Aboriginal inhabitants of this State; that was the crux of the matter.

I have mentioned the death of Mr. Cook and it seemed impossible to embark on a reorganization of the Social Welfare Department's activities until the appointment of his successor. We knew what we wanted to do, but it seemed impossible to carry these ideas into effect without the new permanent head. However, it was not possible to proceed immediately to the appointment of a new permanent head because the question of the amalgamation had first to be settled and then carried into effect. As a step in that process we embarked on the survey of Aboriginal opinion to which I have earlier referred. The purpose of that survey was to find out from the Aboriginal inhabitants of this State just what they considered should be available to them by way of services from the State Government. This was in itself a fascinating exercise. It was greeted with a good measure of suspicion by some members of the Aboriginal community, and I believe that this was justified. I hope that my predecessor but one,

the present Minister, has been able to use the material that was gathered from that survey. We were out of office before the appointment of a Director-General or, as he then was, and I think still is, the director of the two departments, although the making of that appointment was in train at that time. Certainly, the decision for the amalgamation was taken and the process was in train.

I am glad that the present Government has carried the process through which we had in mind and which we began. However, from that, I do not want it to be taken that I claim any of the credit for this Bill, and so far as credit is due, the work entailed in the preparation of this Bill has been carried out since we left office. However, it is fair to say that this Bill is founded on the decisions that were taken during the period 1968 to 1970. There have been (and it is only fair to say this to the Minister) some rumblings from social workers with voluntary organizations that the new ideas and processes are being imposed on them without sufficient discussion between them and the departmental officers who are responsible for putting those proposals into effect. Whether or not that is justified I cannot say, but certainly that is being said.

There is only one other matter to which I should like to refer at this stage. I have been told (and I am sure by the time we discuss the Bill in Committee next week I will have had other feed back) that there is some complaint about the provisions in the new Bill regarding Aborigines, but these are sketchy and inadequate. I do not take that matter any further at present, because these things should all be developed in Committee. I am glad that the Government has introduced the Bill and that there is to be a reorganization. This is what a Liberal Government would have done. I reserve my right to speak to the various detailed proposals and either to accept them or to criticize them when the time comes.

I am sure that this Bill is a step in the right direction and I hope that, with the goodwill of the members on both sides of the House and also of those engaged in the field of social welfare, this legislation can be made to work, so that it will be of real benefit to those in the community who need the services that are provided.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I must begin by paying a tribute to the member for Stuart. I think all members would agree that his was one of the finest speeches they have heard from him in this place and, perhaps, from

any backbencher on either side of the House. I believe it was a fine speech because he spoke directly from the heart. When speaking in this debate, I am seeking to avoid, wherever possible, duplication of material which might be used by subsequent speakers or which has been used already by those who have contributed to the debate. I take, as my method of approach to the measure, how I see the need for reforms set out in the legislation in a certain part of the metropolitan area and how I see the reforms applying to that area. I have chosen an area that roughly coincides with my own district, which is the area I know best.

If one returns to the 1961 report of the Town Planning Committee, one will note that the future of metropolitan Adelaide was seen as expanding through a series of what might be called semi-self-contained regional areas. This was by no means a clearly delineated thing, because the old core of metropolitan Adelaide had grown so large by that time that it was difficult to balance it with some of the newer developing areas. If one looked at the map that was set out at that time, one would have seen a regional area in the vicinity of Tea Tree Gully. One would also have seen areas at Salisbury and Elizabeth and, south of the city, an area that could roughly be called the Noarlunga area. I should like to consider that area, examine its problems, the reasons why it has experienced so many problems, and the reasons why this decentralization of the department's services is not only long overdue but will also be beneficial to the people of this area.

I should like first to examine the Noarlunga area and make a few remarks of a quantitative nature. One could say without too much exaggeration that this area has experienced what could be termed a population explosion. One finds, for example, that the inter-censal increase of population in the Noarlunga area actually doubled the numbers. In the 1966 census the Noarlunga district was shown to have a population of 14,214, whereas the 1971 census showed that it had a population of 28,460. I also include urban Meadows in the general Noarlunga area; that is to say, the area behind the shops at O'Halloran Hill. This area similarly had a dramatic increase during that period, namely, from 1,248 to 3,321. It is interesting to compare these dramatic increases with, say, an average middle-aged suburb, such as the area controlled by the Prospect council. That is another area well known to me, and it had a decrease in population of 704 during

that inter-censal period. The point I make here is that the very meagre public services in the Noarlunga area are under increasing strain as the population in the area builds up.

The build-up in population, of course, arises from three causes, namely, the entry of migrants to the area, the movement to the area of native-born young married couples, and a very high birth rate. It is interesting to note, if we look at the age profile in the 1966 census figures (I was not able to get the 1971 figures), that at that time there were 2,193 persons aged up to four years in the Noarlunga and urban Meadows area, whereas the Prospect council had only 1,320. At the other end of the scale, those aged 60 plus, there were 1,216 in Noarlunga and urban Meadows and 4,898 in the Prospect area, so down south we are philoprogenitive, if nothing else.

Further, the population forecast suggests that this dramatic increase will continue and that by 1976 the population of Noarlunga will be 53,000 and that of urban Meadows will be 11,000. That, quantitatively, is the problem we have to deal with in the Noarlunga region. I turn now to a few qualitative aspects of this, problems of marriage break-up and youth problems. It has these social problems, and also a constant hidden social problem associated with the aged, because it is easy in an area such as Noarlunga to forget that there are old people there. The aged people tend to be hidden by the deluge of the young.

I ask why social problems exist in an area such as this, and I shall try to answer that. The first thing that we must say is that it is predominantly a low-income area. I speak as a member of the Labor Party and as a social democrat, and honourable members will understand that I do not use that term in any derogatory way. After all, I was earning only \$2,300 a year before I was elected to this place, and that is a low income if anything is. Nonetheless, this is a low-income area, and it must be conceded that low-income earners will face greater social problems than the more affluent people, largely because the low-income earners lack the financial resources to deal with many of the problems that the citizen meets from time to time.

There was a time when it was the conventional wisdom of society that people were poor because God was punishing them for their sins. I do not know that this attitude has changed much in the last 50 or 60 years: we

have merely secularized the attitude. We no longer say that God is punishing them for their sins; we say, rather, that they are punishing themselves or that society is punishing them and that this is a jolly good thing. I think there is a gloss, a veneer or a sophistication over this, but it still tends to be part of the general conventional wisdom. Certainly, if this attitude is not explicated from time to time it is implicit in the way in which many social welfare services are run, or expected by many people in the community to be run.

First, of course, the area of which I am speaking is a low-income area, and this partly arises from the fact that land values on the fringe of the city are lower than they are closer to the city. Secondly, we note that many migrants live there and migrants, when they come out here, encounter many problems. Some of these problems arise from the fact that they are unable to bring many resources with them, and so they arrive here with little more than the clothes in which they are standing. Some of the problems, I regret to say, arise from misinformation provided by our migrant authorities in the U.K. and in other places. A man came to see me a few months ago who originally approached Australia House midway through last year; he asked what the employment situation was likely to be in Australia (specifically South Australia) in about October or November, 1971 (that is to say, later that year), and he was told that he would have no problems whatsoever. Yet, so far as I know, this man, who comes here certainly without paper qualifications but with much experience in administration and in local government in the U.K., still has been unable to obtain employment.

These are some of the problems foisted on the migrant when he comes here. Regarding the European migrant, quite apart from people from the U.K., we find that the language barrier has to be overcome. I am sure many members will have shared with me the unusual experience of interviewing people in their homes and having their school-going child act as an interpreter, because the parents lack a command of the English language; and, of course, we lack any knowledge of their own native tongue. This makes job hunting so much more difficult; it makes it difficult for the people concerned to ascertain what are the various services and facilities available to them in the local community. Therefore, the fact that the area is to a considerable extent a migrant area obviously exacerbates the problem that exists.

Thirdly, the area is to a considerable extent a Housing Trust area: more and more people are having to turn to the trust for housing assistance these days, because private building is largely pricing itself, or being priced, out of the range of the low-income earner. I have much praise for the structure and the type of building being constructed by the trust in the Christie Downs area of my district; it is far and away superior to the type of building that was put up by the trust 10 years ago for rental accommodation. Furthermore, I think that what is being done in the Christie Downs area will in the long run be of considerable value to the area. It is the only part of the district that shows any evidence of overall planning in the alignment of streets, the attempt to minimize fast through traffic in areas where there is a high pedestrian concentration, and the various other things that we are increasingly coming to accept as a normal and necessary part of town planning. Nonetheless, considerable problems are encountered by this large mass of below-average income earners who are placed in this area.

Moreover, the problems exist largely because of the lack of community facilities in the area. Basically, this is probably the problem which more than anything else should be dealt with by those who are concerned with Australian cities. We increasingly have the situation wherein people are thrust out to the fringe of the city because that is the only place where land is available or where the land price is within reach of their pockets. When they get to these areas, they find meagre community facilities, and they put further pressure on those facilities.

They find that they are paying rates probably considerably in excess of what, say, their parents are paying, although the parents are living closer to the city and are at a stage of life where they are far better able to meet the high rates than are their recently married children. The parents are probably getting much better community facilities for the rates they are paying. This situation in the outlying areas does not arise because the local council is storing up huge surpluses. Far from it: it is probably rapidly going broke simply trying to maintain some sort of standard of services in the area.

If honourable members want to see a good example of regressive taxation, I suggest they look at the scale of local government payments being exacted in some of the various income areas around our city or any of the

great cities of Australia. There is a lack of recreational facilities, despite the great masses of open land which exist in these areas. There is a lack of halls in which to hold public meetings, and a lack of youth clubs, gymnasias and so on. I could go on multiplying the examples. Further, the distance problem arises. All of these facilities exist somewhere in the metropolitan area, but these people are 16, 18 or 25 miles away; or they are 30, 45 or 60 minutes away. All of this involves not only time but also money for that segment of the population who can least afford to be putting out money for this type of expenditure.

I now turn to another form of problem that exists in areas such as this. It would be wrong to think of these areas as simply completely new housing areas that have spread over virgin soil by way of subdivision. That is not the true picture, because old, decaying townships are engulfed by the oncoming spread of suburbia. What happens in the old, decaying townships is that a collection of dwellings which may be 50 or 80 years old (in a few exceptional cases they may be 100 years old) provide a necessary form of cheap rental accommodation for those who need it. These houses become the refuge of deserted wives with a family, or for men in insecure employment, men who are unemployed for long periods of time. Therefore, there is a collection of (and I say this charitably) hard cases existing in a small area that is in an area where there are few facilities to meet the problems these people actually have.

Another problem to which I should have referred is that the industries in these fringe areas tend to be of the type in which there is a fluctuating labour demand. One trade union leader a short while ago suggested that the type of employment for the unskilled in the motor vehicle industry could perhaps now be regarded as seasonal employment. Although that may be a slight exaggeration, it is not far off the mark. Fluctuations in the labour market bring with them inevitable social problems. They are some of the reasons why grave social problems exist in the fringe areas of our cities.

No doubt the member for Playford, the member for Tea Tree Gully, the member for Salisbury and the member for Elizabeth could underwrite much of what I have said. However, some facilities are available in these areas. For example, I refer to the emergency relief group in my district which provides food, parcels, vouchers and clothing to families that are extremely hard hit. The group

does considerable good work. It obtains some money from time to time from local business houses, councils, and the larger local industrial concerns. The Good Neighbour Council does considerable work in a limited area, namely, that of the migrant.

I recall visiting the Elizabeth counselling centre last year and speaking to the social worker in charge. The centre was established by private initiative, and I was extremely encouraged by the various levels of social work and counselling available there. I have some connection with an experiment being run by a church in my district which makes available interest-free loans to hard-up families, provided that they will for the time being place their financial affairs in the hands of one of two accountants who are active in the local church community. This group is doing very good work, and it has been well received. Again, these people are not incapable of running their own affairs in the normal course of events, but they run up against problems that have completely overwhelmed them, so they badly need help in these areas. In this case, private initiative has shown the way regarding what can be done. I will not have time to refer to other organizations such as St. Vincent de Paul and others that do good work around the suburbs.

The point about the 1962 Town Planning Report with which I started my remarks is that all the facilities that exist for people in the centre of the city should also be made available in these regions so that they can have their own civic centres, large shopping facilities, health facilities and, by implication, also have their own social welfare facilities. Parliamentary Paper No. 23 for the year ended June, 30, 1971, which was the Report of the Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs, gives some advance notice of what the legislation would contain, because it mentions dividing the metropolitan area into three divisions and the rest of the State into two divisions. It also mentions regions, and says that within each region a number of community welfare centres would be established to replace district offices where they exist and provide services beyond those already available.

Some of the proposed future locations for these offices, in addition to those already existing at Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully, were Campbelltown, Croydon, Woodville, Port Pirie, Christies Beach, Norwood, Murray Bridge and Yorke Peninsula. I believe that these centres could provide a useful function by making available to local people facilities that other-

wise would entail a long and costly journey to the city if they were to be made use of. I have met the social welfare officer who is active in the Christies Beach area, and I have inspected the new facilities available there. Consequently, I can testify to the good work being done by that officer and the staff there. Of course, those facilities are by no means as ambitious as those envisaged once the full regional centre of the Department for Community Welfare gets under way in the area. This is something that a Government has to do.

A book from which I have quoted previously in this House, in reviewing the recent political history of the State, had something to say about the Playford period. It pointed out that, during that period, the Government used some quasi-socialistic means for developmental purposes in this State; for example, there was the South Australian Housing Trust, the nationalization of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, and the active involvement of Government in attracting new industries to this State. But the writer goes on to say that that Government and its Leader believed (in a way that Adam Smith never quite believed) the field of charity to be very much a private enterprise.

I believe that both Parties in this State would disagree that that should be the case in the 1970's but, whatever may have been the case and however accurate or otherwise that writer may have been in describing the situation in this State in the 1940's and 1950's, Governments must now be actively involved in this field. At the same time, we must realize that a considerable amount of information, goodwill and expertise has been built up through the activities of private agencies over the years. This is one reason why I welcome the setting up of advisory councils that will assist the Government agencies in providing the type of help that should be made available in this area.

I enthusiastically support the Bill. I thought that the best way I could give some sort of contribution to this debate was not to run over the ground that other members had already covered but to look at one specific area and its problems, and to suggest why those problems made this legislation urgent. Of course, the legislation is not the most important part of what we are doing; the important part will come with administration and with making available finance so that the reforms envisaged in the Bill and the physical structure of the

regional centres are made available as soon as possible.

I conclude with one thought about the experimental nature of the Bill. This is an attempt to decentralize in a way that has not been done in any other Government department. I think we will view this experiment with much interest not only from the viewpoint of the humanitarian gains that will flow from this decentralization but also from the viewpoint of the ramifications it will have for other Government departments. One thinks in particular of the Education Department as an area in which we should be experimenting with far more decentralization.

I am not the sort of person who believes that this is the day and age in which a Government can shirk its responsibilities in any field. Whether we like it or not, in the future there will be increasing Government activity in practically every sphere of human endeavour, and I make no apology for saying that, because such activity is necessary and desirable. If this is the case, what we must be really looking to is the most efficient form of administration by which the Government can disburse the services that it is increasingly being called on to disburse. This is one experiment that we should look at with much interest, because I sincerely believe that it may have ramifications in many other areas.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): The introduction of this composite Bill is no surprise to Parliament or to members of the South Australian community, because it has been foreshadowed for many years. However, I am sorry that little recognition was given by the Minister in explaining this Bill to the originator of the whole concept. I thought that the member for Mitcham was modest about the part that he played that led to the eventual presentation of this Bill. I believe it is only fair to the honourable member that this House should know that this idea was born in the mind of the member for Mitcham as far back as early 1968. It was then submitted to Cabinet that this departmental amalgamation take place. The job of researching, investigating and testing out the opinion of Aborigines, who were under the aegis of one of the departments to be amalgamated was undertaken by one of the Public Service Commissioners (Mr. R. Bakewell). It was to him that the task of bringing this to fruition was given.

As the member for Mitcham has said, the final report and the result of the surveys were not submitted until after we went out of

office in 1970. I should like to pay a tribute to Mr. Bakewell and to the officers of the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department for the detailed work that they put in to bring the proposal to the stage where the legislation has been introduced into this House. There is no doubt in the minds of most people who are interested in this matter that such a Bill is long overdue. The Social Welfare Act, which is the predecessor to this Bill, was based on the Maintenance Act, which came into force in 1926. I believe that some of the provisions in that Bill were based on even earlier Acts, so there is no doubt in the minds of those people involved in any kind of social welfare work that a Bill to consolidate amendments made over the years should be introduced in the form of the present Bill, which deal with the setting up of the new Department for Community Welfare.

It is obvious from the wide ranging speeches heard in this House this evening on many aspects arising from the Bill that much time could be spent speaking on a great variety of matters, but most speakers have wisely dealt with individual aspects of the Bill, aspects about which they are most familiar. The speeches to which I have listened have been most interesting, especially that of the member for Bragg in taking the lead on behalf of the Opposition. The honourable member's speech was excellent and covered most of the main points of the Bill. Of course, he can do this because he was for some time a member of the Social Welfare Advisory Council and is, therefore, well qualified to speak and to lead the Opposition's debate on this Bill.

Most discussion will take place, and more information will be sought from the Minister, on different aspects of this Bill when it is in Committee. I believe that we in South Australia are in a unique position. People from overseas have commented on the high standard of the voluntary agencies that operate in so many fields in South Australia, not only in the social welfare field but also in those areas where people are working for unfortunate persons who suffer from a variety of disabilities. I remember many years ago attending the annual meeting of the Kindergarten Union, when the newly-appointed and newly-arrived chaplain for Toc H, who had lived in many parts of the world, was the guest speaker. In opening his remarks, he said:

I have travelled the world and I have lived in many places and served in many communities, and never in any part of the world have I seen such a happy marriage as there

is in South Australia between voluntary agencies and Government finance.

That, I believe, is true, and anyone who has had anything to do with voluntary organizations would realize this. South Australians have been very community minded in the number of organizations that have been set up to help people in some way or another. So often these organizations have been established and carried on for a great length of time, sometimes under great difficulties, providing the kind of services that are so necessary in the field in which they are operating and, having established their *bona fides*, have been able to go to the Government of the day. Because that Government has been aware of the work they have done, it has provided them with finance.

We in South Australia are lucky that we have so many voluntary agencies covering so many different aspects of community life. There is no doubt (and over the years I have had much association with this kind of thing) that in a small community like Adelaide there has been much overlapping. I know that various attempts have been made to overcome this and to try to co-ordinate services with the idea of conserving finances and resources, doing more for one group of people than has been done in the past. Attempts have been made to bring some of these similar organizations together.

A considerable time before I became a member of Parliament, I was for many years chairman of the committee appointed by the South Australian Council of Social Services. That committee had as its responsibility the co-ordination of services for the physically handicapped. It was a most active committee, and one of its main tasks was to conduct a survey on the number of physically handicapped people in South Australia. This was a difficult thing to do, because in those days people's attitude was probably not as enlightened as it is today. Some voluntary agencies that the committee approached for information about the people they were helping were jealous of the position they occupied, and there was not the same effort to eliminate this overlapping and co-ordinate resources as there is today. The survey that we tried to conduct was only partly satisfactory, because of this reluctance to pass on to a central committee, a committee representative of most of the organizations in this field, information that could be used for the benefit of everyone.

Today our attitude to many community programmes and many voluntary agencies working in various fields has changed for the better.

We are now much more successful in getting people with a disability (whether it is a social or a physical one) acceptable to, and made to feel a part of, the community, but I still believe that much care will have to be taken in the task of bringing these voluntary agencies together. I understand from what a previous speaker has said that the Minister has not yet obtained all the reactions of the voluntary agencies to the proposals contained in the legislation, and I understand that, because of that, progress will be reported when we go into Committee so that these views may be obtained. I hope the Minister makes the reactions known to us so that in Committee we will know the attitude of organizations and individuals to the things provided by this Bill.

I was interested to read in the Minister's explanation that he had no doubt about the problems that faced those concerned with implementing this legislation in bringing about the co-ordination of welfare services, and I think this fact cannot be over-estimated. As I have said, it would not be the first time an attempt has been made to eliminate the overlapping of welfare agencies. I do not know how many members are conversant with the work of the Citizens Welfare Bureau and the excellent publication the bureau prepares. If members look at that publication, they will see the great proliferation of services in certain aspects of community welfare and help for disabled people.

Mr. Coumbe: It's a very worthwhile booklet.

Mrs. STEELE: It is an excellent booklet and originally arose from the operations of the South Australian Council of Social Welfare. Now that I have the opportunity, I pay a great tribute to that organization, because it has been a motivating force for many welfare innovations that have occurred in the community of South Australia. The council initiated much research into all kinds of community problems (I remember the effects of automation was one), and the place they occupy in the community is respected by people in the areas they occupy about which we are talking. One thing proposed in the legislation is the setting up of community centres, and here the greatest possible use will be made of people in the community who have special skills, people who are associated with voluntary agencies.

One also realizes that, in this connection, it is intended that these centres will be proliferated as time goes on, and I would add a word of caution, as I think the member for

Bragg did, that it might be as well to set up several of these centres in the various kinds of community, such as rural and city areas and poorer and more affluent areas, to find out what is the reaction to community involvement.

Another aspect of this comes to mind when one reads the Minister's explanation of the Bill. These centres will take much starting. I know that in recent years in-service training has been provided by the Social Welfare Department, and the number of trained staff has greatly increased. However, it is obvious from the explanation given that the number of staff required will grow considerably in the next few years. This is not an inexpensive business and, additionally, we must obtain the services of people who are willing to undertake this sort of work in the community.

Mr. Goumbe: As a vocation.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, indeed. I suppose that to some people this may be overstating the position in these days when so many professions are open to both men and women. We see today many more men becoming involved in the study of social welfare and undertaking courses in social studies. Nevertheless, a certain kind of person must be attracted to this vocational work. When we think of the opportunities offered to young people today in all kinds of discipline at the tertiary level, we realize that the department, which needs trained personnel, will be competing for people who have the requisite qualifications to enter a number of other professions that offer counter attractions today. Staffing could initially be difficult, although the head of the department and his officers may consider that this will be overcome by providing more and regular in-service training courses.

Another new development concerns the consultative councils, and it is at this level that local government will be involved. I remember some years ago Mrs. Barbara Garrett, one of our most respected and highly qualified social workers in Adelaide, coming to see me at Parliament House to ascertain whether she could gain support for the idea of setting up social welfare centres attached to local councils. She and another social worker who came with her were anxious to know whether local government could be interested in this type of development. This matter, which has been considered for a long time, is now being provided for in the Bill, and local government will definitely be encouraged to participate. I see this as a good thing, as

one only has to talk to people involved in the activities of the Citizens' Advice Bureau to realize what little knowledge people have of the many agencies available to them and to realize also how they are at a loss sometimes to know how to go about getting help.

If this service is provided for people in their own council areas, it will be much easier for them to approach trained people to obtain this sort of assistance. I believe that we need to move gradually in setting up these consultative councils and community welfare centres. We should see perhaps in the first two years of operation how they are functioning, where improvements may be effected and whether they are fulfilling the function for which they were created in the first instance.

So far, I have referred mainly to community welfare. This legislation also entails co-ordinating the Aboriginal Affairs Department with the Community Welfare Department, and this is a much more complicated matter altogether. In recent years, the Commonwealth and the State Governments have moved towards providing more facilities for Aborigines so that their welfare can be promoted, but we still have a long way to go. Although this legislation presumes that Aborigines shall, as nearly as possible, be given the same sort of facilities and treatment as white people are given, nevertheless the authors of the Bill realize that certain areas of the department will have to be devoted directly to Aborigines. I believe that in this area we will probably strike more difficulties than we will find in any other part of the community welfare cupboard. All members are aware of the problems facing those charged with the responsibility of looking after the welfare of Aborigines, and of the problems facing the Aborigines as they are absorbed into a white community. All of us know of local problems. This evening the member for Stuart referred to the situation in Port Augusta, which is in the district he represents. I believe that the greatest difficulties will be faced in this area of community welfare.

This massive Bill covers a great many matters relating to community welfare, and advances new concepts and attitudes with regard to various problems in the community. I believe that in Committee we shall have a better opportunity to probe some of the clauses which may be controversial and which may require elucidation by the Minister. At that stage, we shall become much better informed as to what the Government plans in this field. I stress that, although I support

the Bill at this stage, I believe there is a need for caution in approaching some of the problems and in setting up some of these community centres and consultative councils. Many people in the community are most anxious to do work in these fields to assist people who may be in more need one way or another than other people in the community. The right kind of people must be chosen to ensure that the plan designed by the Government for development of community welfare will be in the best possible hands. I support the Bill.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I, too, support the Bill, which is indeed large, as the member for Davenport has just said. I have often thought that this Parliament might well think of developing the idea of committees which, in cases such as this, could investigate Bills, reporting to the House on them. By this, I have in mind all-Party committees such as exist in other Parliaments. The Bill, which is a pleasure compared with the existing state of affairs, repeals three Acts now separately in existence and provides a new and comprehensive scheme in the whole field of community welfare and Aboriginal affairs.

It would not be appropriate to let the occasion pass without congratulating the Minister on the considerable amount of work he has done on the Bill, also his department's officers who have worked very hard to put the Bill in the good state in which we find it. In particular, I refer to Mr. Cox, Mr. Headland and Mr. Harris. It is also appropriate to refer to the member for Mitchell, who took part in some of the conferences on this legislation and who made several constructive suggestions which have been incorporated in the Bill. I think that he, too, ought to be congratulated.

I have listened to the speeches made by members on both sides of the House. I noted that the member for Bragg, who led the debate for the Opposition, made one general criticism in addition to several specific criticisms. What I intend to do is to deal with his general criticism, with some of the points I consider to be positive constructive points, and with some specific criticisms he made. The member's general criticism referred to a lack of detail in the Bill. He said that the Bill, being new and important, did not go into sufficient detail in defining its concept. He gave one or two examples, but this is the kind of Bill in which one does not want too precise and limited definitions.

This is the kind of Bill by which the local community is being encouraged to develop its own ideas in concert with the Minister and to adapt the various centres and boards that will be set up to suit local conditions. This is obvious, because what is appropriate for Ceduna may not be appropriate for Port Augusta or, indeed, for Norwood.

On the positive side, the Bill contains several specific clauses to which I shall refer. One in particular is clause 47, which is important because it establishes review boards which will ensure that each child who is under the care and control of the Minister for a period in excess of one year shall be reported upon in each successive year. That is of paramount importance, because without the systematic and scientific assessment of the position of the child on a regular basis, it would be difficult for those who have the upbringing of the child to take the positive and correct steps necessary. I point out to members the importance and novelty of clause 47.

Clause 60, which is of great importance, provides for *ex officio* visitors to homes. It provides that all Ministers and all members of the Legislature, any judge, and any person authorized in writing for the purpose by the Minister shall be entitled to visit every home established under this subdivision and the persons detained or resident therein. Clause 60 is important because it makes each member of this Parliament (and I hesitate to use the term) a visiting magistrate, as it were. Perhaps I should use the term "welcome visitor" or "acknowledged visitor". The member could visit each home in his electoral district; it would give him the opportunity to look at the situation and report to the Minister on any developments he might suggest.

Clause 90 deals with legal advice for Aborigines. It does not solve the problem completely, but it goes a good deal of the way towards doing so. When Aborigines are brought before our courts of law they are in a very difficult situation. They face a dual problem: first, they have the problem of reconciling the tribal laws that may bind them in their own conscience with the laws of our community and, secondly, they find it difficult to understand the laws of our community. This clause provides, for the first time, that when an Aboriginal is charged with an indictable offence he must be provided with counsel. Even when he is charged with an offence that is not an indictable offence (such offences include fairly minor offences) the

court may inform the Director-General (if there is no departmental officer in court) and the Director-General may, if he thinks it necessary, request an adjournment to arrange representation for the Aboriginal.

As an example, I wish to quote the case of an Aboriginal client who was assigned to me by the Law Society. He was charged with a series of offences. On the face of it, it appeared that there was no reasonable excuse that could be put to any court. The Aboriginal had been on a drunken spree, had smashed property, and assaulted his wife and other persons. I took instructions from that Aboriginal as best I could. The best I could get from him was that he acknowledged his guilt. I contacted the Aboriginal Affairs Department and found a lady who pointed out that the man suffered from Huntington's chorea, a progressive degenerative brain disease. The incidence throughout the world of this disease is about .002 of the population, but in the southern districts of South Australia 33 per cent of the entire Aboriginal population is affected by the disease. Its effect is to produce a degenerative circuit. The disease itself corrupts the brain and, in doing so, produces an excessive craving for alcohol. The consumption of alcohol in turn accelerates the degeneration of the brain. If I had not contacted the department I would not have known that that man had suffered from the disease, as a result of which he committed the offence. In the light of that knowledge, the magistrate awarded an appropriate sentence and appointed a probation officer.

At the time, I asked myself how many Aborigines in this State had been wrongly convicted of offences, even of murder. Further, I wondered how many Aborigines who had suffered from Huntington's chorea had been hung or sentenced to life imprisonment. The health records are available in the department, and an exhaustive study has been done. Without legal representation and without departmental assistance, such things would never have been known. I believe that it is not just Aboriginal people who should be entitled to legal representation in indictable offences: I believe every person should be entitled to representation at the expense of the State, as normally applies in most American States.

This clause is a step in the right direction, but it is still not a complete solution of the problem. Having got over the barrier of lack of communication, the next problem in dealing with an Aboriginal is one of trust. We need

some sort of liaison system whereby, instead of the legal representative getting his instructions direct and alone from his client, he can be assisted in getting those instructions by another member of the Aboriginal tribe to which the client belongs, by another Aboriginal, or by a person in whom the Aboriginal can place his trust. There are far too many cases where Aborigines are pleading guilty to charges on which they are not guilty, purely because they do not understand the charges or because they are afraid of the police. They are in a situation where they are completely culturally backward and, like all culturally backward Central European and South European people that we have in this country, they are frightened of the police and plead guilty to offences of which they are not guilty.

Solicitors in this State have set up a panel which, although not recognized by the department because it does not see eye to eye on the matter with us, will be acting through the Law Society and will be taking cases for Aborigines. By this means police officers and others will be solidly cross-examined and the idea will be imparted to magistrates and prosecutors that, just because an Aborigine is before them, they are not going to have an easy case. Appeals will be set up to make sure that the idea is carried forward.

We are not unique in doing this: it is being done in New South Wales, where it has had unique and positive results. I hope that the next step will be that the advisers to the Minister will see their way clear to co-operate with us more fully. There are many other positive advantages to which I could refer, but I now intend to deal with some of the specific criticisms made by the member for Bragg.

The honourable member has said that he did not consider that the Bill, in repealing the Children's Protection Act, provided the same protection for children as was once provided by that Act. I point out that the policy has been not to duplicate offences and if, for example, the honourable member was thinking of the provision in section 11 of the old Children's Protection Act, which provided a penalty for placing immoral documents before children, he can rest assured that section 33 of the Police Offences Act deals with exactly the same matters and provides appropriate penalties. That comment can be made in a number of instances.

The next specific criticism by the honourable member was that in clause 24 there was no adequate definition of the words "community welfare centre". I think the problem

with this is that community welfare centres are difficult to define in too specific terms. I believe that one must have a broad concept of what is being attempted. A centre will be an enabling centre in the sense that it is a place where the skills and the combination of skills of officers and voluntary organizations can be put together for the best purpose.

The honourable member seemed to be somewhat confused as to the role of the regional offices and welfare centres. Regional offices are administrative centres. Four or five community welfare centres will be supervised by regional offices. The regional offices will be staffed by highly experienced officers whose aim is to see that there is uniformity in the application of the principles of this Act by the community welfare centres. The welfare centres themselves will be looking at specific problems and will make a place for voluntary organizations that will work under the regional offices. The matter of youth centres is not relevant to this legislation, as they are dealt with elsewhere. However, appropriate provision has been made for youth centres.

The honourable member also referred to clause 14, which deals with consultative committees, and said it was unfair that the tenure of office of the members of this committee should be at the Minister's pleasure. In many ways, I share the honourable member's dislike for provisions in legislation which say that a term of office shall be at the pleasure of anyone. I cannot see why in normal circumstances anyone's employment should be at the pleasure of some other person. That is an archaic provision, and employment ought to be terminated only for proper cause. In this case, we have a special situation, where the consultative or advisory committees are appointed for special purposes, and the members thereof may be appointed for only short terms. Having given their reports to the Minister, that would be the end of their term of office. I do not think the honourable member has much to worry about in this respect.

The honourable member also referred to the matter of community aides, and considered that the Bill was defective in that, by using the concept of the community aide, one would weaken the very voluntary organizations from which these people were taken. With respect, I disagree with that view. On the contrary, the voluntary organizations will be assisted because the community aides will have received training from the skilled departmental officers and will be able to return to the

voluntary organizations and assist them. I agree with the member for Davenport that it is a wonderful idea that the good relations which have existed between voluntary and official organizations will be continued in an even more effective way. I am sure that the good relations which have existed in the past will continue to exist. I do not think enough can be said to the credit of those people who work for the community, at great cost to themselves and without receiving any monetary benefit, to help those in need.

The only other comment I want to make relates to the observation made by the member for Mitcham, who said, in effect, that the debate tonight was rather pointless because the Bill would be changed so much in Committee. I do not think that is truly a valid remark as comments have been called for from outside organizations and, as a time limit has been placed on the offering of these comments, they are expected to be available by tomorrow. There is no reason why they cannot be collated in a short time so that they can be given to the Minister to enable him to consider and report upon them next Tuesday or sometime next week. I do not foresee many problems in this respect.

The honourable member also referred to rumblings (I think that was the term he used) from outside because of the lack of opportunity to consult with the department. In this respect, I spring to the Director's defence, as his door has at all times been open to those who have wanted to speak to him. Also, public meetings have been held and numerous people, including members of this House, voluntary workers, professional officers of the department and so on, have taken the opportunity to speak to the Director. Those who have not yet spoken to him are at fault because they have had ample opportunity to do so. They just have not taken the trouble to walk inside the Director's door, which has been left wide open.

I should like to make one final comment. I have always held a high regard for the probation officers, who form part of the department. These people are in future to be called not probation officers but welfare officers, along with all the other departmental officers. They have an important function to fulfil in assisting in the rehabilitation of offenders. Up to date the workload that they have carried from time to time has been far too great. Under this Act, with the redistribution of the workload, it seems that the system can be more effective. I do not want to be taken

as saying that the system is not effective at present: on the information that has been given to me I consider that the South Australian system is at least as sophisticated as, if not more sophisticated than, the system operating in most other States.

However, I hope that as time goes on, the Public Service Board, which seems to be a rather conservative body of gentlemen, will recognize the social welfare officer as a professional officer and that it will treat him accordingly in the matter of salaries and conditions. I think that in the past that horribly conservative body of gentlemen that fix their salaries and conditions have treated these people as second-rate, semi-professional officers. I hope that the board can be persuaded to change its views. This debate has been interesting and constructive and I can see that the legislation has been prepared carefully and well. There is no reason why any member should hesitate to support the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I, too, support the Bill and I agree with the member for Playford that the speeches in the debate have been most constructive. One may almost say that they have been entertaining because of the breadth of the debate and the concern that has been expressed by members about the many areas of community need and community welfare. These matters have come to the knowledge of members since they have been in the House and, in many cases, long before they came into the House.

I was pleased to hear the explanation by the member for Playford of the elasticity of the proposals and his suggestion that this was a good and necessary thing. I consider that he is correct up to a point, but I hope that we will have a sufficient yardstick in the Act to prevent the need to go to courts or other authoritative sources for an interpretation or pinpointing of the extent to which the various organizations or other persons engaged in community welfare may go.

I should like to speak briefly about certain facets of the Minister's explanation of the Bill, particularly the remarks that he made before discussing the clauses. As other honourable members have said, we need to consider the community in total and we should not take various facets in isolation from the total community concept. The Minister explained some of the results of the Seebohm report in the United Kingdom. Item (c) in relation to that report is as follows:

The poor co-ordination between various agencies providing services.

A person working in the community, regardless of the field in which he works, realizes that in most instances the lack of co-operation between the agencies providing services is caused simply by the lack of a common vehicle or starting point or because they have not the opportunity to meet to discuss their problems. I have no doubt that the Bill will overcome that difficulty. However, I hope the situation will not arise wherein, because there is another organization to do the work, or someone else is responsible, people in the various organizations will say, "We'll leave it to officialdom; there's no need for us to be involved in future." The Minister certainly seeks to involve all these people, and this is in direct contrast to the views previously expressed by his colleague the Minister of Education, who has rejected the suggestion that a committee be set up comprising representatives of those organizations engaged in helping handicapped children, for example, autistic, physically and mentally handicapped children.

It was suggested that this committee would discuss problems, acting as a clearing house, and that this would be an advantage. However, as a result of the Minister's attitude, those organizations remain isolated. I visualize many areas (not specifically concerning education but concerning community problems generally) where there will be a combined effort. The final part of the Seebohm report (item (e)) refers to the need for "imaginative insight into emerging social problems and for adequate forward planning", and I believe this is an excellent aim. However, it involves one of the most difficult problems. I believe that it will be extremely important in the early stages to limit the number of social problems being studied, although I do not suggest that the programme be limited unrealistically.

We must ensure that we do not create a situation in which officers are studying more and more problems but reaching no finality. In relation particularly to those problems that have a wide application in the community, we must ensure that progress is made and that we do not become lost in the woods. The Minister's statement that the State's welfare policy will be centred around the family is extremely important and is the crux of the whole concept which the Minister has promoted. Again, it is a little unfortunate that this genuine desire is not always accepted by other Ministers. On September 15, 1971, when we were discussing the problem of children with mental or physical handicaps

being transported to schools (and the school in question was at Elizabeth and had previously been referred to by the member for Elizabeth), I referred to a letter from a parent, part of which states:

Three families have two children each attending our school and a large number of children are from broken homes, the mother supporting them on a small pension. One mother has her child's taxi fare paid by a charitable organization in Elizabeth. As a parent of a mentally handicapped child I know the big financial strain on a family. Most of these children are under constant medical treatment requiring frequent travelling to the Children's Hospital. Free transport to schools would offset some of these expenses for the privilege of giving our children a natural home environment and providing equal opportunities for their future.

What is at the end of that letter fits in closely with what the Minister said about the State's policy in this field now being centred around the family. I applaud this idea, as I believe it is within this area that we will see the maximum benefit.

The Minister also said that we would have progressive decentralization in the community welfare service. He explained the position with regard to personnel and dealt with other facets of the whole scheme. Unfortunately, I do not think he has said anything about giving these organizations any real degree of autonomy. Undoubtedly they will have some autonomy so that they can make some decisions at the local level. I sincerely hope that this progressive decentralization will not cause a great loss of time that will prevent the effective correction of any situation brought to the attention of a decentralized body. The Minister also said that it was hoped (and I have expressed this hope before) that a degree of co-ordination between the work of the voluntary groups and the work of the department could be achieved. Although I have no doubt that this can be achieved, I express the warning that, if any of the interested organizations in the community are denied the original opportunity to participate, problems, although they may be parochial, will arise.

I do not say that every organization should have a continuing opportunity to participate, but interested organizations should be given the opportunity to participate in the first place. It is a fact of life that, if they are not given this opportunity, difficulties will arise purely and simply because people do not like to feel that they or their organizations have been snubbed or not given an opportunity to be represented. Straight practicalities do

not permit that they will necessarily have the opportunity to continue as individual representatives from that point on but they should at least be in the know—and I suggest that they be in the know from the word go. The member for Bragg, who made a very worthwhile and knowledgeable contribution to the debate, said he hoped that the work of decades would not be lost in a short time. He expressed a view which I also hold. Many features of the Bills now being repealed have stood the test of time and we do not know for certain that some of the provisions will stand up to or correct the situations for which they have been provided. The Minister made this point clear at page 3553 of *Hansard* of March 1, where he is reported as saying:

Although the Bill necessarily incorporates many provisions from the existing legislation, chief of which is the Social Welfare Act, there are many new clauses which attempt to interpret modern welfare concepts.

It is the "which attempt to" phrase that worries me, because there seem to be doubts in the Minister's mind that all the undertakings in the Bill will correct the situations he wishes to correct. I hope we will have progress by evolution and not by revolution. The Minister also said:

Finally, however, the necessary co-ordination will be the product of practical work done at local level. The structure and functions of the community welfare centre are, I think, well adapted towards achieving the desired co-ordination.

I stress "I think", which is similar to "which attempt to". There would appear to be an element of doubt expressed by the Minister as to the achievements he can expect. No doubt many questions will be asked in Committee, because the Bill is one about which members will want to know more.

Finally, I turn to the point where the Minister, before going into the clauses in depth, spoke about various parts of the Bill. At page 3553, the Minister is reported as saying:

Part II sets out the basic principles underlying the Bill in the form of general objectives to be pursued by the Minister and the department. There follow powers whereby the department may promote and encourage the welfare of the community in a variety of ways.

Here again, we have the opportunity to advance into areas we have not yet defined. I again express the hope that we do not progress into too many of those fields at the one time and that we take each one worthy of its salt to finality.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I, too, support the Bill. I am pleased that the

Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs will be renamed the Department for Community Welfare; in other words, the two branches will be amalgamated. It seems to me that the previous arrangement created a barrier in the community between the Aborigines and the white people. Clause 32 makes it obvious that the State's welfare policies will be centred on the family and that the services of the department will be centred on supporting the family when it is in difficulty. Such help will be in the form of money and commodities. Clause 24 deals with community welfare centres and consultative councils. The progressive decentralization of welfare services through regional offices is very desirable. As other members have said, some of these regional centres already exist; there is one at Modbury in the Tea Tree Gully District. People who live in that district know where to turn for assistance. If people have to come to the city for assistance they often do not know where to go. These centres are staffed by at least one trained social worker, but they need more staff. The trained social workers are to be assisted by trained volunteers, to be called community aides, who will work under the instructions of trained social workers. This matter is covered by clause 16.

In all areas there are many voluntary workers assisting with social problems. Most of the organizations to which such workers belong are attached to religious denominations. The St. Vincent de Paul Society has already been mentioned, but all churches provides services of this kind. Clause 19 provides:

The Director-General shall arrange for a community aide to receive such education, training and supervision as he thinks fit.

Although some members have said that they believe that community aides should receive such training and supervision, nevertheless I doubt that these people really need training. Only people interested in this type of work will volunteer to assist social workers, and the main requirement will be common sense. Most of these voluntary workers in organizations to which I have already referred have received no training at all. True, they may be under the supervision of the social worker from the organization they represent, but I doubt that that will always be the case. I seek information from the Minister if it is available as to what standard of education it is expected these community aides are to receive. I believe that, if it is going to be a lengthy

course, it is likely to frighten off people who would be suitable for these positions. Clause 25 provides:

The Minister may establish community welfare consultative councils in such localities throughout the State as the Minister thinks fit. Clause 27 sets out the composition of those councils, subclause (1) providing:

A consultative council shall consist of not less than eight or more than 12 persons appointed by the Minister.

I presume that most of those persons will probably be members of the clergy or their representatives. Subclause (2) provides:

The members of a consultative council may be persons interested in the furtherance of community welfare within the local community.

I believe that this provision could not be improved. Even if regional offices are set up, it does not mean that all cases requiring services of this kind will come to the attention of the regional office of the social worker. Subclause (3) provides:

The Minister shall, wherever possible, appoint to a consultative council at least two representatives of municipal or district councils whose areas comprise, or are included in, the locality for which the consultative council is established.

The member for Bragg said that in his district there were four councils, and he wondered what would happen if all these councils wanted representation. However, I do not believe that that number should be increased; indeed, it should be decreased. I believe that one representative from the local council is sufficient. I believe that members of this House should be given the opportunity to represent their district or, if the member concerned does not wish to be a member of the council, he should be able to nominate a representative. The composition of these councils would then be similar to the composition of school councils. I advocate this because in some respects a member of Parliament is a social worker.

Mr. Langley: We work hard enough.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, and we still attend to many social problems. Some people who come to see us do not go to any other organization and we sometimes refer them to the department, although we process some cases ourselves. It is often necessary to engage other assistance, although not necessarily officers of the social welfare section. It is my belief that, if the local member could be placed on the council, such representation would be useful.

The Bill also provides for equal use of welfare facilities for Aborigines and, as stated by the member for Playford, clause 90 deals

with legal representation that can be arranged for an Aboriginal should he appear before a court. In the past I have been appalled when I have visited the women's rehabilitation centre (it might be more correct to say when I have gone past it, as I pass it frequently, because it is on Grand Junction Road) and have seen so many Aboriginal women in the front garden outside. When I have visited Vaughan House in the past I have found that many Aboriginal girls are inmates there. This did not apply so much on my last visit, although I did not see all the girls who were there. This is indeed a well conducted establishment, and some of my constituents, whom I know very well, are in charge of Vaughan House.

Many Aboriginal women are often being held in custody at the women's rehabilitation centre at Yatala. Although I do not suppose statistics are kept regarding the ratio of Aboriginal women to white women confined in the women's rehabilitation centre at Yatala, I should be interested to know the figures and the offences for which these people have been confined. They have probably been confined because they have not understood our laws, a situation in which we are at fault.

The member for Playford has said that some Aborigines have been pleading guilty to offences with which they have been charged but of which they have been innocent, and this might be one reason for the detention in institutions of some of these people. However, it would certainly not account for the detention of most of them. I do not know what is the answer to this complex matter, but I doubt whether the problems can be solved by this Bill. This is an aspect that must be examined. The problem is one of education, although I do not know how the Aboriginal people are to receive this type of education.

Clause 44 (1) (b), which comes under subdivision 2 of the Bill dealing with provisions relating to children under the care and control of the Minister, provides that the Director-General may place a child in the care or custody of an approved foster parent or other suitable parent. I believe that as many of these children as possible should be placed in foster homes. In the past, too many children have been placed in institutions but, fortunately, it seems that this trend is diminishing and, if possible, I should like to see this trend continue even further.

I pay a tribute to those people who have fostered children. Some foster children that I have seen when I have been to meet their

parents have unfortunately been handicapped mentally or physically. This means that their foster parents must give them much extra attention that they do not have to give their other children. Only a special, certain type of person will foster children of this kind. I have in front of me a letter which was placed on my desk only today and which was written by a lady with foster children. Although she did not know that I intended to speak on this Bill tonight, she writes of the unnecessary drawbacks that she considers exist in relation to fostering children.

Clause 79 provides power of entry, and I hope that the Minister will assure me that an ill-treated child is also covered. Provision for such a child may be made elsewhere in the Bill. Clause 72 mentions ill treatment of a child, and a penalty not exceeding \$500 is provided. However, I wonder whether the words "ill treated" should be included in clause 79. Constituents often tell members of this House that they think a family is ill treating a child, but it is difficult to get these people to stand by their statements. However, protection is given to these people in another clause.

I have dealt with all the aspects that I want to deal with at this stage and I support the Bill with enthusiasm, because the subject interests me greatly. I congratulate the Minister, as well as the Director of the department and his staff, on preparing this mammoth piece of legislation, comprising 252 clauses. I realize that some of the provisions were contained in the original Act, but many new provisions have been included. I consider that the measure will work well and I look forward to seeing the result of its operation.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Social Welfare): First, I thank honourable members for the interesting debate. We have had a wide-ranging discussion of community welfare policies, not only a discussion related directly to the provisions of this Bill. I think that the debate has been valuable and that all those who have been associated with preparing the Bill and, indeed, with preparing the Government's community welfare policies will be gratified by the interest members have shown in the Bill. This is my opportunity to pay a tribute to all those who have taken part in the arduous work of preparing this Bill. I refer especially to the Director of the department, shortly to become the Director-General (Mr. Cox), and his deputy (Mr. Bruff), as well as Mr. Harris and Mr. Headland of the department who have worked so hard in formulating

this legislation. Of course, once again, I must acknowledge my indebtedness and that of the Parliament to the Parliamentary Counsel (Mr. Hackett-Jones), who also laboured hard to prepare the Bill.

The Bill itself is so comprehensive and the debate has been so wide-ranging that I think there would be little purpose, when replying to a second reading debate of this kind, in trying to deal with each of the individual points raised. Most of them relate to specific clauses of the Bill, and I hope that the members who have raised points will raise them again, at least briefly, when we come to the appropriate clause in Committee, so that I may then comment on the suggestions made. I will, however, have each of the suggestions for amendments looked at before the debate on the Bill resumes in Committee in order to consider whether amendments should be made. However, concerning the points that have been raised, I shall be happy to discuss them in Committee when we reach the appropriate clause. I intend, therefore, to confine myself at this hour of the night, in replying to the debate, to dealing with one or two general matters that have been raised in the course of the debate. One of them relates to the function of the community welfare centres.

Here, I refer especially to the contribution of the member for Bragg during the course of which he suggested that the Bill was lacking in detail concerning what was proposed. I remind the honourable member that the Bill is merely the legal framework within which community welfare policies will be pursued and, therefore, one could not expect to see spelt out in the Act of Parliament that will provide the legal framework the details, for instance, of how many community welfare centres there will be, how many rooms will be in each of them, or what staff will be required, and so on. These are not matters which one expects to see, or which could properly be, included in an Act of Parliament.

Mr. Coumbe: I think generally, though, he offered some more constructive criticisms.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The member for Bragg made a most detailed and interesting analysis of the Bill, including some interesting comments on social welfare policies generally, and because I am singling out the matters on which I disagree with him it does not mean that I did not appreciate his comments. However, I should be here a long time if I went through all his comments and referred to those with which I agree; it is much easier to single out those with which I disagree. The matter

of detail, however, is important, because there is no doubt that we should be considering just how we are going to develop these community welfare centres and just how they will operate. I think the member for Bragg appreciates that the intention is that the community welfare centre will be the instrument through which the department will perform all its functions that involve dealings with the public.

So far as it is practicable to do so, the whole range of welfare services will be provided ultimately through the community welfare centres. This involves not only the payment of financial relief but also the fostering services, adoption services, counselling, the provision of the sort of social and emotional support which so many people in the community need (and which so many people are not now receiving), and the supervision of children under probation, etc. The whole range of welfare services will be provided through these community welfare centres. In addition, through these centres it will be possible to provide the sort of professional support which is needed more and more by the voluntary agencies that operate in the welfare field.

The honourable member referred particularly to fears that either he holds or which have been expressed to him that in some way the Government's plans might impair the autonomy of the voluntary agencies in doing their work. I have addressed a great many voluntary agencies and their representatives, who are engaged in this work, and I have stressed that there is nothing either in the Bill or in the Government's policy that can interfere in any way with the autonomy of these agencies. The agencies flourish only because they have a certain inherent power which is derived from the common interest of the members in certain objects, very often limited objects. For instance, members of legacy have a common interest in caring for the relatives of deceased servicemen. That is their interest and the service to the community that they have assumed. Many of these men would not perform nearly as effectively in the welfare field if they were doing some other form of work. This is human nature. We all have our own bent, whether we belong to a church group working within a parish, to a service group, or to a group with a specialized interest, such as legacy.

These groups perform effectively, doing the sort of work they do for the community, precisely because their members are especially interested in the sphere of welfare activity in

which they are operating. Anything which diminished that sort of autonomy would be disastrous to the whole idea of the development of voluntary agencies. Let it be said at once that my object and the object of the Government, far from diminishing the effectiveness of voluntary agencies, is to foster and encourage them. As I said in my second reading explanation, it would be impossible for the State out of its own resources to provide the sort of comprehensive welfare service needed. Even if it were possible to do this, it would be undesirable, because there are many areas in which voluntary workers, operating in their own sphere and amongst people with whom they have some common bond, can perform the sort of welfare work that no Government agency could perform as effectively.

Secondly, the only involvement of voluntary agencies with the community welfare idea is entirely a voluntary involvement. What we offer through the community welfare centres is, first, an offer of co-ordination; it is an offer to make the State, through community welfare centres, the leader. It will provide leadership in co-ordinating the work of the various agencies in order, if possible, to avoid overlapping, and certainly to ensure that the whole field is covered. What is perhaps even more important is that we seek to provide the professional support that the voluntary agencies need. More and more people engaged in voluntary welfare work say that it is increasingly difficult for the untrained voluntary worker to cope with people's welfare problems. It is becoming too complicated to rely simply on good will and charitable intention; that much is needed but more is needed as well.

What we seek to do is to provide professional support. I hope that, by means of the welfare centre operating in the community, supported by consultative councils on which will be representatives of voluntary agencies and local government, and so on, we can provide a framework and atmosphere whereby voluntary agencies will feel that they have easy communication with the professional social workers in community welfare centres, so that when a voluntary worker identifies a need or comes into contact with someone who has a need for some kind of welfare support, he will know that, if he cannot cope with the case himself, he can easily and informally contact professional people at the community welfare centre. He will have come to know them, and his organization will have a representative on the council and, by that means, easy contact will have been

established. He will say, "This is the problem. I think I can handle it myself if I know what means of relief and support are available, but how do I go about arranging it?" He might say, "I am right out of my depth. It needs a professional social worker to take a hand in it. I will refer the client to the community welfare centre or arrange for a social worker to call." That is the kind of co-operation between voluntary workers and voluntary agencies and community welfare centres which I expect to develop and which will be fostered by the consultative council.

The last thing I wish to say (and this will allay the fears of anyone who might think that the State wishes to interfere with the voluntary agencies) is that we offer support but that no agency is expected to avail itself of it if it does not wish to. This is a matter for the voluntary agencies. If the voluntary agency says, "We are getting on well on our own," it need not come near the community welfare centre. No-one seeks to interfere with the autonomy of the voluntary agencies.

Mr. Millhouse: That's contrary to the remarks made by the member for Mawson.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I did not understand him to say anything contrary to that. What I am saying is what I have stressed over and over again. I am certain that the member for Mawson does not hold any view contrary to that.

Mr. Millhouse: You'd better talk to him about that.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The member for Mawson is well able to express his own views on any subject very articulately. He does not need any help from the member for Mitcham to get his point over, nor do I.

Mr. Millhouse: His views are contrary to yours; that's the point I am making.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The point I have stressed over and over again, and which I repeat now, is that no agency need be concerned about any interference with its autonomy of action. The voluntary agencies may avail themselves of the kind of support we hope to offer; if they prefer not to avail themselves of the support, that is entirely a matter for them. If they feel that by participating in a co-ordinated community effort they are being assisted in achieving their objectives while at the same time participating in a scheme to provide a comprehensive service for the community, they will be welcomed; but if they do not prefer that, that is entirely their own choice. Whether they come into the consultative council or do not take part in co-ordination.

the services of the centre will be equally available to them if they feel at any time that they need professional support or assistance.

The member for Bragg referred to the absence of reference in the Bill to health services, but I do not want to develop that subject. He has heard my speech on the topic of co-ordination of health and welfare services, so I will not repeat now what I said then. The honourable member will know that there is in existence a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Bright which is inquiring into this topic, among other topics, and I said in my second reading explanation that the Government awaits with great interest the recommendations of that committee. I think there is certainly a very considerable area for investigation as to how we marry the two and as to what sort of machinery is needed to ensure the closest possible co-operation between health services and welfare services in the community. The only reason why there is no reference to the matter in this Bill is that it is not the appropriate place for such a reference; plans will have to be formulated when the report of the Bright committee is available.

The suggestion was faintly made by one or two members that there might have been a lack of consultation with people engaged in social work before this Bill was prepared. Actually I do not believe that many Bills introduced into this House have been preceded by more consultation with those interested. For many months there have been consultations with voluntary agencies at officer level, and I have seen many deputations. I have addressed many meetings of organizations in the voluntary welfare field and I have outlined the sorts of policy that the Government was formulating. Officers of my department, particularly the Director-General, have addressed countless meetings and have seen countless people, and this has gone on almost continually since I assumed office about 18 months ago. Long before this Bill was introduced almost everyone in the welfare field who was at all interested in the matter knew pretty well exactly what the Government was planning.

I believe that there has been the widest possible consultation and that people involved and interested have known what was intended. We have had most useful comments and constructive suggestions from all quarters. Further, this Bill has been on the Notice Paper for some time to enable the various organiza-

tions to make submissions. We sent to all the interested organizations of which we were aware copies of the Bill and copies of my second reading explanation, and those organizations have been making submissions and having interviews with the Director-General. In the next few days I will consider those submissions and decide what amendments should be made during the Committee stage.

The other point made was that the community welfare centres should be approached on an experimental basis, as pilot schemes. In the nature of things they will be pilot schemes. The Government cannot build 20 community welfare centres in six months. The Government's plan is that, within the foreseeable future, we will have 20 community welfare centres in the main centres of population; that obviously means that it will be a period of years before we will have 20 centres. In the initial stages, if we get three centres in 18 months or two years we will be doing as much as we can hope to do. Those three community welfare centres will be operating, and we will benefit by the experience of the early centres as the later ones are constructed.

So, in the very nature of things, the experimental aspects of the policies will involve pilot studies. The department has had much experience, anyway, in this type of work as a result of the district offices that have been established. This is a progressive and increasing experience because the department is continually decentralizing its functions to the district offices without waiting for the fully-fledged community welfare centres. More and more of the functions of the department are being discharged through district offices so that continual experience has been gathered on decentralized operations that will be expanded when the first community centres are established. They are the only points I need to cover in this second reading debate because I will have an opportunity to deal with particular topics when we deal with them in individual clauses in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Minister how far he wishes to go with this Bill this evening. I understood we would just go into Committee, but the Attorney-General seems to be letting the Bill run on.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Social Welfare): I would not dream of delaying the

honourable member tonight. I know how fresh and fit he and his colleagues need be in the morning as they have an early appointment which it is important for them all to attend. I intended to allow the Bill to progress to clause 4, because it seemed there was nothing controversial up to that stage.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 16, at 2 p.m.