HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 28, 1974

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Football Park (Rates and Taxes Exemption),

Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (Points Demerit),

State Government Insurance Commission Act Amendment.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM) BILL

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the sitting of the House to be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Bill.

Effective agreement has been reached at the conference, but I have moved the motion because the formal report of the conference is not yet available although its terms are now being typed for the formal signature of managers of both Houses. Formally, the conference is continuing, but there is no reason for members to be absent from the Chamber whilst the formalities are being completed.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Although the Opposition supports the motion, it should be clearly pointed out that it should not be taken as a precedent. When a conference is held outside sitting time (and I fully agree with that procedure), I consider that the first business to come before the House should be the report of the conference. Although I accept that difficulties have arisen on this occasion in relation to the preparation of the report, T think it would be most unwise for the House to regard this motion as a precedent for future occasions, because I believe that each and every situation should be considered on its merits.

Motion carried.

At 3.12 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its suggested amendments and that the House of Assembly make the following amendments to the Bill:

Clause 4, page 3—After line 6 insert definition as follows:

"licence period" means—

(*a*) the period commencing on the twenty-fourth day of March, 1975, and ending on the twenty-third day of September, 1975;

and

(*b*) each succeeding period of twelve months:

After line 29 insert definition as follows:

"prescribed percentage" means—

(*a*) in relation to the first licence period—ten per centum;

and

(b) in relation to a subsequent licence period—such percentage as is prescribed in relation to that period.

Lines 30 to 33—Leave out the definition of "relevant period" and insert definition as follows:

"relevant period" means—

(*a*) in relation to a licence that is to be in force during the first licence period—the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, 1974;

and

(b) in relation to a licence that is to be in force during a subsequent licence period—the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June last preceding the commencement of that licence period:

Clause 14, page 7, line 38—Leave out "ten per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage".

Page 8, line 4—Leave out "ten per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage".

Line 11—Leave out "ten per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage".

Line 18—Leave, out "ten per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage".

Line 25—Leave out "ten per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage".

Line 32—Leave out "ten per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage".

Line 39—Leave out "ten per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage"..

Page 9, line 4—Leave out "ten per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage".

Line 11—Leave out ''ten per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage".

Lines 13 to 27—Leave out subclause (11)..

Lines 28 to 31—Leave out all words in these lines and insert "Where an application is made for a licence and the applicant did not, during the relevant period,".

Clause 18, page 11, lines 30 and 31—Leave out "the twenty-third day of June, the twenty-third day of September and the twenty-third day of December" and insert "the twenty-third day of December, the twenty-third day of March and the twenty-third day of June".

Lines 37 and 38—Leave out "the twenty-third day of September and the twenty-third day of December" and insert "the twenty-third day of March and the twenty-third day of June".

Line 45—Leave out "December" and insert "June".

Clause 20, page 12, lines 32 and 33—Leave out "on the twenty-third day of March next ensuing after the day on which the licence comes into force" and insert "at the expiration of the licence period in respect of which it was granted".

Page 13, lines 1 and 2—Leave out all words in these lines and insert "be renewed for successive licence periods":

Clause 27, page 18, line 4—Leave out "March" and insert "September".

and that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The schedule of amendments is fairly complex but, in simple terms, they mean that the licensing period will be from year to year and the relevant period for the franchise fee (which must occur before the franchise fee is payable and, therefore, before the licence period begins) will be annual, but there will be a transition period of six months, and the provisions of the Act will prescribe the 10 per cent amount for that six months; thereafter, the percentage amount of the licence fee (not the flat amount) will be prescribed by regulation, the first of such regulations taking effect in September next year. Thereafter the prescription will be annual.

The effect of that is that the constitutional difficulties about short-term periods for the licence fee will be obviated. There will be a continual franchising, and there is no question of a franchise fee not being payable in respect of an indefinitely continuing licence. That is essential constitutionally. However, it will give Parliament an opportunity to disallow a regulation should, in fact, altered circumstances obtain. If altered circumstances did not obtain, the regulation would proceed in the normal way.

I want to say two special things about this matter. The resolutions of the conference caused an enormous amount of hurried drafting work to be done by the Parliamentary counsel, the Deputy Parliamentary Counsel (Mr. Hackett-Jones) and his Legal Officer (Mr. John Eyre). I am extremely grateful to them, as I consider every other member should be, for the amount of expert and hurried work that they had to do today on a fairly major recasting of provisions in the Bill to comply with the provisions of

the agreement reached at the conference. They really worked extremely hard, and I am very grateful to them.

The second matter is that this situation is anything but satisfactory from the administrative point of view. It really presents many administrative difficulties, and I can tell honourable members that the oil companies, .having been apprised of the position now proposed, are anything but pleased with the administrative results that will occur to them.

Mr. Mathwin: They weren't pleased about the tax.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They accepted that the tax was to be imposed, given the financial position of the State. What they are not. pleased with is the administrative result, and they would have preferred the result in the original measure. However, I have pointed out to the officers of the oil companies that, if they are looking for someone to pour a bucket of oil over, they can look to members of another place.

Mr. Coumbe: I suppose you made that quite plain?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I made it very plain, and I have no doubt that they will make their views known to members opposite. I cannot suggest that the position is satisfactory administratively but, at any rate, we are left with something that is not constitutionally challengeable in the way the measure would have been had the original amendments of the Legislative Council been incorporated in the Bill. I consider that we are left with a probably sustainable piece of legislation constitutionally.

There is an added problem constitutionally: the transition period is short, and there may be some argument about the fact that the fee must be prescribed by regulation and could conceivably be not prescribed. Doubtless, that is something that lawyers may seek to seize on, and the position is marginally worse from our point of view. However, I believe on our best advice that it is sustainable; I hope it is. This compromise has been forced on us by another place and this is the best we could get that could be sustained before the High Court.

Mr. EVANS: I congratulate the conference managers on what I believe is a sensible solution to the problem. 1 support the remarks the Treasurer made about the drafting of the amendments by the officers concerned. I do not support the statement that oil companies will have extra problems in administering the regulations. They will have a considerable problem in the first year of the introduction of the tax, and the extra amount of administrative work will be very small. The only time they will have problems will be if the percentage is altered by regulation each year, and that is likely to happen if the present Government finds itself with a greater deficit than it now has. I am not quite sure whether the Government will want to reduce the tax unless a substantial sum is available from the Commonwealth Government.

If the Treasurer conveyed such an attitude to the oil companies and the oil companies believed it, I think they are easily led, or they have misunderstood the situation that will exist if this legislation is enacted. I believe the proposal to introduce regulations each year regarding the percentage is fair and just. It would be a good thing to do this when the Budget is being discussed so that, if it were proved the rate was too high, the Government could provide for a reduction, and it would be a matter of political opinion whether it was right or wrong. I think it is a sensible move, because it now includes a provision for annual scrutiny. I hope the Treasurer appreciated the limited but, I thought, sound support he received from his two Liberal colleagues in this place. .

Mr. COUMBE: I support the motion. The Treasurer could have been perfectly correct last evening in saying that the amendment from the Legislative Council as it then stood could have been unconstitutional. After listening carefully to his interpretation of the judgment handed down by Mr. Justice Menzies, it appeared that his view was the only one that could be accepted. We have heard today a variation that has been accepted by the conference whereby a different mode of handling this taxation can be achieved. There will be continuing legislation, with a provision allowing for annual assessment of the rate of tax. The attitude put forward vehemently last evening was that the Treasurer was right all along the line. It is interesting to see another point of view in this regard and another variant, and I think it is wise to bear that in mind in future. .

Motion carried.

Later:

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

PETITION: HALLETT COVE

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD presented a petition signed by 163 residents of Hallett Gove stating that housing development near the area of scientific interest at Hallett Cove was threatening the loss of a unique feature on the continent of Australia and in the world, and praying that the House of Assembly would influence the State Government to provide an area to serve as a buffer zone to ensure the preservation of the scientific features of Hallett Cove and an area for. community recreation. .

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

ABDUCTION FILM

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (September 25).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Inquiries made have revealed that the Police Department now has in its possession three films on extended loan from the South Australian Film Corporation dealing with the topic of child abduction and molesting. These films are:

(1) *Never Go With Strangers*—an English production shown to infants and primary schoolchildren.

(2) *Red Light Green Light Meeting Strangers*—an American production shown to primary schoolchildren.

(3) *The Child Molester*—an American production shown to adults only.

It is understood that prints of *Never Go With Strangers* were in the Film Corporation's film library when it was taken over from the Education Department. The other two films were purchased by the Film Corporation in 1974 for the film library at the request of the Police Department.

The Police Department concedes that it would probably be better if a locally made film was produced on child abduction and molesting that related more to the Australian situation. However, it was considered that the three films now being used by the Police Department were quite suitable for making both children and adults aware of the dangers, and the need to be on guard against child abduction and molesting. .

EGG BOARD

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (November 14).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Minister of Agriculture states that grading agents of the South Australian.

Egg Board are operating eight or more pick-up transports fitted with cooling units. In most cases evaporative cooling units are installed, but more recently the first of several vehicles fitted with refrigerated units was commissioned. Tests have revealed that, even though eggs may be several hours in transit from a farm cool-room to a grading floor, the variation in their temperature in this time is minimal, and there are no serious effects on egg quality. Nevertheless, there must still be a reasonably quick movement of eggs from farm to grading floor, *if quality is* to be maintained, and I am advised that the need for refrigerated egg transports has arisen from the recent legislation which restricts the hours of driving and which means that, in some areas, a partly loaded pick-up unit must remain away overnight before completing its journey.

BUSH FIRES

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (November 20).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Minister of Agriculture informs me that the precise definition of the term "fire in the open air" has been actively debated for many years. The generally accepted definition is that of the late Justice Angas Parsons, in the case of *Opie v. Mount.* Justice Parsons ruled in that case that the air in a paddock is obviously "open", as distinct from air in a place where it is confined, such as in a house or any closed-in structure. He explained that the Bush Fires Act does not deal with the vessel in which the fire is lit but strikes at its being lit outside, that is, out-of-doors or in the open. More recent legal opinions are less stringent in their interpretation of the term, but these invariably acknowledge that, if such cases were tested in court, a stricter view might be taken.

It is accepted that, unless a fire is enclosed by a structure capable of preventing the escape of sparks or other burning material, it could be construed as being a "fire in the open air", and the person lighting the fire could be guilty of an offence under the Bush Fires Act. Whilst a fire in a totally enclosed tent or marquee is not considered legally to be a fire in the open air, the serious danger thereby created is obvious, and a heavy responsibility rests on any person who lights a fire in these circumstances to ensure that the strictest precautions are taken to prevent its escape. Needless to say, this practice should be avoided under all conditions.

DAIRYING AUTHORITY

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (November 21).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Minister of Agriculture states that he has no plans at this juncture to introduce legislation for a single statutory dairying authority in South Australia. Separate representations have been made to him by United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, and the South-Eastern Dairymen's Association for a state milk authority, and both organisations have been told that, if they present a unified plan, acceptable to the dairy industry as a whole, for such an authority he will be willing to consider further the constitution of a State body. In fact, to facilitate the preparation of a scheme, he has invited the representative organisations to a series of conferences in the new year, under the chairmanship of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Milk Board. The Minister is still awaiting replies from some of the organisations.

SPEECH THERAPISTS

In reply to Mr. PAYNE (November 19).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The present position is that the Sturt College of Advanced Education has had approved by the S.A. Board of Advanced Education the funding of a course in speech pathology to be conducted at the college. It is expected that the course will begin in second term 1975. It was not possible to begin in first term because of the lack of time. An initial advertisement for staff has been unsuccessful. Further advertisements have been placed in other States and overseas, and the Assistant Director at the college, during a period overseas, is attempting to recruit suitable personnel. When the course is established it will be at least three years, possibly four, before graduates are available in this State. A notice of the existence of vacancies for speech therapists has recently been forwarded to the three existing Schools of Speech Therapy in the Eastern States with a request that it be displayed for the information of students.

TEACHER HOUSING

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (November 13).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Following the submission by the Education Department to the Housing Trust of a priority list of housing requirements for country teachers, and bearing in mind-the availability of serviced allotments, the trust prepared a proposal for the erection of 45 two-person units during 1974-75. The approved programme is as follows:

Town	No. units
Renmark	2
Clare	2
Mount Burr	1
Kadina	6
Penola	2
Peterborough	2
Port Lincoln	6
Meningie	2
Kapunda	1
Yorketown	2
Balaklava	3
Kingston, S.E.	2
Loxton	1
Port Pirie	3
Pinnaroo	1
Wudinna	2
Bordertown	2
Gladstone	1
Cummins	2
Minlaton	1
Keith	1
Total	45

WANGARY PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (November 14).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A house for the teacher at Lake Wangary has been included on a priority list that has been drawn up, but no indication of the date of availability of the house can be given at present. In the meantime, negotiations are under way with a home owner in Coffin Bay with a view to leasing a property for a period of three years.

WAIKERIE PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (November 19).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All documentation for the upgrading of the junior section of Waikerie Primary School is completed, and it is expected that a tender call will be made early in the new year. A comprehensive plan for the upgrading of the upper primary section of the school has been prepared. The plans include the provision of an administration unit, an activity hall, a Commonwealth standard library unit, and 11 teaching spaces. Following discussions with officers of the Education Department some changes are intended. When the revised

plans are prepared and accepted as a working basis, officers of the Primary Division of the Education Department will be pleased to make the plans available to the Waikerie Primary School Council for discussion and comment.

IRON BARON ROAD

In reply to Mr. KENEALLY (November 19).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Iron Baron road was inspected recently following advice.of deterioration because of extended wet conditions. Some sections which tend to be slippery when wet require resheeting, and this work will be put in hand before next winter. The road is in reasonable condition for dry weather conditions.

PROJECT 329

In reply to Mr. COUMBE.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Australian Government provides both financial and material assistance to the State and territorial traffic and road safety authorities through the Australian Transport Advisory Council Committee and the Publicity Advisory Committee on Education in Road Safety. This State's financial grant is $18 750 and is for spending on publicity, advertising, displays, etc., and for field officers' salaries. Material assistance is given in the way of printed material, and advertising in the press, on radio and television for specific promotions. However, the Australian Government is not providing any assistance for Project 329, as funds from this source are already set aside for general promotions.

FISHING

In reply to Mr. RODDA (October 29).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Although it is desired to conduct exploratory fish trawling for hake in South Australian waters, the allocation of funds to areas of higher priorities has prevented this research, which would cost between $60 000 and $100 000. There is little or no expertise for this type of trawling amongst South Australian fishermen or Fisheries Department personnel. It has also been found in New South Wales, where the expertise does exist, that this fish species does not bring a high enough price on the market because of consumer resistance to the fish. A recommendation has now been made and supported by the Standing Committee on Fisheries to change the common name from "hake" (which is apparently mistaken for flake) to "gemfish", a name which is used in some areas in order to assist in overcoming buyer resistance to a very good table fish. It may be too soon for South Australia to embark on an expensive exploratory fishing project before more success is achieved on the market.

STATE FINANCES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Treasurer, as a matter of urgency, give the House a full and detailed statement of the State's financial situation? There is widespread and deep concern in the community concerning the state of the South Australian economy, which appears to be running downhill at an extremely fast rate. However, in spite of the financial difficulties that appear to beset the State Treasury, Government spending seems to be unaffected, and hand-outs appear to be continuing. Obviously, the people of the State have a right to know what is happening. Since this is the final day of this year's sitting and therefore the last opportunity for at least seven or eight weeks for the Opposition closely to scrutinise the matter on behalf of the people of the State, will the Treasurer make this information available now or, if he does not have it immediately available, will he undertake to provide it during next week by way of a public announcement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am amazed that the Leader seems to be lacking in information on this score, as I have given much detail.

Dr. Eastick: What's that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has had the monthly statements of the position of the State's finances which are detailed and to which explanations have been attached. In addition, I have given information to the House. The State budgeted for a deficit on Revenue Account of about $12 000 000. Given the fact that there were expected completion grants from the Grants Commission and the holding in hand of about $4 000 000 of Loan money, in fact the cash situation of the State was at balance as provided for in the Budget. As I have pointed out to the Leader, there have been three further deteriorations. First, there has been a deterioration from the point of view of the finances provided from the Commonwealth Government, because contained in that budgetary situation outlined for a $12 000 000 deficit there was $6 000 000 expected from the Commonwealth that did not eventuate. The second deterioration was in relation to stamp duty revenue, which has taken a marked down-turn. The third deterioration was in the increases in the cost of wages and of the prices of goods to the Government above those estimated originally in the Budget.

The total of that means that on cash balance, without the revenue from tobacco- tax and petrol tax, this State would be looking at a deficit of about $36 000 000 on its Revenue Account, rather than the $12 000 000 originally nominally budgeted for with regard to cash on Revenue Account. The provision of tobacco tax and petrol tax will bring that position back to about $24 000 000 to $26 000 000. As against that position, we have had an addition of Loan moneys of about $12 400000 and, together with some other savings we have been able to make, that means that we are able to hold in hand, as against prospective revenue, $20 000 000, or a little more, as compared to the $4 000 000 I had originally provided in the Loan Estimates. In consequence, the gap now being faced by South Australia on known accounts is between $4 000 000 and $6 000 000 which, on the working balances of the State, is easily fundable. The result of that position for South Australia is better than the Budget of any other State in the Commonwealth: indeed, it is in very marked contrast. The position in Victoria and in New South Wales, particularly, and in Western Australia is much worse. In fact, in respect of Budget accounting, 1 point out that what I have said before is again evident: that on an accounting basis I have been more conservative in ensuring a balanced Budget situation in South Australia than has any other Treasurer in Australia.

TENANCY BONDS

Mr. WELLS: I intended to direct my question to the Attorney-General but, as he is unavoidably absent from the Chamber, I ask the Premier whether the Government intends legislating to govern the amount of the bond required to be paid by tenants occupying premises and to relieve the genuine hardship such tenants are experiencing when they seek the return of the bond. I have had several complaints recently from constituents in my district who say that, after being required to post a substantial bond on occupying premises (whether a house or flat), on relinquishing the tenancy they find that the bond has been eaten into to a great degree mainly by fictitious complaints of damage and other claims on the property.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter raised, discuss it with my colleague, and let the honourable member have a reply.

VICTORIA SQUARE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say what is the present position relating to Victoria Square redevelopment? I ask the question particularly in view of an announcement made earlier this week about building plans having been submitted for a proposed 19-storey office block adjacent to St. Francis Xavier's Cathedral which new building, I understand, is to be occupied partly by State Government departments. What has happened to the plans that I understood were announced a couple of years ago for the erection of a rather ambitious and exotic Eastern-type hotel? If the plans for that project, which was to be built on vacant land owned by the Government in Victoria Square, have fallen through, has the Government any plans or ideas for developing that land?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member's question deals only with the Victoria Square hotel site, I can easily reply to it. However, I believe his question is broader than that. A proposal on the redevelopment of Victoria Square was prepared for the Government and the Adelaide City Council by Professor Denis Winston. In the Urban Systems Corporation report to the City Council on the redevelopment of the city of Adelaide (the strategic development plan) provision was made to incorporate in that plan Professor Winston's concept for Victoria Square. All developments in Victoria Square have been checked out with Urban Systems, the City of Adelaide Development Committee, and Professor Winston. The City of Adelaide Development Committee now has before it a proposal in relation to the development by the Catholic Church of an office tower on the eastern side of Victoria Square, between the southern end of the cathedral and Victoria Square, but leaving most of the side of the cathedral open to the square with a plaza, as was proposed in Professor Winston's report. The Government agrees with that concept. It differs in some measure from what Professor Winston originally proposed but, in fact, it fits generally into the height and space ratios of the original plan. That matter is being pursued. There are one or two problems about those height and space ratios and the facing of the building that need to be discussed, but the Government has supported the concept. In fact, we have told the church that we will need office space in that area immediately and that we would take a lease of the premises there.

As to the Victoria Square hotel, which was an essential part of Professor Winston's proposals for the square, a consortium has been submitting proposals to the Government for about two years in relation to that site and an associated site nearby for total development of the south-western corner of the square. Having asked for the consortium's final proposal, we have been told that, because of the changed rate of interest on the money it must now borrow, the consortium needs a re-working of its original feasibility study on the proposals which it put to us and which were awaiting, during the interim, the preparation of final sketch plans by architects. We have not had that final proposal from the consortium, but I have asked for it urgently. The problem about hotel financing in Australia at present is extremely serious. The difficulty that hotels are facing is that they have had, in central city areas generally, a fairly poor track record in providing returns and, indeed, it was because of what had come up in feasibility studies in Melbourne, Sydney and Perth on this score that the Government proposed to give concessions that Professor Winston had provided for as an essential part of his scheme. Even given those concessions, the return from the investment in a major hotel project in a central city area has become much less attractive, and the evidence for that, of course, is clear immediately opposite Parliament House and on the corner of Pulteney Street and North Terrace. Those two previously proposed hotel sites, for one of which the licence had already been considered and a certificate given by me, are being held in abeyance at present because of the increase in interest rates that hotel constructors must face and their inability, therefore, to provide a competitive return on money invested. That is the situation we face at present. In the meantime, until we get a final determination, we are using the Victoria Square site for precisely the purpose for which the honourable member's Government used it.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Premier aware that more than 60 per cent of export earnings in South Australia are attributable to agriculture? Is he also aware that 60 000 persons are involved in producing and handling agricultural products in this State? Is he further aware that, in 1969-70, South Australia spent $700 000 less on its Agriculture Department than did Tasmania, and that South Australia spent only 0.87 per cent of its Budget compared to the 3 per cent spent by the Tasmanian Government? Is he further aware that all other States spend twice as much on their Agriculture Departments than does South Australia? When replying to a question asked by the member for Rocky River on October 2, the Premier said:

> I point out that, in the total money spent within this State, more direct assistance was given to the rural community than is given to any other section of the community. That is markedly the case. No other sector of the community is given the direct assistance and service that is given to primary producers in South Australia.

How does the Premier reconcile that statement with the fact that the percentage of the Budget allocated to the Agriculture Department has fallen from 0.89 per cent in 1970-71 to 0.76 per cent in the current Budget? If he really believes what he said, will the Premier consider increasing the allocation to the Agriculture Department in next year's Budget to provide the funds necessary to enable that department to expand its activities to the greater benefit of the industry and to bring it up to the same level of expenditure as that provided in the Agriculture Departments of all other States?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In South Australia, through State and Commonwealth Government financing (they are both involved in the expenditure of the Agriculture Department), the employment in the department, which accounts for about one-quarter of total commodity production in the State, exceeds 700. I have been under constant attack from members opposite for minimally increasing the number of people employed in servicing secondary and primary industry in this State. The number of public servants employed in the area of secondary industry does not exceed 30, yet I have had constant demands from members opposite to reduce it, and the area of service to non-primary production in this State is far less than it is in any other State. Every time I rise in this House to deal with a question on the Industrial Development Branch I am told by members opposite that I should sack at least some of the officers of the branch. Only 21 people are employed in the Industries Development Branch and, if one adds to that the staff of the Economic Intelligence Unit and the Policy Secretariat, the total is still less than 30.

Mr. Venning: That's a different situation altogether.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member always says that when things are different they are not the same. The total area of assistance to industry in South

Australia has, under all Governments, including this Government and that of the members opposite, been less than similar expenditure in other States. We have tried to provide an efficient service—

Mr. Dean Brown: How about—

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Order 169 still exists.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —for the rural sector. We held the Callaghan investigation; we have had the report; and we are proceeding towards regionalisation in accordance with that report. We intend to ensure that we get the best return for the money we are spending, and that is also the case with regard to industrial development. I point out to Opposition members that it is strange that they have consistently criticised the provision of officers in that area whereas, if it had not been for those officers, the basis of secondary industry in South Australia could well have been destroyed, given the report of the Industries Assistance Commission. It was because of those officers and their report that the commission's report was not accepted by the Commonwealth Government. I have had the member for Victoria getting up and asking that those officers should be. used for other purposes in helping the State, and that is proper. However, I suggest to the Opposition members that, in order to achieve the best for South Australia, we should have a balance and that Opposition members should not be getting up and demanding that I spend more money when, in the very same breath, we have the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition members saying that I must prune Government expenditure.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Acting Minister of. Works ascertain which streets are included in an area to be sewered east of Haines Road, between Milne Road and North-East Road, Tea Tree Gully, and what progress has been made thereon, provision having been made in the 1974-75 Loan Estimates for this project to proceed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

DUCK SHOOTING

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when the duck-shooting season will open and close in South Australia and whether these times will coincide with the season in Victoria? Also, will he say what season will be set down for quail and snipe shooting? Considerable interest centres around the timing of the opening of these seasons, and considerable time and effort is spent by members of the Field and Game Association in seeing to it that the waterways and game habitats are maintained. As concern has been expressed throughout the duck-shooting areas that the season may be curtailed, the Minister's spelling out of the duration of the season in all three areas would be greatly appreciated.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The season will certainly not be curtailed and it is unlikely that we will be blindly following the Victorian practice. As T have already said earlier this year, the department intends that the opening of the duck-shooting season shall be based oh our evidence of conditions applicable from year to year. Naturally, last year and again this year, because of the flood conditions of the river, circumstances varied, with the result that we need to consider all biological aspects associated with the opening of the bird seasons in the light of matters associated with those conditions. I am aware that people interested in this matter are anxious, for their own convenience, to know at the earliest possible moment when the season will be opened officially. As we are well aware of their concern, we shall make our decision public as soon as it can reasonably be made.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say what opportunity the House will have to debate the regulations concerned with the safety of farm machinery and tractors? 1 understand that the regulations were introduced this week, following their gazettal last week. I further understand that the regulations have not been considered by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. Having spoken with the Chairman and an Opposition member of that committee, and realising the concern that has been expressed in my district regarding the impact of the regulations, I believe that, under Standing Orders, we shall not have an effective opportunity to challenge these regulations in the House. As they will come into force on January 1, I ask the Premier whether, in view of the concern expressed in my district at the impact of these regulations (and no doubt this concern has been expressed in other rural districts), the House will be given an opportunity to effectively debate the regulations and to vote on a motion for their disallowance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member an undertaking that that will be done before January 1. However, we will make time available, particularly for a discussion of the regulations, soon after the House resumes in February. That should cope with anything outstanding in the way of regulations within the time limit one would normally expect for discussion of regulations in the House.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Premier say why he has not consulted with the Australian Government concerning clause 25 of the Redcliff indenture which attempts to exempt the petro-chemical companies from all Commonwealth trade practices legislation? I quote from a copy of a draft, made available to me by Senator Steele Hall, of clause 25, which provides *inter alia:*

(2) For the purposes only of the Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1971, or any other legislation of the Commonwealth, relating to trade practices whether passed in substitution therefor or otherwise (and only for such purposes) the State hereby approves those agreements, practices, arrangements, acts or. things in connection with the undermentioned matters which would, but for this indenture, be a contravention of such act or other legislation.

The matters hereinbefore referred to are:

(i) the acquisition of raw materials, power, steam and services for use in the petro-chemical complex;

(ii) the manufacture of chlorine, caustic soda, ethylene, ethylene dichloride, polythene and any other . products of the petro-chemical complex or any . part thereof by the company;

(iii) the sale or disposal of the aforementioned products to the company, South Australian E.D.C. Company Limited, South Australian Ethylene Company Limited, South Australian Gasoline Components Company Limited, South Australian Polythene Company Limited, South Australian Chloralkali Company Limited, I.C.I. Australia Limited, Alcoa of Australia Limited .. or Mitsubishi Corporation or their respective subsidiaries (such companies are hereinafter collectively called "the companies");

(iv) the acquisition holding or disposal of shares in the companies;

(v) the management of the companies.

I put this question to the Premier, because it appears to be in direct contravention of the Australian Government's determination to bring fair standards into free enterprise

in Australia. I also ask the Premier whether this is one of the reasons why he has attempted to hide the provision of the indenture until its presentation to Parliament at the last minute.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the outset, the honourable member asked me why I had not consulted with the Commonwealth Government on this matter, but I assure him that the Commonwealth Ministries have had full copies of the draft indenture. Therefore, there is no question of not consulting with the Commonwealth Government. The second matter about which the honourable member seems to be talking in his question is that the companies concerned are to get sole rights to certain gas and liquids from our gas field. That contract could conceivably be considered to be contrary to the trade practices legislation unless it were authorised by State legislation. The indenture that would give the sole rights to the company as to certain gas and liquids would be a necessary condition of our getting the industry, and consequently thoroughly in the public interest. I do not know how the honourable member can suggest that we could proceed with the company without guaranteeing its supplies. As its supplies are finite, we could not possibly induce an investment of the kind that will be necessary in Redcliff (the biggest single investment in any industrial enterprise in the history of the State) without ensuring that the company had adequate access to its supply.

That is all that the clause read out by the honourable member deals with. Does the honourable member suggest that we should immediately introduce in the House a Bill to cancel the indenture of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited because its indenture gives it sole right of exploitation of the iron ore in the Middleback Range leases? How would we maintain a steel industry in South Australia if that company did not have that indenture? I suggest to the honourable member that he should point out to Senator Hall the fact that there are certain realities in economic life in this country. If we were simply to say to anyone who was investing in South Australia, "We will not give you sole rights to any raw materials whatever and you will take your chances whether you can buy them in future", and used that as the basis of industrial development in South Australia, we would have a fairly poor look-out for the State.

BRIGHTON ROAD CROSSING

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport use his influence to expedite the erection of an activated pedestrian crossing in Brighton Road, near Jetty Road, Glenelg? The Minister will be well aware that the first stage of the roadworks on Brighton Road is now completed. This section of road is now very wide. Many aged people who live in the area of Glenelg to which 1 have referred face considerable problems in crossing this wide road, on which traffic is now much faster, as they must do in order to shop in Jetty Road. At times, they find it impossible to cross Brighton Road. The Minister will also be aware that some months ago a petition was presented to the Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Johinke) asking for assistance in this matter. Now that roadwork is completed, I ask the Minister to use his influence in expediting the erection of this crossing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get a report on progress being made.

RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. CHAPMAN: As Minister in charge of housing, will the Minister of Development and Mines, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Minister, take steps to exempt Kanagroo Island from the provision in the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement that refers to a means test on the weekly income of an applicant before he can qualify for South Australian Housing Trust rental housing? The Kingscote council has furnished me with correspondence expressing concern about the lack of housing in that community. On discussing the matter with the Housing Trust, the council was informed that, before such rental housing could be provided, applicants must qualify under a means test related to weekly income. Investigations reveal that, once an applicant earns more than $82 a week, he cannot qualify for this type of housing. 1 believe all members realise that, in rural and outer areas, the gross income of families generally exceeds that sum. Therefore, I am sure that the Minister joins me in understanding the concern expressed by the council and people in this community about this matter. I refer to the correspondence particularly, and bring to the notice of the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is this correspondence lengthy?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes, Sir, it is lengthy, but the paragraph to which I wish to refer is brief.

The SPEAKER: The. honourable member must quote correspondence only briefly.

Mr. CHAPMAN: This paragraph states:

> The trust officers have suggested that in order to have trust accommodation built on the island it is necessary for the area to be declared exempt from the provisions of the Housing Agreement Act.

The council understands that there are provisions in that Act that give the Minister, in conjunction with his Commonwealth colleague, the power to make exemptions in certain circumstances. As I believe the Minister is aware of the importance of providing rental housing in outer areas, I ask him to direct specific attention to this matter.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If the honourable member will perhaps furnish me with a copy of the correspondence, I shall have the matter examined. The situation is that *4* per cent of the money made available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement is to be used for persons who earn 85 per cent of the average weekly earnings or less, although 15 per cent of the total is discretionary money. The history of exemptions from this is not particularly encouraging. There is an area in the north-west of Western Australia where the Australian Minister for Housing and Construction has used the specific provision in the agreement to provide for a higher ceiling than the 85 per cent. Of course, this was done specifically because of the industrial potential of the Pilbara area and the difficulties, because of the fairly high wage structure, that apply to that area. Regarding the liberalisation of the means test, the Australian Minister has the primary responsibility, so it would be more precise for the honourable member to refer to the Australian Minister in conjunction with me rather than to me in conjunction with the Australian Minister. Obviously, the final decision will rest with Mr. Johnson. Although the history of the matter is not encouraging and suggests that the Australian Government does not look particularly favourably on applications for this type of liberalisation, if the honourable member gives me the correspondence I shall take the matter further.

PREMIER'S VISIT

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether the decision to cancel his proposed visit to Queensland last weekend to support the Prime Minister in his electioneering for the Australian Labor Party indicates a change of altitude on the Premier's part, or was it simply the result of the airline stoppage? Recently, the Premier has constantly

protested his dissatisfaction with the Commonwealth Government's deliberate refusal to grant sufficient funds for the general revenue of this State, and he has frequently criticised the wilfully parsimonious attitude of the Prime Minister in this regard. To many members of the community, his protestations have worn thin and his sincerity has been gravely questioned in the light of his decision to contrive to support the Prime Minister electorally in Queensland. Since he did not go there, South Australians are concerned to know whether this decision was forced on him by the airline stoppage or whether, in fact, he has finally been stirred to action, as well as words, in—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: —repudiating the Prime Minister and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The latter part of the question is definitely out of order, as the honourable member was commenting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: 1 was asked to go to Queensland to support the campaign of Mr. Tucker, the Leader of the Labor Party, against the most disastrous State Government that this country has seen.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A- DUNSTAN: That State Government has constantly under-spent every other State Government on State services, and its services to the people are a disgrace. It is in office by a gross gerrymander, because it receives only 19 per cent of the vote.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was keen to have the chance to say one or two things to Mr. Bjelke-Petersen during the course of that campaign. As 1 have received a certain amount at his hands, I was eager to return the compliment, because Mr. Bjelke-Petersen tries to keep people in Queensland ignorant of what happens elsewhere in Australia. True, he came here to interfere in the election at which the member for Goyder was elected, and tried to defeat him: he was not successful in that. I was prevented by the airline strike from going to Queensland for the arranged meetings that 1 had in that State.

Mr. Venning: It's an ill wind!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When that happened, my Secretary tried to arrange other times at which 1 could go to Queensland, but unfortunately no such times could be arranged because of my other commitments. I should like to have gone tomorrow but, unfortunately, we had scheduled lengthy meetings with the Commonwealth Minister for Urban and Regional Development and his staff on developments in South Australia, and my efforts to fit otherwise into the election programme of the Labor Party in Queensland could not be achieved before a radio and television shut-down next Wednesday. In these circumstances, I could not be there.

Mr. Coumbe: "Thank goodness," said Tucker!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He did not, because I have had requests from Mr. Tucker to campaign not only generally in Queensland but also in his district, and he has expressed considerable sorrow at the news that I could not be there. However, 1 sent him my information and my best wishes.

GARBAGE COLLECTION

Mr. DUNCAN: Is the Minister of Local Government aware of allegations of corruption and malpractices existing in the Stirling District Council's affairs, and will he say what action can the Government take to investigate and remedy any improper practices in that council's affairs? The matter to which I wish to refer particularly involves the rubbish contractor to the Stirling District Council, F. S. Evans & Sons Proprietary Limited, a company in which the member for Fisher's family has interests.

Mr. Venning: How low can you get?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: The contractor Evans has asked for whopping increases—

Mr. Gunn: What a muck-raker!

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. DUNCAN: —in the contract price of 46 per cent for one year, an increase from $43 000—

Mr. Gunn: Question!

Mr. Mathwin: Question!

The SPEAKER: "Question" having been called, I call on the honourable Minister of Local Government.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am aware of several difficulties existing in the Stirling District Council area, and I regret that the question of the honourable member has obviously touched the quick of some Opposition members.

Mr. Dean Brown: And State taxes have gone up, too!

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Some members of Parliament, such as the member for Davenport, seem to want one-way traffic: they like to stir muck themselves but do not like it when it comes back. I reported to the House some considerable time ago, for those members interested, that investigations were proceeding in relation to the Stirling District Council. Those investigations were initiated as a result of representations from the Chairman of the council. We often hear Opposition members lauding the authority of the Chairmen of district councils, but this time, when I have acted in accordance with the request of the Chairman, my action has met with resentment because of the possible implication of other people. When allegations are made, I believe I have a responsibility to have them investigated in order to ensure either that the appropriate action to remedy the situation is taken or to show that the person who has been maligned by innuendo is innocent, and that is the action that has been taken.

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

Mr. Duncan: No!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher seeks leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Elizabeth has decided to tie my name to the question he has asked the Minister of Local Government. Therefore, I think it is right and proper that I state my knowledge of the incident to which he has referred, as much as it refers to me. Before I became a member, I was a member of a company, F. S. Evans & Sons Proprietary Limited, and in about 1965 that company made a deal with people who required garbage collection to collect garbage at the rate of 25c (then 2s. 6d.) a can. Subsequently, the council called for tenders. I had left the company, for the benefit of the honourable member who has tried to tie me into it—

Mr. Duncan: I didn't say anything about you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: —but the family company applied for a contract, and was awarded one. That contract no longer exists and has not existed since February of this year, but, as agreed I think over two years ago, the family company has carried on the contract at the same price, regardless of

escalation of costs and inflationary trends. The company has not altered the price charged. For the information of the honourable member, the company could say tomorrow that it did not wish to continue, but a minority group—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he has the right to make a personal explanation but, as such, it must be confined to that, and he must not debate a specific subject. He must confine his remarks in conformity with Standing Orders.

Mr. EVANS: I understand your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I think this is a pretty serious implication that the member for Elizabeth is trying to tie me to, and the Minister of Local Government seemed well aware of it when he was replying. I do not deny him the right to be aware of it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Thanks very much for that.

Mr. EVANS: However, I just wish to say that no contract exists and I am not tied to the organisation. The honourable member may be aware that I have never set out in the House to attack anyone using this sort of approach. 1 hope the Minister will carry out a fair investigation to find out whether 1 have any interest in the organisation. The only interest he will be able to tie back to me is my position as a trustee of a property on which the rubbish is dumped. As a trustee with three other people (one a Queen's Counsel and another my brother), I am responsible in accordance with my mother's life interest in that property to decide what she should receive from the contract to dump rubbish on this land. That responsibility is divorced from the contract that existed in relation to collecting garbage. The contract for the right to dump rubbish expired early this year, and the trustees of the estate have continued it on the same basis, because the Minister was asked to carry out an inquiry and because the family thought it wise to let things sort themselves out, so that the community could find another place in which to dump rubbish if it wished. Dumping areas are scarce in the Hills. The community is tied to that service, as I am tied to it to the extent that, as I am a trustee of the property on which material is dumped, I am responsible for looking after my mother's life interest in the property.

WATER STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Acting Minister of Works say what are the present holdings of State reservoirs, whether additional pumping will be required, and whether rationing of water will be introduced this summer? The Minister of Works, who is an avid reader of *Hansard,* would like the public to get first-hand information of the position of the State's water supply, which is an important commodity for the well-being of the State. May I also add that I hope the Minister of Works is making steady progress and singing *I'll be Home for Christmas.*

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the latter comment bears any relationship to the question. The honourable Acting Minister of Works.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sure all of us here wish the Deputy Premier and Minister of Works a speedy recovery.

Dr. Eastick: None more so than you!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. Being sure the honourable member who asked the question and other members were concerned about this matter, I arranged to have the information here today so that I could reply to the honourable member's question. The various holdings in the Adelaide water supply system are as follows:

Supply	Capacity Megalitres	Present Storage Megalitres
Mount Bold.....	47 300	46 610
Happy Valley.....	12 700	10 059
Clarendon.....	320	317
Myponga.....	26 800	26 742
Millbrook.....	16 500	15 657
Kangaroo Creek	24 400	21 844
Hope Valley.....	3 470	2 973
Thorndon Park	640	544
Barossa.....	4 510	4 279
South Para.....	51 300	48 655

The current holding in the pipeline system is 457 *Ml* compared to a capacity of 740 M*l*. The total capacity of the system is 188 680 M*l*, and the total storage, as at Tuesday morning last, was 178 137 M*l*. The position is that the reservoir system is about 95 per cent full and the present storage is about 23 000 M*l* greater than it was this time last year. Clearly, pumping will be less than usual this year, and there is no likelihood of rationing; nor would there be even if storages were much less than they are at present.

STATE EMBLEM TIES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I seek leave to make an oral reply to a question without notice asked of me by the member for Bragg. I did not have the reply in time to circulate it before today's sitting.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Bragg raised with me the important saving that could be made by our not having State emblem ties. State emblem ties were commissioned by a former Agent-General, a total of 202 ties being produced at a cost of £1.04 each. The ties are issued to the staff of the Agent-General's Office in London and to visiting State officials in order clearly to identify them at functions and trade activities in England. A small stock of ties is held in my department (about half a dozen ties, I believe), and they are issued from time to time to official visitors to this State. 1 suggest to the honourable member that, in the circumstances, it would not be possible for us to make a great saving on the accounts of the State if I were to have cancelled the original order of the former Agent-General.

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether it is correct that South Australia did not apply to the Commonwealth Government for funds made available under the National Roads Grants Act? In a news report that was broadcast by the Australian Broadcasting Commission at 6.15 a.m. and 6.45 a.m. on November 16, the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) announced that, under the National Roads Grants Act, $33 000 000 would be made available to certain States. New South Wales was to receive about $10 500 000, Queensland $9 000 000, Victoria more than $8 000 000, Western Australia more than $3 500 000, and Tasmania $1 500 000. The Commonwealth Minister said that South Australia had not requested any money from the Australian Government. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether the statement by the Commonwealth Minister for Transport is correct and, if it is, why South Australia did not apply for funds when the State is so drastically in need of them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It still remains to be clarified whether the Australian Minister for Transport actually made that statement—

Mr. Mathwin: Don't you talk to him?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —or whether that was the interpretation put on his statement by a news reporter. If the honourable member cares to check it out, he will find that the latter is the position. The situation is that the report the honourable member heard on November 16 (a Saturday) followed immediately the meeting in Brisbane of Transport Ministers on Friday, November 15.

Mr. Russack: The report was made from Brisbane.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. What the Australian Minister for Transport was told then was that there was no current application for South Australia for the November allocation. The position simply was that the Australian Government has, in accordance with the terms of the legislation that the Commonwealth Parliament has passed, allocated to South Australia $31 000 000, in the three pieces of legislation. To the end of October, covering a period of four months, or one-third of the year, South Australia had applied for and received $10 000 000, which is so close to one-third of the $31 000 000 that it does not matter. The position simply was that, after the Australian Minister left Canberra to go to the conference of Transport Ministers to discuss with us the various problems associated with the conference, our application went to Canberra. When the Australian Minister spoke to the conference, he produced a schedule showing the amounts that had been allocated to the States, the amounts that had been received, and the amounts that were being processed. There was no amount for South Australia, because of this overlap, but before the Australian Minister got back to Canberra the application by South Australia for the November allocation had arrived there. It is just one of those things where, regrettably, reporters do not understand what a matter is all about, make up some sort of story to try to grab the headlines and mislead many people.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1967-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill deals with three quite disparate matters and it is suggested that they can best be explained in the consideration of the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is a drafting amendment. Clauses 3 to 8 are together intended to ensure that applications for appointment to an office can be called for not only when a vacancy occurs in the office but also when, in all circumstances, it is likely that an office will become vacant within a known period. This will ensure that vacant offices are filled more expeditiously and make for the better administration of the service. For instance, if an officer is on long service leave and has not retired, it has been held that we cannot call for applications for the prospective vacancy, and that means an inordinate delay. If an officer is oh sick leave and it is known that he is about to retire on grounds of invalidity, we still cannot, until the resignation for invalidity occurs, call applications for the filling of that vacancy. That was something very necessary for us to clear up.

Clause 9 is intended to ensure that an officer who falls sick on one of the so-called "grace days" will be entitled to sick leave for that day. Members will recall that pursuant to section 86 of the principal Act the days on which an officer is, because of the closure of his office, not required to work are deducted from his recreation leave entitlement. Some difficulty has in the past been met with officers who, had those days been ordinary working days, would have been entitled to sick- leave in respect of one or more of them, and on a strict interpretation of the provision an officer could not be granted leave in respect of a day on which he was not required to work.

It is suggested that the proposed amendment will ensure that in appropriate circumstances sick leave can be granted for one or more of those days, and hence the deduction of the appropriate number of days from the officer's entitlement to recreation leave will not in future apply. Clauses 10 and 11 in effect ensure that male and female officers in the Public Service are subject to the same conditions of service and in particular to the same ultimate retiring age. Previously, section 110 of the principal Act provided that permanent officers could serve to 61 years in the case of females and 66 years in the case of males. It is now proposed by the repeal of the clause that the common maximum retiring age for permanent officers shall be 65 years. By the same token, the amendment proposed by clause 11 provides a maximum retiring age for all temporary officers of 70 years; previously, this was 65 years in the case of female temporary officers.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. When introducing the Bill, the Premier indicated that it contained three provisions. Advertising a vacancy in advance of an office becoming vacant is a much better system than that which applies at present. For too long we have had the situation where an important office has remained vacant for some time and work (it can be important work of a scientific or administrative nature) has been held up or has proceeded at a reduced rate to fit in with the activities of someone who is unable to devote his full attention to it. In the past the provisions of long service leave entitlements and other factors have left some offices vacant for long periods. This amendment means that the State will now get value for each dollar spent by way of salary and there will be a continuity of effort in the best interests of the State by creating a necessary stimulus to other staff members to get on with the job. Too often in important vacant senior positions there is a tendency for people to mark time because they are uncertain of the attitude that will be adopted by the officers about to fill those positions. Officers have been reluctant in the past to make decisions that might be different from those of the officer about to fill a vacancy. For those reasons I believe the measures contained in the Bill are excellent.

1 am in total accord with adopting the Commonwealth provision allowing an officer to take sick leave on a grace day. Previously, he would have taken a day's annual leave. Departmental administrators will have to ensure that officers do not take advantage of the provision. The Bill represents a responsible and enlightened attitude to the present-day acceptance of this type of measure. The third measure contained in the Bill is completely consistent with the newly enlightened policy of removing discrimination on the grounds of sex in respect of employment and follows a recent amendment to the Superannuation Act involving public servants. Such a change was indicated when considering that amendment. Having checked the material put before the House by the Premier, I totally support the measure.

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

Later:

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CONSOLIDATION)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1967-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main purpose is to amend the principal Act with a view to preparing it for consolidation under the Acts Republication Act, 1967-1972. Most of the clauses of the Bill are therefore of a corrective or consequential nature. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The Bill also removes certain difficulties in the administration, and in the preparation of the consolidation, of the Act which arise from sections 25 and 26 and the second and third schedules of the Act. The second schedule contains a list of departments that were in existence at the commencement of the principal Act, and opposite the name of each department is shown the title of the office of the permanent head, if any, of that department at that time. The third schedule contains a list of officials who are vested with the powers and functions of permanent heads in relation to the departments which have no permanent heads as such. Under section 25, the second schedule can be amended by proclamation, and under section 26 the third schedule can be amended by proclamation. Since the Act was first enacted, proclamations have been made which have had the effect of amending both the second and third schedules, and those schedules can only be updated from the records kept by the board or from an examination of every *Gazette* published since the Act was passed.

A schedule to an Act which contains information or matter that is capable of alteration by an administrative act like the making of a proclamation has been found to be of doubtful or no value, as the schedule (which is originally enacted as an integral part of the Act) becomes out of date upon the making of each proclamation and, even if new up-to-date schedules were enacted in place of the second and third schedules, the same situation would recur as and when each subsequent alteration to each of the schedules was made by proclamation. Besides, it has always been found to be indefinite, time wasting and inconvenient to have to examine a mass of *Gazettes* to discover whether or whenever an Act has been so amended. This being so, there would seem to be little dr no purpose in retaining or consolidating the second and third schedules to the Act if a more suitable alternative could be enacted whereby the same or a better and more flexible system of administration could be achieved without sacrificing any of the advantages of the existing policy of the legislation. In the process of removing the difficulties in the preparation of the consolidation of the Act that arise from sections 25 and 26 and the second and third schedules, the Bill simplifies the system of administration of the Act by amending the provisions of those sections and doing away with those schedules. Those amending provisions necessitate certain consequential amendments to the definitions in section 4 of "department" and "permanent head", and I shall explain the provisions of the Bill as I deal with them clause by clause.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 corrects an error in section 3 of the Act. Clause 3 replaces the definitions of "department" and "permanent head" so as to simplify the definitions and make them more meaningful, especially in view of clause 4 which amends section 25, and clause 5 which replaces section 26 with a new provision. The definition of "department" in its present form in the Act is linked with the second schedule which is being repealed by clause 17, because that schedule becomes out of date with every proclamation creating or discontinuing a new department or creating or abolishing the permanent head of a department. In place of that schedule the Bill (in clause (6) enacts provisions for the keeping of a register of departments (new section 26a) containing essential information and such other entries as the board thinks proper. In its present form the definition of "department" does not include a department of the Public Service established by special Act of Parliament, but the proposed new definition in clause 3 (*a*) is wide enough to cover such a department. The definition of "permanent head" in its present form is also linked with the second schedule, and paragraph (*b*) of that definition links it with the third schedule, which is also to be repealed by clause 17 for the same reason as it repeals the second schedule. Moreover, paragraph (*b*) of that definition in its present form is applicable only to a person referred to in the third schedule when exercising the powers and functions of a permanent head, when the intention of Parliament must surely have been to extend its application to a person who possesses those powers and functions, whether he is at any particular time exercising them or not. The new definition in clause 3 (*b*) removes this anomaly.

Clause 4 (*a*) repeals subsections (1) to (5) of section 25 which deal with the departments of the Public Service and the offices of permanent head by reference to the second schedule to the Act which is capable of amendment by proclamation, and replaces them by new subsections (1) to (4) which preserve the existing departments and permanent heads with power to increase or reduce their number, or change their names or titles as at present, but in new subsection (3), as proposed by clause 4, provision has also been included whereby new departments could be formed by the amalgamation of two or more departments or parts of departments or by the amalgamation of a part or parts of a department or parts of two or more departments with another department and whereby a department or part of a department could be amalgamated with another department so that the former becomes part of the latter. The new subsections also widen and simplify the procedures for making changes in the structures of departments of the Public Service and place beyond doubt the policy that all departments of the Public Service, whether declared as such under the Public Service Act or established by or under any other Act, would clearly come within the jurisdiction of the Public Service Board, unless Parliament otherwise enacts.

New subsection (1) of section 25, as proposed by clause 4 (*a*), enacts that on and after the commencement of this Act, the departments of the Public Service shall be those in existence by virtue of any Act immediately before the day of such commencement and those brought into existence thereafter but excluding those discontinued or those which have become part of some other existing or new department. That new subsection makes a similar provision in relation to the offices of permanent head of those departments. New subsection (2) of section 25 deals with the name of each department in existence immediately before the day of commencement of the Bill and the

name of each department brought into existence thereafter, regard being paid to the case where the name of a department is changed. New subsection (2) also deals similarly with the titles of each office of permanent head of a department. New subsection (3) re-enacts the provisions of subsections (3) and (4) of the section as they now stand but sets out and expresses the powers exercisable by proclamation in a more direct and definite way in order to avoid the necessity for restructuring and amalgamating departments and making other essential changes by means of complicated proclamations. New subsection (4) provides for a proclamation under subsection (3) to take effect on a day fixed by the proclamation or, if no day is so fixed, upon publication in the *Gazette.* This is a modification of the present subsection (5) which provides that each proclamation under existing subsection (3) takes effect upon publication in the *Gazette* which frequently makes it administratively most inconvenient.

Clause 4 (*b*) and (c) makes consequential amendments. Clause 4 (*d*) removes a superfluous passage in section 25 (6) (*b*) (ii). Clause 5 enacts a new section in place of section 26, which deals with departments which have no permanent head as such but have Government officials vested with all the powers and functions of permanent head in relation to those departments. The present section is also linked with the third schedule to the Act which is being repealed by clause 17. The new section preserves the existing position and retains similar powers for altering that position as the occasion arises but in a more flexible and less complicated manner.

Clause 6 enacts two new sections 26a and 26b. New section 26a provides for the keeping of a register of departments as from a point of time immediately before the Bill becomes law. The section provides that the register must show, in relation to each department, the title of the office of its permanent head or the title of the office or appointment held by the person who is vested with the powers and functions of permanent head in relation to that department. The board is required to cause such other entries to be made in the register as it thinks proper and to publish in the *Gazette* a copy of the register made up to the time immediately preceding the day of commencement of this Act and whenever any alteration is made to the register or whenever directed by the appropriate Minister. New section 26b is an evidentiary provision designed to save the time of the commissioners and their officers and to avoid the necessity for them to attend courts and other tribunals for the purpose of giving formal evidence as to the authenticity of their signatures and authority. Clause 7 substitutes for references in section 31 to the Chief Secretary references to the Minister for the lime being responsible for the administration of the Act. Clause 8 strikes out from section 35 (2) the reference to subsection (3) of that section, as that subsection had been struck out by section 3 of Act No. 38 of 1974. Clauses 9, 10 and 11 make grammatical corrections to sections 71, 84 and 87 (3). Clauses 12 and 13 update references to the Superannuation Act, 1926-1967, in sections 93 and 112 (3) (*c*) by adding to each of those references a reference to any corresponding subsequent enactment.

Clause 14 updates the reference to Division VI of Part II of the Industrial Code, 1920-1966, in section 115 (1), by adding to that reference a reference to any corresponding subsequent enactment. Clause 15 (*a*) amends section 123 (1) (*a*) by extending its application to any award of a conciliation committee within the meaning of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, as amended. Clause 15 (*b*) and clause 15 (*c*) update the references in section 123 (1) (*b*) and in section 123 (2) to the Industrial Code, 1920-1966, by adding to each of those references a reference to any corresponding subsequent enactment. Clause 16 updates the reference in section 128 (2) (*c*) to the Superannuation Act, 1926-1967, by adding a reference to any corresponding subsequent enactment. Clause 17 repeals the second and third schedules to the principal Act, which will become redundant when the register of departments is to be kept and maintained as provided by new section 26a (clause 6).

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Agent-General Act, 1901, as amended; the Audit Act, 1921, as amended; the Police Regulation Act, 1952, as amended; the Public Service Act, 1967, as amended; the Public Service Arbitration Act, 1968, as amended; the Valuation of Land Act, 1971, as amended, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill, which is in the usual form of a Statutes Amendment (Public Salaries) Bill, several of which have over the past years been considered by this House, makes an important change in the method of salary fixing. Members will be aware that a Bill of this nature usually makes amendments to a number of different Acts, all of which have a common feature in that they contain provision for fixing the salary in actual money terms of holders of certain statutory offices. In the Government's view, it is no longer appropriate that the officers mentioned in the various Statutes should have their salaries determined in this way and, accordingly, the Bill provides that in future the salaries of these officers shall be determined by the Governor in the same way as the salaries of statutory office holders are determined.

In other words, many senior Government officers have their salaries fixed by the Governor in Executive Council, after a report is made by the Public Service Board, whereas certain officers at the same level in the Public Service, or even at a lower level in some cases, have their salaries fixed by Statute. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce a Bill each time adjustments must be made to those salaries. The Bill provides that all such salaries shall be fixed simply by determination of the Government. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses of the Bill' inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES .

Clauses 1 to 4 are formal. Clause 5, which repeals and replaces section 5 of the Agent-General Act, provides for the determination of the salary and allowances of the Agent-General by the Governor. I draw members' attention to subsection (2) of the section enacted, which provides that a determination made for the purpose of that section may be expressed to take effect on a day that occurs before the day on which the determination was made. This is simply to provide for a degree of retrospectivity in salary adjustment that is necessary when, say, cost of living increases and such matters must be taken into account in adjusting salaries. Clause 6 is formal. Clause 7, which amends section 6 of the Audit Act, makes a provision similar to that adverted to above but, in this case, in relation to the salary of the Auditor-General.

Clause 8 is formal. Clause 9 makes a similar provision in relation to the salary of the Commissioner of Police.

Here the Act that is amended is the Police Regulation Act. Clause 10 is formal. Clause 11 provides for a determination of the salary of the Chairman and Commissioners of the Public Service Board by amendment to the Public Service Act. Clause 12 is formal. Clause 13 provides for the fixing of the salary of the Public Service Arbitrator under the Public Service Arbitration Act. Here it is pointed out that, since this office is usually held in conjuction with another office, only the higher of the salaries applicable to the offices is payable. Clause 14 is formal. Clause 15 provides for the salary of the Valuer-General by an amendment to section 8 of the Valuation of Land Act.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2, line 41 (clause 5)—After ."been" insert "continuously".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

This simple drafting amendment, moved by the Chief Secretary in another place, remedies the omission of "continuously" in this clause. The insertion of "continuously" will bring the legislation into line with the corresponding provision in section 61 (4) (*a*) of the principal Act.

Mr. COUMBE: The amendment, which is merely an exercise in semantics to improve the Bill, has the support of Opposition members.

Motion carried.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CENTRE

Consideration of the following resolution received from the Legislative Council:

That this House resolve that the providing of a hospital and medical centre by the Government of this State on the lands comprised in certificates of title register books, volume 3267 folio 73, volume 3952 folio 112, volume 3252 folio 35 and volume 4004 folio 310 or any portion or portions of such lands shall be a public purpose within the meaning of the Lands for Public Purposes Acquisition Act, 1914-1972.

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

The the resolution of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

No power is conferred by any Statute to provide public' hospitals. The Hospitals Act merely provides, in the main, for administrative procedures in relation to existing institutions that are proclaimed to be public hospitals. However, the Lands for Public Purposes Acquisition Act, 1914-1972, enables the Government to acquire land for certain public purposes that are not covered by particular Statutes. This resolution is moved pursuant to paragraph III of section 4 of that Act which provides:

The Governor may by proclamation declare to be a public purpose any purpose which both Houses of Parliament, during the same or different sessions of any Parliament, resolve shall be a public purpose within the meaning of this Act.

The effect of such a proclamation is that the purpose so declared is deemed to be an undertaking within the meaning of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972, and the procedures outlined by that Act apply in respect of any land required for the undertaking. The resolution is moved at this stage to enable the Government to acquire those parcels of land, more particularly described in the resolution, or any portion or portions of such lands, in order that the proposal to establish a hospital and medical centre in the Salisbury-Elizabeth area may be implemented.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. One -thing that has become apparent from my reading the debate in ' another place is that at least one person whose property is to be acquired first learned of the Government's intention only when inquiries were being made by members of Parliament as to who was the proprietor of certain sections of land. That is indeed an unfortunate set of circumstances, and a lesson is to be learnt from this exercise. Whilst supporting the resolution, which will benefit the health services in the appropriate area, I think that this matter should be taken note of and that the details should be made known to all heads of departments so that there will be no future occasion on which a person will be suddenly confronted with this problem in the way in which Mr. Jenkins first learnt of his involvement.

Resolution agreed to.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its suggested amendment and had agreed to the House of Assembly's alternative amendments.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1730.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): On the surface, this- is a relatively unimportant Bill. It has been described as being part of the general statute revision. I have no doubt that the Opposition is expected to pay a further tribute to the excellent work of the Commissioner for Statute Revision (Mr. Edward Ludovici); I do that with much pleasure, as we all appreciate the work he is doing. The Opposition is probably also expected to support the Bill along the lines stated by the Attorney-General in his second reading explanation, as follows:

It is one that is submitted to Parliament essentially by way of statute revision to facilitate the preparation of the Act for consolidation under the Acts Republication Act.

That is as may be. Statute revision or not, this Bill makes radical changes to the Act as it was first introduced, changes which totally alter its meaning and which have a tremendous significance on the structure of health services in this State. Perhaps the Attorney-General should examine this, matter. I realise that he has merely introduced it, having received it from his colleague in another place, but there is much more to this Bill than appears on the surface. First, the provisions in the Bill virtually delete any reference at all to the Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services, which was set up in the original Act in 1949. I believe that is a fairly significant change. The Bill deletes all the definitions in section 2 of the Act, except the definition of "the Minister"; one wonders why that definition is left.

The Hon. L. J. King: You're opposing it, are you?

Dr. TONKIN: I am supporting the Bill to the second reading stage, but I may have a few words to say in Committee. Since this Bill makes such drastic changes to the principal Act, I believe we should have a close look at that Act. Section 1 of the Act is formal and section 2 deals with interpretation. Section 3 provides:

(1) There shall be established a body to be called "The Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services".

(2) The council shall consist of seven members, one of whom shall be appointed by the Governor to be chairman of the council.

Section 4 provides:

The members of- the council shall be—

(*a*) the Director-General of Public Health;
(*b*) the Director-General of Medical Services;
(*c*) the Principal Medical Officer of the Education Department;
(*d*) the Superintendent of Mental Institutions;
(*e*) the Director of Tuberculosis;
(*f*) a medical practitioner appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the South Australian branch of the British Medical Association;
(*g*) a woman medical practitioner appointed by the Governor.

I am pleased to see the provision for a woman medical practitioner in paragraph (*g*). Section 5 provides:

(1) The Director-General of Public Health, the Director-General of Medical Services, the Principal Medical Officer of the Education Department, the Superintendent of Mental Institutions and the Director of Tuberculosis shall be members of the council so long as they respectively hold the offices indicated by their official titles.

The section then provides that each member shall hold office until June 30 in the fourth year after the year in which he was appointed, and so on. Sections 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 relate to the proceedings of the council. The provisions are set out in some detail, as is the case with other constituted boards. Section 11 provides that four members of the council shall constitute a quorum. Section 12 is important, and I am disappointed to see that it is repealed by the Bill. It provides:

(1) The Minister may refer to the council for investigation and report—

(*a*) any question relating to health, hospitals, medical services, the training and employment of any classes of persons whose work relates to the promotion of health or to the treatment of disease or abnormality of the human body;
(*b*) any proposals for new legislation relating to any of the matters hereinbefore referred to;
(*c*) any matter incidental to any matter hereinbefore referred to.

(2) It shall be the duty of the council to inquire into all matters referred to it pursuant to this Act and to report thereon to the Minister.

.(3) In this section "medical services" includes treatment by medical practitioners, dentists, opticians, and physiotherapists, and the facilities for such treatment, and any other treatment for remedying disease or abnormality of the human body, and any measures for safeguarding public health.

in section 13, the advisory council is given the powers of a Royal Commission. That procedure is not now followed,- because most boards of this kind are now given their own powers, which are virtually equivalent to those of a Royal Commission, anyway. Section 14, which will continue to operate, appoints the Director-General of Public Health, while section 15 appoints the Director of Tuberculosis. Since the Director-General of Public Health was first appointed, some distinguished people have held this office, rendering signal service to the State. Dr Southwood, who was the first appointee, was the Principal Medical Officer in the Central Board of Health. I remember when I was a medical student his lecturing me on the importance of drains. Sometimes we regarded his lectures with amusement, but there is no doubt that his contribution to public health and the attitude of preventive medicine that he induced in us have been most important.

When introducing the principal Act in 1949, the then Minister of Health (Sir Lyell McEwin) paid a tribute to the work of the advisory council and particularly to the work of Dr. Southwood. It is significant that the council has played a tremendous part in the health and welfare of this State and of this country, because it was a plan evolved by members of that council that was put into operation in this country to combat tuberculosis. It was a significant move, and the present relatively low incidence of tuberculosis in this country can be attributed in a great measure to that original plan. In his second reading explanation the Attorney-General said that the council had not met since 1965. I do not know whether that was a significant date; I think something happened politically in that year, but whether it had any direct bearing on why the council has not met, I do not know. Perhaps the Attorney can enlighten us.

The Hon. L. J. King: Why don't you ask the Minister of Health for 1968-70?

Dr. TONKIN: That is a good question. I could not ask at that stage, but I believe the reason given by the Attorney why the council could not be constituted may have some bearing, because the Attorney-General said:

The Act provides that the council be constituted by reference, in the case of some members, to the offices in the Public Service held by them at the time when the Act was passed in 1949. Some of those offices dp not now exist in the Public Service and, as the provisions dealing with the council have been inoperative and incapable of application for such a long time, it would be misleading and serve no useful purpose to reprint the Act without removing the "dead wood" from it.

Perhaps those officers, past or present, would not.be pleased to be described as "dead wood". It is not Jong since 1965, but I am sure it would seem so to people of this State who have been smarting under a Labor Government for most of that time.

Mr. Wells: The people suffered for more than two decades.

Dr. TONKIN: That does not concern me. Despite what the Attorney-General has said, it would be relatively simple to rejuvenate the council established by the principal Act. I cannot understand why, if the title of an officer who by virtue of his office would be a member of the council had to be changed, the Act could not have been changed at the sime time. It seems to be a matter of nomenclature. In welcoming one statement in the Attorney-General's second reading explanation, I was pleased to hear that the Government had finally decided to set up a working party and project team for the progressive implementation of recommendations of the Bright committee. It is about time: although the report of the committee has been available since the beginning of 1973, few changes have been made. The Minister of Health was a bit touchy about the matter in another place when he was asked about the wonderful things the Government had done to implement that committee's report. However, he missed the point by glibly glossing over chapter 3 of that report. At page 1298 of *Hansard* the Minister is reported to have said:

Regarding chapter 3, dealing with organisation of health services, I have already reported to this Council that the Government has not accepted the Bright committee's recommendation regarding setting up a separate authority. However, we are looking at the question, so that the health and hospital services can be integrated more thoroughly. I am sure we will come up with a very good solution.

That statement shows how much this Government is concerned about this State's health services! Tt has categorically refused to accept the fundamental recommendation of the Bright committee's report, because that report stated that without recognition of that principle much of the committee's report would be incapable of being implemented. The Minister of Health spoke for a further two full pages of *Hansard* in outlining other details, but his statement makes no sense because of the Government's refusal to accept the fundamental part of that report.

This Bill has not been introduced accidentally, and it is not as much a matter of statute revision as the Government would like us to think. I believe that the authority is still constituted under the Health and Medical Services Act, 1949, and the duties of the advisory council are presumably still the same. When, called together, the council has the duty to advise on every matter affecting health services in this State. Just as the Government is not willing to accept the central authority suggested by the Bright committee (the most significant part and the keystone of the State's health services for the next 20 years), I believe that it wishes to get rid of this advisory council.

I know what the Minister of Health's good solution will be: it has become apparent that he will, on behalf of the Government, hand over the health and hospital services of this State, lock stock and barrel, to the Commonwealth Government. That is as plain as the nose on the face of any honourable member. If this course of action is followed, it will provide one of the most tragic instances of socialistic intervention into a viable and efficiently working system that we could possibly have. It will put private hospitals in South Australia out of business. More than 60 per cent of this State's hospital beds are in private or community hospitals.

We in South Australia should be proud of our health and hospital services. By pushing forward a policy of political ideology, the overall effects of the efficient health services provided in this State will be taken over by a mass-produced, State-provided and State-controlled medical and health service. By "State", I refer to "the State" generally and not to South Australia. This Bill may be cutting away dead wood. On the surface, the Bill is difficult to oppose: it is rational because it is related to statute revision. However, there is no doubt in my mind that it is designed to remove an advisory body which, although it has not met for many years, still comprises members or their equivalent officers who can advise against the proposals of the Commonwealth Government's universal health insurance scheme. I believe that this Government does not want anyone in an official position of any sort to be able to criticise the implementation of that scheme. The Commonwealth Labor Government's record is poor; all honourable members are well aware of that now.

Mr. Chapman: It has been recently.

Dr. TONKIN: The Labor Government has not been in power long, and it will not be there too much longer. However, its record in the time it has been there is extremely poor.

The Hon. L. J. King: Who'll replace it?

Dr. TONKIN: One of .the Government's weaknesses that shows through is the Prime Minister's total obsession for taking over health and medical services of the States for. building Commonwealth hospitals. Recently he has tried to take over hospital development in New South Wales and Victoria because, he said, there was an urgent need for certain hospitals to be completed and they were not being completed fast enough by the State. He offered to co-operate with the States in terms that Mr. Waddy and Mr. Scanlon could not accept, and, having told him what he could do, they proceeded to build their own hospitals in the places where they had decided from wide experience of the local scene the hospitals were most needed. Suddenly the Prime Minister changed his mind; he announced that the hospitals that he had previously said were of tremendously high priority were no longer of such high priority as were hospitals at other sites. He discovered that hospitals were needed urgently in other places and announced that the Commonwealth Government would go ahead and build hospitals on the Commonwealth Government's own sites in Melbourne and Sydney in direct competition with State Hospitals Departments and Health Commissions. This is paranoia of the first order. The man is obsessional, but I cannot understand how he can impose his obsession on Labor Caucus.

The SPEAKER: Order! Back to the Bill!

Dr. TONKIN: I have not been off the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is the sort of activity we will see in South Australia unless a responsible, independent body (an expert advisory committee on health and medical services such as that established under this Act, which the Bill seeks to amend) is able to speak out against the iniquities of the imposition of the Commonwealth scheme and the intrusion of the Prime Minister with his obsessional ideas into the health services of this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that this is a short Bill and does not contain any reference to a national health scheme. Therefore, the honourable member's remarks must be linked to the Bill. .

Dr. TONKIN: I thought I had linked my remarks to the Bill rather well.

The SPEAKER: Apparently the honourable member and I have different opinions.

Dr. TONKIN: That is possible; it has happened before. Perhaps it is a pity that you, Sir, have not heard my full argument on the matter. It has recently been announced that a new hospital is to be built north of Adelaide, on a site a little south of the present Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth. Normally I would have expected that such a project would be referred to the Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services, as defined in the Act that this Bill seeks to amend. It seems, however, that we are not to have the benefit of the skilled advice of representatives of that advisory council because, if we pass the Bill, we abolish the council. It seems to me that we will have hospitals built in South Australia whether we want them or not and, if we are not careful, the Commonwealth will take over all our hospitals whether or not the State wishes it to happen. In this case, however, I suspect that the Government would not mind that, but the people would.

Mr. Keneally: Who are the men on the council?

Dr. TONKIN: I thought the member for Stuart had been in the House during the whole of my speech, because I read out that information when I started. The, Sax committee has been set up as a joint hospital works planning committee and consists of representatives of State authorities and Commonwealth authorities. Already it has, at the invitation of the South Australian Government, met and decided how money is to be spent on the State's health services and hospitals. I should, have thought that an advisory council of this nature, as set out in the Act, would be of tremendous value in advising the Minister and the people, through Parliament, whether or not such actions were necessary. Nevertheless, the Joint Hospitals Works Planning Committee, which includes Commonwealth representatives, will make future decisions as to the hospitals that will be built in South Australia, as well as the extensions that will be made to hospitals. Indeed, the control of our hospital services is already fast leaving our hands as a State. It was pleasing to hear the recent statement by the shadow Liberal Minister for Health and also the statement by the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament (Mr. Snedden), that any hospitals built in

States against the wishes of those States would be handed back immediately to the State authority when a Liberal Government came to office. I hope that this will apply to community health services also.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: The Joint Hospitals Works Planning Committee will act in much the same way as that for which the Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services was established in the first instance, and I consider that that is a correct procedure. The States, including South Australia, are capable of deciding their own health services priorities and they should be allowed to do so without direction or intrusion from the Commonwealth Government. Since the major recommendation of the Bright report was for the establishment of a health authority and that recommendation has not been adopted, I ask why we are destroying totally the advisory council.

Why has that recommendation not been adopted? What is the reason for this Government's rejection of what the Bright committee stated was the major recommendation? If Government members will not answer, I shall answer for them. It is because the Government does not expect it ever to come into operation in any way: the Government confidently hopes for, expects, encourages and supports the handing over of our total health scheme to the Commonwealth Government under the universal health insurance plan. The Government is doing this in furtherance of a political ideology. Why should the Health and Medical Services Act, an amendment to which we are now considering, not be updated and re-activated in regard to the advisory council? 1 am disappointed that the Attorney-General is leaving the Chamber and will not be able to answer my questions. Perhaps the Minister of Education would like me to start my speech again for his benefit.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a Standing Order that deals with repetition.

Dr. TONKIN: I will abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Payne: How long will you spend on the Bill when you get around to it?

Dr. TONKIN: Interjections of that kind show that members opposite have not read the principal Act, and that does them little credit. Why should not the advisory council be re-activated? It would be easy to do that. One would need only to update the terms of appointment for members of the council. Why should we cut out dead wood? Why not replace it with something that would be viable and of service to this State? I consider that the existence of this advisory council or health authority would embarrass the Government when it decided to play out this ideological charade, the introduction of nationalised medicine, which we believe will be introduced first in South Australia by July 1 next.

The existence of this advisory council will be an impediment to the scheme, as would the recommendation of the Bright committee. The council would speak out against the introduction of such a scheme if the Government called it together. We can see from the Bill that the Government intends to cut out what it considers to be dead wood. It wants a clear run to hand over the State's health services to the Commonwealth Government. In turn, this will force a take-over of community and private hospitals, medical practice, and other private health services, without the people having any choice.

Recently the Commonwealth Minister for Health opened the new facilities on Osmond Terrace provided for the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board. The Commonwealth Minister and the Premier scratched each other on the back about how wonderful the co-operation was because the Commonwealth Government had paid the. total cost of acquiring and renovating those premises. The Commonwealth Minister said that he would be pleased to give that sort of co-operation, and the Premier intimated that he would give the State away if the Commonwealth Government paid enough for it. This will be done, regardless of what people want.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: With respect, Mr. Speaker, the whole point behind the introduction of this Bill, in my opinion and in the opinion of other members on this side, is the desire to destroy the advisory council as it is constituted in the principal Act.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You make outrageous statements.

Dr. TONKIN: Not in the slightest: I am sure that I am on firm ground and my feeling is reinforced when the Minister of Education interjects like that. The council must be destroyed by the State Labor Government so that it will not stand in the way of the introduction of the Commonwealth Government's health scheme.

The SPEAKER: I point out Standing Order 156 to the honourable member.

Dr. TONKIN: Although I may be repetitious, I am being so only because you asked me to come back to the Bill and I am expounding on how this matter is strongly and closely linked to the Bill. We should not stand by and see our standards of health care compromised because of an ideological ploy. Because the Bright committee considered that a health authority was necessary and because the advisory council was appointed under the principal Act to protect the health of the people of South Australia, we should allow the council to continue to meet and tell the people what it believes is the highest possible standard of health care.

This council could be of equal or even greater value to the people of South Australia compared to when it originally put forward the proposal to combat tuberculosis. It is a matter of grave concern that the council has not met since 1965, when the Walsh Labor Government came to office. Even in those days Mr. Whitlam was expounding his nationalised health service theories. I cannot help wondering whether the advisory council was allowed to lapse so that advantage could be taken of its inactivity in future. Section 12 of the principal Act provides:

(1) The Minister may refer to the council for investigation and report:

(a) any question relating to health, hospitals, medical services, the training and employment of any classes of persons whose work relates to the promotion of health or to the treatment of disease or abnormality of the human body;

(b) any proposals for new legislation relating to any of the matters hereinbefore referred to;

(*c*) any matter incidental to any matter hereinbefore referred to.

That is the crux of the matter. I believe South Australia needs the protection of this advisory council, particularly if this Government refuses to establish a health authority. For that reason I believe the council should be updated and reactivated for the protection of the people of South Australia. I will take the appropriate action in due course, and, in the meantime, support the Bill to the second reading stage.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the Bill to the second reading stage. I would like to congratulate Mr. Ludovici on the work he has done.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to the Bill as introduced by the Minister.

Mr. RUSSACK: I understand this Bill has been introduced by way of statute revision to facilitate the preparation of the Act for consolidation under the Acts Republication Act. I am rather amazed to find that the advisory council has not met since 1965. A council for educational and planning research is in the process of being established and that council will make recommendations on education. I should have thought the Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services would perform a similar function in relation to public health and medical services. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

> In view of the Government's decision to set up a working party and a project team for the progressive implementation of recommendations of the Bright committee, there is no point in retaining the council as constituted in this Act.

I am pleased to see that the recommendations in the Bright report are to be studied. As the member for Bragg has said, in South Australia we have health and medical services that are to be commended. I know this is the case in my district. During recent years many hospitals in my district have been upgraded. I have seen the extensions made to the Blyth, Riverton and Kadina Hospitals, and I know that early in the new year extensions are to be completed on the Snowtown and Balaklava Hospitals. Moonta Hospital has been upgraded considerably and Wallaroo Hospital, which is a Government hospital, is to be upgraded by having a room added.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I realise the honourable member's need to prime the parish pump if it is relevant but this is not relevant. There is nothing in this Bill relating to a Government hospital at Wallaroo or to hospitals in particular. I suggest that the honourable member confine his remarks to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: As I have pointed out to the member for Bragg, this is an updating Bill for statute revision purposes. It is a short Bill and deals with certain sections of the Act, and as such the discussion on it shall relate to the Bill itself.

Mr. RUSSACK: I mention these points because I believe this Bill can lead to abandoning certain accepted procedures. We have a good standard of health care in South Australia, and I am hoping this will continue and that there will be no downgrading of medical services. I believe the implementation of the Bright committee's recommendations will assist in this matter. Boards and auxiliaries of hospitals have done a marvellous job during past years, and I believe the implementation of the Bright committee's recommendations will ensure the continued good work of these bodies. People on auxiliaries are becoming concerned about the suggested drastic change in the system of administration of hospitals not only in South Australia but throughout Australia. I hope the same freedom will exist as has existed in the past, and I am confident that, if an advisory council had been used and had been permitted to give advice, the present situation would have been better.

Although 1 know I cannot comment on what will happen in the Committee stages I think it would be advisable for the advisory council to be replaced by another council comprising people who will be able to attend council meetings. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that the council was being dissolved because some members had occupied positions in the Public Service which no longer exist. I think it is a pity that the members were not replaced so that the council could have carried on and an overall plan been maintained. I think the principle would have been the same as that of the education council being introduced, and that continued surveillance by well-informed technical personnel would have assisted and improved our medical services.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I oppose the Bill. In his second reading explanation the Attorney-General said, at page 1730 of *Hansard* of October 29:

> The Act was originally and mainly intended to provide for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services and for the appointment of a Director-General of Public Health and a Director of Tuberculosis. The advisory council has not met since 1965 and can no longer be constituted as provided by the Act . . .

As the Bill will remove the advisory council, I submit that, if ever there was a time when it should remain in office (it will be given much work to do, more than ever before), that time was now, because the whole of Australia's medical services will be taken over as a result of the Commonwealth Government's national health scheme.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the Bill about any new health scheme. As the honourable member is speaking outside the confines of the Bill, I ask that you rule that he deal with the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! Hitherto during the debate I have pointed out to the honourable member for Bragg and the honourable member for Gouger, and I now point out to the honourable member for Glenelg, that the Bill contains certain provisions and that, although it repeals certain sections, it does not open up debate on the original Act. Therefore, all honourable members must confine their remarks to the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Sir. If the Minister of Education were to read the Attorney-General's second reading explanation, surely he would agree that the basis of the Bill is that it will make the advisory council defunct. My argument against such a proposal is that the council will be even more important in the future, because it will have more work to do than it has ever had before. If the Minister is aware of the oversea experience of the type of health scheme that will be introduced here, he will realise the pitfalls arising therefrom.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to Standing Orders 156 and 169. Although the Bill repeals certain sections of the principal Act, it does not open up debate on the entire Act. We are debating the clauses contained in the Bill now before us; therefore, debate must be along those lines.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Sir. I do not wish to deviate from the Bill, but the Minister in his point of order—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was upheld.

Mr. MATHWIN: He said that I was miles away from the Bill, but that was incorrect. I refer members to the Attorney's second reading explanation of the Bill which states that the advisory committee will no longer be needed. The Attorney's second reading explanation states:

> The advisory council has not met since 1965 and can no longer be constituted as provided by the Act, as the Act provides that the council be constituted by reference, in the case of some members, to the offices in the Public Service held by them at the time when the Act was passed in 1949.

I believe it imperative that the council remain in office.

Mr. Max Brown: It's done nothing for almost 10 years.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Attorney-General said that it had done nothing since 1965, but I believe that it will be busier, as a result of the introduction of the national health

scheme, than it has ever been before. The Attorney-General's second reading explanation also states:

In view of the Government's decision to set up a working party and a project team for the progressive implementation of recommendations of the Bright committee, there is no point in retaining the council as constituted in this Act.

The Attorney-General made that statement twice, but he is not here now to defend the Bill. He has left a substitute, who is not familiar with the Bill, to look after it. I am pointing out something of vital importance to the State.

Mr. Burden: It hasn't met during the past 10 years.

Mr. MATHWIN: I agree, but I believe that it will meet regularly in future when we are faced with a health scheme that will be entirely foreign to the people of this State, who will be unaware of its pitfalls.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the Bill to the second reading stage and hope that the Minister of Education appreciates the problems which the member for Bragg, the member for Gouger and 1 have raised. Although the Minister of Education is not the Minister who introduced the Bill, I hope he will ensure that common sense prevails and will support any moves made by the Opposition.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I suppose that when we get to the last day of the session, prior to an adjournment, it could be described as the silly season, but I have never quite heard it as silly as it has been this afternoon. The Bill, which arises entirely as a statute revision amendment on Mr. Ludovici's recommendations, has been blown into some dreadful plot vital to the State. I would bet pounds to peanuts that the member for Glenelg had never heard of the advisory council until the Bill was introduced.

Mr. Mathwin: That's not true. I'll take a point of order, if you like.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No point of order is involved; it would involve a personal explanation. The advisory council, as. was explained in the Attorney's second reading explanation, has not met since 1965 and, as presently constituted, it cannot meet. At no time during the last nine years under either a Liberal Government or a Labor Government has any attempt been made to revive the council.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the national health scheme?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about a national health scheme.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I realise that Opposition members want to talk about something other than what is contained in the Bill. When the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was Minister of Health, he did nothing to revive the council.

Dr. Eastick: He was conserving funds, because you squandered them before he came to office.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I have said, it is the silly season. The Bill simply takes out of legislation something which can no longer function and which has not functioned for nine years. However, the Bill has been turned into something else, because I suspect that Opposition members have convinced themselves of so many aunt sallies in recent times that another one will not do any harm. The Government believes it is sensible to proceed with this statute revision.

Mr. Mathwin: You want to clear the way for a national health scheme.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is a straight-out lie.

Mr. Mathwin: That's unparliamentary.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member is upset, I shall say that it is a flagrant untruth. This Bill, which is purely a statute revision Bill, was introduced on the recommendation of a gentleman who was an officer of this Parliament and who is now responsible for statute revision. The Bill has passed the Upper House without any trouble, although the Leader of the Opposition in that Chamber (who is a former Minister of Health) had the numbers to support any alteration. Now, we have run into the local Mr. Fraser suggesting that somehow the Government wants to clear the way for national health. I have never heard so much rubbish in all my life.

The second reading explanation made clear that this was only a statute revision matter. The Government has established a working party and project team for the progressive implementation of recommendations of the Bright committee, so that there is simply no need for the provisions that are to be repealed. If there is to be an advisory committee, it will not be in the form of the legislation that we are presently repealing, because it cannot be. Some of the positions that are supposed to provide *ex officio* members of the council no longer exist. It should be possible to debate matters rationally, without the member for Bragg spreading any canard that his imagination can work out. The more unsavoury the fairy tale he can work out, the better it suits him. I realise that he has set himself up among his colleagues as the local Fraser type of alternative to the Leader' of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. Tonkin: What about the recommendations of the Bright committee?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The second reading explanation states:

In view of the Government's decision to set up a working party and a project team for the progressive implementation of recommendations of the Bright committee, there is no point in retaining the council as constituted in this Act.

I suggest that the honourable member contain himself and discover progressively precisely which recommendations of the Bright committee report will be implemented. If the honourable member ever wants any argument he puts up listened to again, he should not go on with the complete and utter rubbish with which he has gone on this afternoon. I know that it is a good tactic and that he hopes to make himself a good fellow with some of his colleagues, perhaps even fooling some of them, by putting up the most obvious untruths and complete misrepresentations about the purpose of the Bill. This is a simple matter that should not have warranted the debate put forward by members opposite this afternoon.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Repeal of ss. 3-13 of principal Act."

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Chairman, how much of my amendment, which is on the file, should I move at this stage?. .

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member should put only the first part of his amendment, which is the question I will put to the Committee. However, in order to facilitate discussion, I will permit the honourable member to discuss the whole of the amendment.

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

To strike out "13" and insert "11"

It is a matter of extreme concern to members on this side that the Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services will be abolished by the Bill. Regrettably, the council has not been kept up to date or allowed to meet

and has not been constitutional. The Bill deletes sections 3 to 13 of the Act, but we intend, by the amendment, that only sections 3 to 11 will be deleted. Therefore, sections 12 and 13 will remain. They relate to references to the council as it exists. This council has had much to offer the people of South Australia. The effect of the amendment will be to reconstitute the council, so that we will bring into operation an advisory body composed of the foremost experts in the State in all .matters of health care. Such a body will be eminently suited to advise the. Government on all health care matters. The structure of the council will not be dissimilar to the structure of the health authority proposed by the Bright committee, and that is not a coincidence. I believe that this amendment would be supported by the people of this State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): The explanation of the Bill made clear the action that had been taken to ensure the progressive implementation of the recommendations of the Bright committee, and we will proceed in that way and not in the way suggested by the honourable member. The honourable member should wait and see how Government policies develop. We cannot accept the amendment.

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously, the Minister is not aware of the statement made by the Minister of Health, who said that the Government does not intend to accept the recommendation of the Bright committee to establish such an authority.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), and Venning,

Noes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Becker, Blacker, and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran, King, and McRae.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

KINDERGARTEN UNION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 27. Page 2322.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill without reservation. Throughout the country there is a considerable move into pre-school education. All political parties acknowledge the importance of this subject; they have extensive and elaborate electoral policies in relation to the matter and the introduction of this measure has been inevitable. South Australia is making rapid strides in the directions of pre-school and further education. On my recent oversea study tour I was interested to see how pre-school facilities were provided around the world. I was surprised to discover that not much headway has been made in oversea countries in relation to nursery education, as it is called in England. The most advanced plan for pre-school education is in England; particularly the scheme administered by the Inner London Education Authority, where there are elaborate plans to move into this field. Unfortunately, all countries are inhibited by a shortage of funds, and that is particularly so in England. Although I thought that that country had the most highly developed plans, it did not have funds available to implement those plans.

Often Sweden is held up as Utopia, but Stockholm had few facilities. I think the number of students that can be accommodated there can be compared to the number in South Australia. In Sweden schooling does not start until children are seven years of age. Then they have compulsory schooling for about nine years. Although that country has plans for what is called there pre-school education, those plans would be for children of an age at which they must attend school in this State. There were rumours in Sweden of what people were describing as a mild recession.

Australia is well to the fore in pre-school education. In the United States of America, education is as diverse as anywhere else in the world and it is controlled with far more autonomy than in Australia. It is on almost a local government basis and there is a tremendous variety. Work was being done in California to establish a kindergarten programme, but the work seems to be bogged down in political argument. There was what was called accountability and people were trying to freeze the levels of taxation, and so on.

We in South Australia are ahead in kindergartens and, if they develop along the lines contemplated, we will go even further ahead. We will be far ahead of Sweden, which is said to have a highly developed structure for social provisions. The importance of pre-school education is readily accepted in the community. That form of education helps ameliorate the effects of adverse backgrounds. The most important aspect of early education is that it helps in an early recognition of handicaps that -otherwise could go unnoticed for many years. The earlier these handicaps are recognised the greater is the opportunity for the child to enjoy normal schooling, and this recognition can be the key to success of the future citizen.

I am keen on the provision of pre-school facilities and we are moving in the right direction, but in this country we will be inhibited by the economic recession in which we are wallowing. Doubtless, the Minister has had difficulties, because in July last the Commonwealth Government announced that it would have to defer the pre-school programme because funds would not be available. As a result of what apparently has been agitation in the Labor Caucus in Canberra, the programme has been reinstated. It has been a matter of on-again off-again aid.

The guidelines that the Commonwealth Minister has sought to lay down are far from clear about what the. Commonwealth Government will require in terms of use of funds, and wider ramifications will be spelt out when the Commonwealth Minister makes up his mind. The Fry report, which I have not had the opportunity to read again since this Bill has been introduced, made recommendations which might have been compiled in haste and about which there seems to be controversy.

It is good that this Bill is to be referred to a Select Committee. I am becoming more convinced of the benefit of referring to Select Committees even Bills that are not required to be so referred, because people then have an opportunity to put a point of view. Although members of Parliament might complain that time would be taken from their normal duties if we allowed. these references

to proliferate, those members who sit on committees have found time to ascertain the import of the Bill. Reference of a Bill to a Select Committee encourages people that the Bill involves, and in regard to the Bill now before the House I do not know of there having been any agitation.

The Kindergarten Union has done good work over the years. I understand that it has 212 branch committees in South Australia at present and that 190 kindergartens are operating. Most of these kindergartens are subsidised, and the work of the union is creditable. The State Government is now moving into the field and the number of State-controlled' kindergartens will doubtless increase. I think we have about 11 such kindergartens now established or proposed for the immediate future. Two objectives of the union commend themselves to me as being of major importance. The first is as follows:

To promote proper education, development, guidance and care of pre-school children.

That puts the emphasis where it ought to be, namely, on the children for whom kindergartens are established. Some people who get involved in education sometimes get excited and lose sight of what the exercise is all about. The institutions exist for the welfare and development of the rising generation. I believe that is an important statement. Clause 6 (*h*) provides:

To encourage members of the community to become personally involved in matters affecting pre-school education.

It will be a sorry day for this country when we develop an attitude in the community that we do not have to concern ourselves with these things because we know the Government will do it. I believe some of the rabid advocates of the Socialist philosophy tend to encourage this attitude. I believe we should encourage a sense of responsibility among members of the community to care for other members of our community. The mentality which tends to develop that the Government should do things to absolve people of any responsibility in respect of activities in our community will have a deleterious effect on our society in the long term.

The Minister has taken pains to point out that, even with the new arrangements for the provision of grants to schools rather than the provision of subsidies, it is important to retain parental interest. One of the strengths of the subsidy system was that it encouraged people to get busy and work for the school so that it attracted subsidies. The Minister rightly pointed out that it would be a sorry day if the availability of grants tended to reduce the parental interest in the schools. It is important that this aspect has been stressed in relation to the union. The more we can encourage people to be interested in doing something for themselves the less will be the demand on the taxpayer to make funds available for these schemes, and there will grow up within the community a charitable outlook which is valuable.

The Bill is easily read. The board of management, although large, should be effective in controlling the affairs of the union. Clause 17 provides for a report to be made to the Governor each year. I believe this is necessary wherever it can be invoked in legislation. Yesterday we were told of one case where it was not considered appropriate that an authority should report to Parliament, but I am pleased to see that in this instance there will be an annual report made by the union to the Governor and that it will thus be available to Parliament. That is only proper where a body is charged with the administration expenditure. The council will comprise representatives of all affiliated kindergartens and others. I think a mistake has been made in clause 21 in relation to the quorum of three, and the Minister has indicated that the mistake will be corrected. I do not think there is any more I need say, except that this Bill has the wholehearted support of the Opposition.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. It effects the take-over of a complete organisation which has operated effectively in the past and which, I am sure, should continue to operate effectively in the future. I commend those people who have administered the affairs of the Kindergarten Union and have conducted its affairs, sometimes under very difficult conditions. Apart from the present time when Australia's economy has reached a state of almost total collapse, it has only recently been possible for a substantial sum to be made available freely for education. No doubt the people concerned in the Commonwealth sphere thought there was a chance to move into pre-school education by making larger grants available and attaching strings to the grants. This Bill gives the opportunity to members to comment on pre-school education in their districts. Clause 6 (*h*) provides that one objective shall be as follows:

To encourage members of the community to become personally involved in matters affecting pre-school education.

In saying that, we are saying that we would like the total community not only to take an interest in pre-school education but also to help raise funds to maintain kindergartens within the community. In my area we have some rich people and some poor people. Last Saturday, the Aidgate kindergarten group conducted a fete in the main street of Aldgate and raised a considerable sum that will go towards the Aldgate group and towards a new group called the Hills Kindergarten Community. A fortnight earlier, the Bridgewater kindergarten group held a fete. A Petticoat Lane has been conducted by the Stirling kindergarten group for many years and as much as $1 500 has been raised in one day. In future, however, a committee will decide the priorities for grants to be made to kindergartens.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That will be all right.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Kavel says that the committee will be all right, but it will make its decisions on the basis of need. If part of a community happens to be affluent, the general view seems to be that the whole of that community is affluent and that it does not need money. The other conclusion seems to be, in effect, "You have raised so much now that you can afford to raise the rest while we build somewhere else where other people have taken no initiative." Some people sat back and said, "We want pre-schools for our children, but the Government must supply them." The Bridgewater group has worked hard in an area that was, in the main, a railway town, consisting mostly of day workers who are far from rich, compared to other parts of my district. The Bridgewater group built a pre-fabricated kindergarten to serve in the interim until money became available to erect a permanent building. The group had raised money but, as a result of galloping inflation, it cannot raise the required sum, because raising funds nowadays is somewhat difficult. Three weeks ago, on a sultry day, white ants were flying inside the building; that is how serious the conditions in the building happen to be.

However, in recent times the money was still not available, nor has this group been accepted as having the right priority. This group of workers, who are not rich, have struggled to save money and have accepted the responsibility contained in paragraph *(h)* to encourage members of the community to become personally interested in pre-school education. This community met that obligation and put away money, but its building is white-ant ridden. This

group is still left in the wilderness. That is the worst example in my area, where it is important that they be given a grant. When the group embarked on this project it was to cost between $10 000 and $12 000, whereas it is now estimated that the project will cost $24 000 or even more. This group needs better treatment in the future. At Coromandel Valley, I was a member of a committee to raise funds to establish a kindergarten. The group there had to use the local Baptist church hall. We doorknocked, by taking about 30 houses each, and raised money to buy the equipment to get the kindergarten off the ground.

The committee has raised other funds by holding functions. The people there are giving up in disgust because, by the time it gets a building under present programming, the present children will be too old for pre-school education. They met the obligation of taking an interest in pre-school education and appear to have lost. The Hills committee, which is within Stirling and which is separate from the Stirling committee, needed funds to commence another project. The Hills committee found that 200 children in that little area were waiting for pre-school education. I joined that committee and, with the good graces of the Catholic church of Mount St. Catherines, they found an available room. That committee has worked to raise money to provide a temporary operation within the church property. The group appreciates the room that has been made available to it and the playground and equipment that have also been made available. That area needs two kindergartens. The Bridgewater and Coromandel Valley cases are serious, and much the same thing applies at Happy Valley, which contains some children from the Mawson district. The building there is located in the district of the Minister of Development and Mines. The committee there works hard and does not complain, but that group is also waiting for money. Perhaps it has a better building than do some of the other groups.

The Happy Valley group is also on the waiting list. The union will now be able to receive moneys provided by the Commonwealth Government or State Government for the purpose of pre-school education and allocate them in accordance with the terms for which they were received. The expression "in accordance with the terms for which they were received" concerns me. I do not mind if the State Government, even an Australian Labor Party Government, decides priorities to a degree, because that is the philosophy for which the people elected. However, I do not believe it was ever intended that the Commonwealth Government should tell the State Government what its priorities should be and how Commonwealth money should be spent. The State Government must abide by Commonwealth Government decisions. The Commonwealth Government says, "We will make money available for pre-school education on certain terms." The State has the expertise from the Minister's department and will have it from the union, when established, and from the committees that will advise the Minister; so, I believe it unnecessary that the Commonwealth Government should interfere. We do not want duplication, but that is what we will get, and that is what will take up much of the money that could be spent on building kindergartens. The union needs to be given as much freedom as possible, with advice from the Minister's department. As much as it is necessary for a political Party to have an influence, if it wishes to have it, in relation to a means or needs test, the union should be given as much freedom as possible away from the Commonwealth scene.

Regarding the needs test, T am aware of the real needs existing in the metropolitan area for the provision of kindergartens and I know that the affluence in those areas would not, on average, be as high as it is in some parts of my district, but Bridgewater and Coromandel Valley, in particular, are two needy areas. If we are to keep the incentive of those people who have always been willing to work as a community for the benefit of the community, we would be doing harm to the overall aims of education, or of any other body, if we discouraged the voluntary effort. It is important that we preserve, encourage and protect the voluntary effort and, if the voluntary effort is to be discouraged by the Bill, it would be harmful. The needs test should not be the major factor in deciding priorities. The Minister knows of my concern about Bridgewater and Coromandel Valley and it concerns me greatly that many people there, who could ill afford it, have made great sacrifices to raise the limited sum they have raised. Inflation has practically defeated their efforts; they cannot keep up with it, even in their normal living expenses, let alone in being able to raise money for kindergartens. Their children want pre-school education next year: the year after would be too late, because their children would then be too old for pre-schools and ready for primary education. I realise that the argument about the age of children can be used with reference to many parts of the metropolitan area. I am talking about people who have made a financial sacrifice. As they are not rich, they cannot afford to drive their children to the city (I have heard that a few do this) to a kindergarten there, or to some other training; they cannot afford to employ tutors, as they are in the lower income order.

In supporting the Bill, I am taking the opportunity to point out that it is not always fair and just to make decisions on a needs test basis, as this can kill the valuable asset of self-help, which has helped make this country a great place and which I hope will help make it a great place in the future. If voluntary effort disappears and we become too dependent on the State, finally we will have nothing on which to be dependent. I hope that the Minister will take action to see whether at least Bridgewater and Coromandel Valley can receive a slightly higher priority than appears to be the case at present.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I consider this to be an important Bill, for I am convinced of the need for pre-school education. I first became interested in this type of education before I was elected to Parliament at a time when my daughter attended a kindergarten. 1 enrolled her because she did not have any other children to play with; at that time I was not convinced that she would receive any educational value. Following her enrolment, I became associated with the kindergarten and realised how important this type of education was to the children who were fortunate enough to receive it. This became obvious when these children first enrolled in infants school, as they settled down immediately, whereas other children took about six months to settle down and benefit from their infants school education. At that time, many parents were not interested in this type of education. However, the position has now changed to such an extent that parents are more or less demanding this type of education, being disappointed if it is not available in their area.

Over the years, I have got to know many people who are officers of the Kindergarten Union. 1 pay a tribute to present members as well as to some members who have retired, and also to the parents of children who attend kindergartens. Of course, mostly 1 know people associated with kindergartens in my district but, from what the member for Fisher has said, I can see that the same situation applies in other areas. Parents become enthusiastic, doing much voluntary work, especially fund raising, in the

interests of these kindergartens. Fortunately, in recent years the emphasis with regard to this type of education has changed so much that the State Government has helped establish kindergartens to a far greater extent than applied previously. Originally, all that happened was that the Kindergarten Union received an annual grant with no strings attached. Thanks to the present State Minister of Education, subsidies have been granted towards the capital cost of buildings. If any surplus Education Department land was available, it was provided to kindergarten committees. Since the advent of the Commonwealth Labor Government, that Government has made grants towards establishing kindergartens, and this has contributed towards the increase in the number of kindergartens. However, there is still a backlag.

Although a lot has been achieved, much still needs to be done because in most areas, especially developing areas, there' are only half as many kindergartens as there should be. I think that the concept of the Australian Government's making a grant either direct to the union or to the State Education Department for a building to be erected on primary school land is a good one. I favour the erection of pre-schools on primary school land, near infants and primary schools, although I know this is not possible in all areas. Therefore, I presume that the dual system we have at present will probably continue. As I know the Bill is to go to a Select Committee, I do not intend to speak further now, but will reserve any additional comments until later.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): In my district, several distinguished people do much work for kindergartens. I appreciate the objectives of the union to provide for proper educational development and guidance in the care of pre-school children. As recently as last week, the pre-school centre at Penola approached me with regard to assistance. As the member for Fisher has said, self-help is the best help, but sometimes additional assistance is needed, such as that which will be provided under the Bill. As my colleagues have said, a pre-school centre lays the foundation for education. My granddaughter has enjoyed this beneficial background, and it has certainly had an effect. This Bill, which is a major step forward, will have the approbation of kindergartens in my district. On behalf of the people in my district, I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I, too, support the Bill. Again, I object to the fact that the Minister in his usual way has introduced another lengthy Bill at the end of the session. This Bill runs to 18 foolscap pages. Members have great difficulty in trying to ensure that there are no errors in legislation. We are confident that the Minister would not do anything under-hand, but he must realise that we have to scrutinise this legislation closely. The Bill was introduced yesterday, and I presume it will be law today. As children, most members would have attended a kindergarten and, since I have been in this country, I have been amazed at the excellent kindergartens and the type of people who work so hard for them.

I settled at Seacliff and my children attended kindergarten in an old army hut. The staff, auxiliaries, and committees worked very hard to keep that hut in good condition and provide for the children attending it, and they deserve the greatest respect from and congratulations of the Minister and me. In recent years a new kindergarten has been built, and it is now an excellent place in Maitland Terrace, at which my daughter teaches. She will be moving to another kindergarten at Happy Valley at which conditions are somewhat different from conditions that she has been enjoying, because it is an old building situated near the reservoir and has many problems.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Acoustically, it is first-class.

Mr. MATHWIN: A new kindergarten college has been built in the district of the member for Torrens and, obviously, teachers are trained well. Previous conditions at the college were somewhat difficult for students and teachers, but the present marvellous building is a credit to everyone concerned. This is a long Bill, and clause 6 sets out the objects of the union, one of which is to register as members of the union kindergartens that meet the requirements of the union in respect of membership.

Apparently, a constitution has to be submitted to the union before a kindergarten can be admitted as a member. Another object is to encourage members of the community to become personally involved in matters affecting pre-school education. I believe it is imperative that the general public and those personally concerned with kindergartens should be encouraged. In a recent instance at Gawler people were told that they should not interest themselves in raising money to help the kindergarten. That is a bad philosophy, and I am pleased that the object to which I referred has been included.

Clause 7 sets out the powers of the union, and paragraph (*d*) provides for it to receive moneys provided by the Government of the Commonwealth, or of the State, for the purpose of pre-school education, and allocate and apply the moneys in accordance with the terms on which they were received. It seems that the Commonwealth Government in Canberra, in its far-flung ivory tower, will direct how and where the money is to be spent and which kindergarten is to receive priority. I suggest to the Minister that the people of this State because of their knowledge, should be able to decide priorities, and, whether the Commonwealth Government provides finance or not, it should not give directions as to how the money is to be spent. That Government should have confidence in people controlling these organisations and allow them to decide on priorities. That is a common-sense attitude, and I am sure the Minister would agree.

Another power of the union allows it to invest any money not immediately required for the purposes of the union, thus allowing money to be invested in gilt-edge securities. Perhaps the Minister will explain what is intended by this provision. The board of management, comprising 15 members, from time to time will be able to co-opt others to assist, but no more than two co-opted members are allowed at any one time.

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

Mr. MATHWIN: It is interesting to see so many Government members in the Chamber! There are not many here at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the honourable member is referring to a quorum.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MATHWIN: Clause 9 (1) (*b*) provides:

> The board of management shall consist of...two members appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister after consultation with the South Australian Institute of Teachers (of whom at least one must be a member of the Pre-school Teachers Association).

That means that at least one member must belong to the association, which I suppose is the equivalent of a union. Certain other members are appointed by the Governor, including one from the staff of a college of advanced education that is conducting courses for the benefit of people wishing to become pre-school teachers (the kindergarten college). A new college for this purpose has been erected

in the district of the member for Torrens and is an asset to the community. Good kindergarten teachers are produced by the staff operating that college. An additional four members of the board of management are to be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the council, and four more are appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister. Not more than two members at any time can be co-opted to membership on the board. Under clause 10 (2) (*a*) and (*b*), two of the four members nominated by the council and two of the four members nominated by the Minister shall be appointed for a term of one year in the first instance, so that half the number of those members will retire each year. Clause 14 (1) provides:

The board shall, from time to time, as occasion requires, appoint from its own membership a President and Vice-President, or Vice-Presidents.

I should hope that the board, in its wisdom, would appoint more than one Vice-President. It is a good principle for boards such as this (especially boards of this size) to have a President and two Vice-Presidents. I fully support that clause. Clause 17 provides that the board shall prepare and present to the Governor a report of the affairs of the union during the previous calendar year, and that is a proper provision, giving people ah opportunity to peruse the records of the union if they so desire. Clause 18 provides, in part, that any people who have been elected to life membership of the union shall be members of the union council. This applies also to any person holding an honorary office in the union, and the provision gives these people a continuing interest in the organisation. I applaud the Minister for seeing fit to incorporate those provisions.

The member for Kavel referred to the manner of calculating a quorum of the council, which is calculated by dividing the number of members of the board by five, ignoring any fraction resulting from the division, and adding one. The Minister's attention has been drawn to this matter, as problems could arise. Clause 21 (4) provides:

Each member of the council shall be entitled to exercise one vote on any matter arising for the decision of the council.

The clause does not provide, as I see if, for a Chairman's vote and does not stipulate whether his vote is a deliberative or casting vote. 1 applaud the provisions of clause 23 (2) regarding the registration of private kindergartens. Some unions do not give copies of their rules or constitution to members. We cannot get from the Parliamentary Library a copy of the constitution and rules of any union.

Many people work hard for kindergartens, and I refer to the kindergartens at Ballara Park and at North Brighton and Somerton, in the District of Glenelg. The Minister knows those kindergartens: at one stage they were in his district and, fortunately, they are now in my district. I am delighted to be invited to see the children at their Christmas tree functions at those kindergartens. Although I do not wish to take up the Premier's Cassius Clay attitude, we have never had it so good in Glenelg. We have won a football final and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows full well that he cannot speak along those lines.

Mr. MATHWIN: I give credit to the staff and committees who work so hard for kindergartens. Many people continue that work although they no longer have children at kindergarten.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. Dean Brown, Mrs. Byrne, and Messrs. Goldsworthy, Hudson, and Simmons; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on February 19, 1975.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS COMMISSIONER'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 1, lines 18 to 27 and page 2, lines 1 to 4 (clause 3)—Leave out all words in these lines.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

This motion probably will go down in history as my greatest capitulation of all time, and I regret that I am moving it.

Dr. Eastick: How did you vote four years ago?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The important thing that the Leader has raised is that five years ago the Legislative Council unanimously agreed to what it is now disagreeing to on a cooked-up vote of eight to 10.

The CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with the Legislative Council's amendment, and I ask that that be the subject of discussion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Regrettably, the Legislative Council's amendment denies to the South Australian Railways Commissioner the right to sell liquor in bottles, cans, or other sealed containers. Five years ago (not four years ago, as the Leader has suggested), the then Minister, the Hon. Murray Hill, who is a member of the Leader's Party (I do not know whether he is the shadow Minister of Transport), introduced legislation authorising the establishment of a bottle shop. Today, we find that the progressive members of the Opposition in another place have opposed what they supported five years ago. What a progressive Party it is!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister not to reflect on another place. The honourable Minister.

The Hon; G. T. VIRGO: We have already debated the Bill designed to provide additional activities in the interests of the travelling public and in the interests of State finances. Regrettably, we now find that Opposition members in another place have been able to move an amendment to deprive the railways of a source of income.

Mr. Mathwin: The railways could be subsidised, by the taxpayers.

Mr. Crimes: Who subsidises the hotels and bottle shops? The taxpayer and the consumer!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Spence is out of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A few days ago the member for Eyre complained in the Chamber about the railway losses.

Mr. Harrison: I think he said they amounted to $8 a minute.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He suggested that the Minister ought to review the position with a view to improving railway finances. I told him that I had already taken action, with Cabinet support, to achieve certain improvements in railway finances and that other matters were under consideration. One of those matters was the Bill then before members. We now find that another place has deprived the Commissioner of earning additional revenue on the score that it would be against the best interests of private enterprise. In other words, what they have said is that we should have a private enterprise system (a monopoly unopposed by the Government). What a great capitalist system Opposition members here and in another place support! That is the effect of the amendment another place has inflicted on the Government. It will

prevent the railways from providing a service for the travelling public. The member for Alexandra may wave his handkerchief, but he has only to give me one hint and I will withdraw the subsidy we are giving to people on Kangaroo Island.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable Minister to address the Chair, and honourable members to cease interjecting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: 1 oppose the reactionary attitude of the Liberal majority in another place who, by design, defeated our move by 10 votes to eight. One of them did not even know whether he had voted for or against.

Mr. COUMBE: After the Minister's outburst, 1 cannot resist rising to congratulate him on the stand he has taken. However, I deplore the crocodile tears he has shed and the threats he has made to an important oversea dependency of South Australia. The Minister could not even remember for how long he has been in the Chamber, but I can tell him that it has. been too long for a start!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister's term in Parliament has nothing to do with the amendment. The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. COUMBE: What the Minister meant to refer to was the 1969 amendment, introduced by the Hon. Mr. Hill (the then Minister of Transport), which provided eating and other facilities, including the Tavern at the station, but the amendment did not include provision for bottle facilities.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It did.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister should read section 105 of the Act.

Mr. MATHWIN: I congratulate the Minister on the brilliant way in which he has supported the Legislative Council's amendment. I was present in the gallery when the vote was taken and, although the Minister has ridiculed the Hon. Mr. Hill, Mr. Hill voted against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the amendment the Committee is discussing.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister said that he—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister was out of order, and so is the honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister got the explanation out of his head. Without the amendment, we would have a nationalised industry—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Legislative Council's amendment.

Mr. MATHWIN: The amendment strikes out words that relate to sales of liquor in bottles or cans from an outlet at the Adelaide railway station. The Minister said that this amendment was designed to help private enterprise, but there are many other reasons for it. I congratulate the Minister on the decision he made to accept the amendment, but 1 do not congratulate him on what he said.

Mr. GUNN: Again, we have witnessed a typically abusive attack by the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order. I ask him to confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. GUNN: A similar amendment to the Legislative Council's amendment was moved when we dealt with this Bill previously; the Minister should have taken a more reasonable attitude then. The nonsense with which he went on this evening shows that he is more interested in making political points than in discussing—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not continually warn the honourable member. If he wishes to continue, he must confine his remarks to the Legislative Council's amendment.

Mr. Mathwin: How will this look in the *Herald?*

The CHAIRMAN: I warn the honourable member for Glenelg, too.

Mr. GUNN: It is a proper amendment, and I am pleased that the Minister has grudgingly agreed to accept it. It will help people in the hotel industry.

Motion carried.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following suggested amendments:

No. 1. Page 6, lines 19 to 36 (clause 11)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert new paragraph *(b)* as follows:

(b) for a retail tobacconist's licence a fee of ten dollars together with an amount equal to ten per centum of the value of tobacco sold by the applicant in the course of tobacco retailing during the relevant period (other than tobacco purchased in the course of intra-state trade from the holder of a wholesale tobacco merchant's licence).

No. 2. Page 6, lines 41 to 46 (clause 11)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 3. Page 6, lines 47 and 48 (clause 11)—Leave out "for a period after the thirtieth day of September, 1976."

No. 4. Page 7, lines 12 to 17 (clause 11)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 5. Page 7, lines 18 and 19 (clause 11)—Leave out "for a period after the thirtieth day of September, 1976."

No. 6. Page 7—After clause 11 insert new clause 11a as follows:

Reduction of fees.

11a (1) Where the Minister is satisfied that payment of a fee assessed by the Commissioner in accordance with section 11 of this Act in respect of a licence would cause substantial hardship to the applicant for, or holder of, the licence, the Minister may reduce the fee.

(2) A reduction shall not be granted under subsection (I) of this section after the thirtieth day of September, 1976.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be agreed to.

The amendments, which have been circulated, are rather technical in their detail. I am instructed that their meaning is as follows: amendments Nos. 1 to 5 relate to the possibility that during the first quarter some people could make purchases of tobacco which, in some measure, might be an avoidance of the taxation. The amendments are designed to cope with that situation. Amendment No. 6 provides for a reduction of fees and relates to the possibility that there might be a transfer from existing wholesalers to other forms of supplying tobacco that would face the existing wholesaler with grave hardship, since his licence fee would relate to a previous specified period in which his sales had been at a greater rate. Therefore, some specific provision for remission in those circumstances has to be made. We agree that that is a sensible provision. These amendments follow representations in the trade that the Government agrees are proper and valid.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I appreciate that the Government has accepted the amendments. I point out that, when the Bill was previously before us, we queried whether it would do what it was intended to do. I sought an assurance from the Treasurer that there had

been sufficient time for industry to scrutinise the measure to ensure that it would not have an adverse effect. This week we have been passing legislation through exhaustion. It is not good enough on behalf of the people of the State to deal with measures in this way; we must be able to ensure that legislation is framed to do what it is intended to do. We are fortunate to have a bicameral Parliamentary system that allows these matters to be reviewed so that we do not stampede into a situation from which we cannot extricate ourselves.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Does the Treasurer appreciate the hardship this Bill is likely to cause? I refer specifically to amendment No. 6, which relates to cases of hardship. Does the Treasurer realise that independent tobacco distributors in this State will, by April 1, be required to find, in some cases, up to $250 000? Obviously they will not be able to produce that sum by then, and they are not able to rely on collecting the money beforehand from retail outlets, because some of them come under the Prices Justification Tribunal and will have to apply for an increase, which would not really be valid until the tax was actually imposed. How is a case of hardship classified? What sort or relief can these people expect? Can they expect relief for three months? What conditions would the Treasurer impose for such relief?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As it is not possible to include provisions for every conceivable, circumstance, each case will be considered on its merits. If wholesalers are faced with financial difficulties, they will be given time to pay and their liquidity position will be considered.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This is a new tax and these organisations will have to find large sums in a short time. Will the Treasurer undertake to consider the private distributors, rather than allow multi-national companies to take over the distribution of this product?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Consideration will be given to all local companies.

Motion carried.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 3 (clause 6)—After line 9 insert "and".

No. 2. Page 3, lines 13 to 21 (clause 6)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 3. Page 3, lines 28 to 44 (clause 7)—Leave out paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) and insert new paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) as follows:

(*a*) an amount equivalent to 2 per centum of all moneys paid or payable to him in respect of bets made on events held within this State;

and

(*b*) an amount equivalent to 2.6 per centum of all moneys paid or payable to him in respect of bets made on events held outside this State.

No. 4. Page 3, lines 46 to 48 and page 4, lines 1 to 29 (clause 8)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

(*a*) by striking out paragraphs (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*) of subsection (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraphs:

(*b*) an amount equivalent to the prescribed percentage of the total amount of the bets made with bookmakers on events decided within the State on the day the bets were made (excluding the amount of bets made in registered premises) shall be paid to the clubs at whose meetings those bets were made;

(*c*) an amount equivalent to the prescribed percentage of the total amount of the bets made with bookmakers on race-courses and coursing grounds on events decided within the State on a day or days subsequent to the day on which the bets were made (excluding the amount of bets made in registered premises) shall be paid to the club by which the event was conducted;

and

(*d*) the balance of the commission received by the board under this section shall be paid to the Treasurer in aid of the general revenue of this State;

and

(*b*) by inserting after subsection (4) the following subsection:

(5) In this section—"the prescribed percentage" means—

(*a*) in relation to bets made within the metropolitan area—1.1 per centum;

and

(*b*) in relation to bets made outside the metropolitan area—1.3 per centum.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

These amendments are designed to provide a solution to the alleged problems of country racing clubs by removing the differential in the bookmakers' turnover tax between the metropolitan and country areas. These amendments are not acceptable to the Government. In considering the Hancock committee's report, the Government believed that, because of low turnovers, there was a case for a lower rate of Government tax on both totalisators and bookmakers, and accepted neither of the recommendations of the committee. The Legislative Council, not satisfied with what I regard as effective protection given to country clubs by the Bill, has suggested that the rate of tax on bookmakers should be the same in country areas as it is for the metropolitan area, but has suggested a change of rate for on-course totalisators. I do not believe that that is a fair proposition. If the Legislative Council had been dinkum in this matter it would have suggested that the same rate of tax should apply on on-course totalisators in the country as in the metropolitan area. The Legislative Council's suggestion is not acceptable in any circumstances. The Government is not adding a cent to its revenue through this Bill, which assists the racing industry.

I do not think it is good enough to say, "We will solve this problem by removing the assurance provided in the Bill to the country racing clubs and by picking on the bookmakers." It must be recognised that, if there is a case for a lower rate of stamp duty for the Government in connection with country totalisators (because, on a given turnover, the fixed costs are a higher ratio to turnover), exactly the same case applies in connection with country bookmakers. Lower turnovers mean that the. bookmakers' fixed costs are a higher ratio to turnover, and therefore a lower rate of tax is justified. A lower rate of tax for country bookmakers was introduced by the Hall Government, and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was the Minister responsible.

Mr. Becker: That is unfair.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is true. Now, the Legislative Council has decided to attempt to remove this. The same principle must apply: if it is good enough to have a lower rate of tax on on-course totalisators, the

same thing applies to bookmakers, and we must find another way of solving the problems of the country clubs.

Mr. Arnold: What do you suggest?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The suggestion in the original Bill was quite adequate.

Mr. Chapman: Are you suggesting that this same rate of tax should apply to the operations of the S.P. bookmakers?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member had suggested a lower rate of maximum penalty for country S.P. bookmakers than for those in the metropolitan area, I might have accepted it, but it is too late for that. The Bill assumes that it is inappropriate for Parliament to determine the specific allocations that apply to country clubs. The allocations that are to be made by the controlling authority have to be determined in the light of the full knowledge of the situation that applies. It is not good enough for Parliament, because there is a little bit of local pressure, to try to lay down these things. Over the past few years the extent of assistance from the South Australian Jockey Club, the controlling authority of horse-racing, to country clubs has been expanded significantly.

Mr. Wardle: It takes a lot of our best dates, though.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member ought to be the last person to complain about the S.A.J.C., because it has produced a rationalisation in his area which is eminently sensible and which has strengthened the Murray Bridge Racing Club to ensure that it can develop permanently as a strong club and a strong training centre; this was achieved by transferring the Tailem Bend club's dates to the Murray Bridge club. It is all very well for the honourable member to set himself up as a sort of momentary expert on this matter; he pays no attention to it for 11 months of the year.

I suggest that the controlling authority of horse-racing is the appropriate body to make these allocations. What we need to ensure in the Bill is that the allocations to the country clubs in general are increased, and we should then leave it to the controlling authority to determine who gets what, after the authority has considered all the appropriate issues. We are not talking about racing itself: we are talking about the overall allocation. The member for Glenelg was stupid enough in the earlier stages of the Bill to move an amendment that would have guaranteed the country clubs $10 000 in circumstances where they were already getting $50 000; I do not know of anything more stupid than that. Further, the honourable member's colleagues were obliged to vote for the amendment out of a sense of loyalty.

Mr. Mathwin: You want to get the $10 000 into the Treasury. Deny it!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The overall position in connection with the State Treasury is zilch—nothing. The allocation of $10 000 was previously controlled by the Betting Control Board, a completely inappropriate authority for making allocations to country clubs. The overall adjustments made in the Treasury's share of the bookmakers' turnover tax mean that the effect in connection with the Treasury is virtually negligible.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you deny that you want to get the $10 000 into the Treasury?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member does not want to listen.

Mr. Mathwin: I am listening.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Well, the honourable member ought to stop being so ignorant. I am willing to put up with many things, but sheer stupidity gets a bit hard to put up with.

Mr. Mathwin: I am listening.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Well, take this! The racing clubs previously paid on-course fractions to charities on the decision of the various club committees: they were not paid into the Hospitals Fund. On the recommendation of the Hancock committee, those fractions will cease to go to charities. On our decision they go, at the discretion of the club committee, either to the Racecourses Development Board or to the club itself. Charities that were previously supported by racing club committees will now have to apply to the Government, and extra payments (mainly under Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous) will be made to them.

Dr. Tonkin: What about those charities that normally get a grant from the Government anyway?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If they get a grant from the Government and one from a racing club committee normally, they will be able to demonstrate to the Auditor-General that they need additional support. If they convince the Auditor-General, they will get it. There are two offsetting factors to that loss of Government revenue: one is the $10 000 that comes from the Betting Control Board to the Government and the other is the effect on the bookmakers' turnover tax of the introduction of Sydney betting. The Government will get an offsetting gain in revenue to the loss that arises from the extra pay-outs to charities. As far as we can judge, the two things balance out quite well.

The total net gain to racing, trotting, and dogs from this measure will be about $960 000 a year, representing $971 000 from the extra tax provisions that go to the clubs minus the $10 000. If the controlling authority for .racing cannot provide for the country clubs out of the extra revenue it will get, there is something wrong.

Mr. Mathwin: Why should they—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The reason is simple. First, the Betting Control Board, as pointed out by the Hancock inquiry and accepted by the Government, is not an appropriate authority to make allocations to clubs. If allocations are to be made, they should be made by the controlling authority.

Mr. McAnaney: Who runs that?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When the amalgamated club is established the controlling authority will have country representation. The controlling authority is now the South Australian Jockey Club, which does not have country representation but which, since the Totalizator Agency Board has been introduced, has increased the support given to country clubs.

Mr. McAnaney: By taking race meetings away from-them.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is rather like trying to establish an area school. This has been part of the controlling authority's problem.

Mr. Gunn: What has this to do with schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We are establishing two new area schools in the district of the member for Eyre, involving consolidation and the closing of other schools.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the Minister have nothing to do with the Legislative Council's amendments. He is waffling on about schools.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the Minister to confine his remarks to the matter before the Chair.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I intend to link up my remarks to the amendments immediately by pointing out the analogy in relation to the racing industry. In some areas of the State there is a need for rationalisation and

co-ordination, but it is not appropriate that Parliament should lay down that rationalisation. It is a job for the controlling authority after consultation with all the interests involved. Just as with schools when we go in for consolidation, so it is with racing; there are worries and fears as to the consequences of changes made. Thirty or 40 years ago, people were much less mobile and a good case could be made out for almost any country centre having its own club. If we are to upgrade racing, just as we try to upgrade education, in a day and age when people are much more mobile we must pick the areas in which to consolidate the effort. We do not want magnificent grandstands at Jamestown, Laura, Clare, and Balaklava, all in the one area.

Mr. Becker: Why not? Laura is as much entitled to decent facilities as is Jamestown.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Unfortunately, that is a silly statement. The member for Hanson should know full well that, if we are to approach the building up of racing in this State on the basis that the controlling authority is going to put first-class facilities in every existing racing club, it will never happen. It can only happen if the effort is concentrated in certain areas. The controlling authority for racing must do that job and it should be allowed to do it in the interests of racing on an overall basis.

Mr. Arnold: Where this rationalisation has taken place and two clubs have amalgamated but the new club is still not getting a reasonable go, where do they go from there?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The argument must be between the club and the controlling authority. I do not think it will be possible as a long-term policy for this Parliament to lay down the allocation from the controlling authority to all country clubs. If we try to do that, sooner or later we will end up in bedlam. Honourable members have loyalties to certain clubs; there will be additional funds for country racing, but those additional funds will have little effect unless they are concentrated and unless there is some possibility of rationalisation. This can come about only through the controlling authority. The original provision in the Bill was that the controlling authority should have regard to payments previously made by the Betting Control Board. I have spoken to the Secretary of the S.A.J.C. and I have his assurance that the increased funds to country racing under this Bill will be greater than the amounts that country racing got previously from the Betting Control Board. If members opposite require a written assurance on that, I am sure that it will be given. Why question the integrity of the S.A.J.C. on the matter?

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister know whether the industry, through spokesmen for its major club and members of the Country Racing Association, may not agree with the amendments? I ask him to assure us that the position has not changed. Perhaps the amendments are as they would like.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure whether the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has consulted the Bookmakers League. I know that there have been previous discussions between them when he was a member of a Government. If the Hon. Mr. DeGaris states that the Bookmakers League supports the amendments, that would be interesting information. There is more to the industry than the controlling authority and we must be sure about country clubs, the trainers and the jockeys, and the bookmakers.

Dr. Eastick: In other words, you're not sure about what may be the position today?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sure that the amendments have been promoted by one source only. The S.A.J.C. does not support them. I have spoken to the S.A.J.C. since the amendments were moved in the other place this afternoon.

Mr. Becker: At what time?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At about 5 o'clock. The Secretary made clear that the position was one of, "We will give an assurance to the country clubs in general that increased funding will be available but, if we are to have any discretion, we cannot give an assurance that any one club next year will get the same amount as it has got this year." Overall, there will be increased funding in the country clubs. If members opposite want to telephone Mr. Keen, they may do so.

Mr. BECKER: I support the amendments, because the Legislative Council is trying to guarantee assistance to country racing. There is no guarantee that members of country racing clubs will get as much as they have got in the past. '

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's in the Bill.

Mr. BECKER: It is not. The Legislative Council is trying to have written into the Bill a provision that country clubs will get a fair share.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, King, and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Blacker, McAnaney, and Nankivell.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments nullify the principles of the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendments.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POTATO MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1430.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): As the Potato Marketing Board operates effectively, I support the Bill, and at this stage I have had my chips.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I was going to make the shortest speech I have ever made in the House until I read what had been said in another place, where a representative of the metropolitan area, which is the most highly-subsidised section of South Australia, made rude comments about the board. Originally, potato marketing was carried out by the merchants, and this meant that certain people sometimes cornered the market and made large profits at the expense of both the grower and the consumer. Ultimately, the board was constituted, but it was set up.in only a half-hearted fashion. The potato redistribution centre,, owned and operated by the merchants, made substantial profits. Ultimately, the need arose for a change to a system

of orderly marketing, as a result of many arguments both in this House and in the industry.

The potato, an important commodity, originated in Ireland. The potato famine in Ireland caused many Irishmen to migrate to many parts of the world, where they have left the mark of their culture. The Irish have led the rest of the world in culture and their high standard of living. They have supplied most of the members of the New York Police Force. I understand that, as more and more foreigners have entered that force, it has deteriorated considerably.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has been in the House long enough not to need any prompting on any matter.

Mr. McANANEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your confidence in me. I do not have that prickly little customer worrying me from the rear this evening. Because of various amendments to the legislation, which have been made necessary because of changing circumstances, we have an efficient potato-marketing organisation that satisfies the growers. I was indeed upset to read that a member of another place had said that, because of the Potato Marketing Board, cheap or good potatoes could not be purchased at any time. I strongly disagree with that. Indeed, we have an efficient board, which is run by the growers. In turn, the growers have, with more stable conditions, become more efficient and adopted the latest methods of production. If the Government permitted them to use more water this year, growers could produce more potatoes for the benefit of the community. I hope the Government will take note of what I am saying and ensure that water which is at present going out to sea and wasted will be channelled in this direction.

I congratulate the Potato Board on asking the Government to introduce this legislation to enable its activities to be brought up to date. I remember when I was battling in this House to get the board to take over the responsibility for distribution, the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) completely opposed the legislation. Although he may have been the greatest Treasurer Australia had ever seen, he knew nothing about the potato industry. He agreed with me later when he began to realise what was happening in the industry. What was happening was very much a racket: at one stage potatoes were being packed in South Australia and exported to New South Wales; they were also being packed in Victoria. This was uneconomic not only for the producer but also for the consumer, who had to pay more for this commodity. I regret that, because of ignorance and lack of knowledge, certain statements were made in another place. Generally, bad legislation is improved by another place. It is therefore a desirable Chamber.

Mr. Venning: What would the Government do without the Upper House?

Mr. McANANEY: True, another place saves the Government from itself at times. If the Government is under pressure to pass certain legislation, its task is simplified if the Upper House knocks out that legislation. Politically, another place is unwise to knock out legislation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen is out of order in referring to another place.

Mr. McANANEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I always agree with your ruling.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I. thank both members for their contribution to the debate and for their support of the Bill.

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

APIARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 20. Page 2112.)

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The story of bees has been told by poets like Maeterlinck, by scientists like Huber and Lubbock, and by practical beekeepers. This Bill contains 13 clauses, most of which are immediately acceptable to the industry. 1 shall go through them individually, as I want to make some points about them. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts further definitions in the Act. The first part of this clause refers to a definition of a bee itself. It seems rather unusual that the bee has not previously been defined in this Act, despite the fact that the Ligurian Bee Act was first introduced in South Australia in 1885 (incidentally, that was the Kangaroo Island Ligurian Bee Act). That legislation gave protection to the Ligurian bee, which is unique to this country and particularly to Kangaroo Island, because it is the only true strain of Ligurian bee in the world.

The specific reason for inserting the definition of "bee" in the Bill follows the problems that were experienced last year when the Agriculture Department introduced an apis to Australia for experimental purposes. It is also the result of bringing in the solitary or leaf-cutter bee, which brought with it to this country a serious disease. On discovering this disease, the Agriculture Department was required to destroy not only the bee but also the experiment the depot was carrying out. The clause includes a couple of other definitions relating to a beekeeper, and so on. I point out that these definitions are acceptable to the industry.

Clause 4 relates to section 5 of the principal Act and proposes to describe further the requirements of a beekeeper in relation to the registration of his hives. Clauses 5 to 10 are simple clauses to increase the fines applicable to breaches of the Act. To date, the applicable fines have been $40, and they are increased to $200. I am informed by members of the industry that this is acceptable; they support the clauses without hesitation. Clause 11, which proposes to amend section 13a, refers to the branding of hives. I think honourable members are aware of the disturbance this proposal has caused not only in the industry but also among some of the members of this House. It is interesting to note the progressive requirements of the Agriculture Department in this matter.

Initially, apiarists were required to register their hives and brand at least one hive on the site. In, I think, 1964, the principal Act was amended, requiring apiarists to brand one hive in 10 or at least one of the hives that they owned, even if they owned fewer than 10. The clause in the Bill requires beekeepers to brand and keep branded each of the hives in the prescribed manner with a brand allocated by the Chief Inspector. Failure to comply with this provision will mean a penalty of $200. Those people who keep a few hives in the back yard have asked why they have to brand or identify the hives, as identification of the hives does not present any problems to inspectors. Many times councils have ordered the removal of hives at short notice because the bees were causing inconvenience to nearby food factories. Tn these instances the hives must be quickly moved to new locations, such as empty blocks outside the area. Identification of these hives, unless branded, is virtually impossible. I hope those who keep a few hives will accept the reason for the importance of branding each hive.

Inspectors are appointed to control the spread of disease that can appear in a district at any time, and are empowered

to destroy diseased bees. Therefore, close supervision is kept on all hives in any area where an outbreak has occurred. Under the Apiaries Act penalties are provided for failure to brand hives or to notify the Agriculture Department concerning the removal of bees from one area to another. It is in the interest of all beekeepers to safeguard their bees by observing these provisions of the Act. Although these comments were prepared in support of the introduction of branding one in 10 hives in 1964, they apply today. The honey industry is important to South Australia and, although the bee is a tiny insect it does an excellent job of producing honey. It weighs 1/100 000 of a kilogram, and an average colony will contain 30 000 individual bees, weighing about 2.7 kg. There are 94 994 hives in South Australia owned by about 867 registered beekeepers. In South Australia, 4 700 tonnes of honey was produced in 1971-72, of which a significant amount was exported.

The industry is having some problems at present, but the Australian Honey Board is one of the few boards that has not asked the Government for help, and it is to be commended for the way it conducts its business. Mr. Len Stevens, a leading apiarist in South Australia, has brought to my notice that, although he agrees with the principle of branding hives (and he does it), he has been disturbed because the Minister's department has not directly contacted those in the industry and told them of the intended amendments. The industry will accept these amendments, because they are in the long-term interests of apiarists and will help inspectors to recover stolen hives or detect disease among bees. There has been a breakdown in the Bill, not in its preparation but in its presentation, because the industry was not warned about its introduction.

Most of the Bill is almost identical to the Bill introduced by the Liberal Party in 1968, and it is pleasing to note that the Minister has not altered it much. On principle, I would be reluctant to criticise the Bill. Generally, the industry has no quarrel with its contents. The first laws regarding this industry were prepared and enacted by this Parliament on behalf of the Kangaroo Island community. However, there is no provision in the Bill or in the principal Act to prevent secondhand apiarist material being sent to Kangaroo Island from the mainland. Whilst every effort has been made to secure the pure strain of all Ligurian bees in that community, a provision should be introduced to make it an offence to take secondhand or used hive-making material or hives to Kangaroo Island.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That would be difficult to police.

Mr. CHAPMAN: There are so few people involved that it. would not be difficult. Because of the branding of hives provisions, the exercise would be simple. Few people, other than commercial apiarists, are interested in keeping bees in the backyard.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Hives to be branded."

Mr. CHAPMAN: I ask what is meant in relation to the branding of hives. In what way is it suggested that the apiarist mark, indite, or brand?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): The hives must be branded in the way set out in regulations, and at this stage we cannot say what the regulations will provide. I think it will be in a way that will enable the hive to be identified as to ownership. I spoke to the Minister on this matter today and my impression was that several ways would be prescribed so as to try to be not too bureaucratic.

Clause passed.

Clause 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Amendment of schedule of principal Act."

Mr. CHAPMAN: As we are following Victoria (and I think that several apiarists take their hives to New South Wales), will New South Wales be encouraged to fall into line?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message that it had disagreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) moved:

That the House of Assembly do not insist on its amendment.

Motion carried.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message that it had disagreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) moved:

That the House of Assembly do not insist on its amendment.

Motion carried.

FORESTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 27. Page 2357.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. Where houses exist in areas originally declared forestry reserves, the opportunity will be available to the Government to define the houses in those areas owned by private individuals other than forestry reserves. So the person, in actual fact, will have his property outside the forestry reserve. The member for Victoria will explain the position more fully with regard to his area. In the Hills area, in the Fisher District and in neighbouring districts, there are considerable forestry reserves, and objections have been raised in the past that the Government produces and sells timber from these forestry reserves but pays no rates to the local council. So, in effect, local people subsidise, at great expense, a Government enterprise to the benefit of the rest of the people in the State. There is an injustice in that respect. About one-third of the Gumeracha area, in the Kavel District, comprises forestry reserves. In the Mount Bold water catchment area, little land owned by the Woods and Forests Department is used for housing purposes, but one area of land now being used by the department will be declared under the new provision, namely, the old Blackwood experimental orchard, in Coromandel Valley, which is an extreme fire hazard.

If by the legislation the Government intends to declare a forestry reserve for the purpose of growing trees for timber or seedlings for later planting in other reserves, it should reduce the fire hazard in that area. The area is in the middle of a residential area, and it will be disastrous if the area is not denuded of its high growth before it becomes highly flammable. The department's activities

have a great impact on the environment of the community, and I will attempt to discuss that matter more fully at a later stage. I support the Bill in its present form.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The member for Fisher has a wide knowledge of forests and forestry reserves. The Bill tidies up the matter of forestry reserves, and the Opposition supports it. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, difficulties hamper us from time to time because the application of the principal Act relates to forestry reserves. As members appreciate, generally the dedication of land for forestry reserves is intended to be permanent. That has given rise to certain difficulties, but I will come to that matter later, as it affects the South-East. The Bill amends section 16 of the principal Act which contains a proviso that makes it obligatory not to sell land that has been dedicated under the Act. The Bill will put on the Statute Book a provision that, before land which has been dedicated and declared a forestry reserve can be put to other use, the change must be made by proclamation, and the relevant regulation would lay on the table of the House for 14 sitting days. Such a provision affords a protection. I know full well the views of the member for Fisher on this matter. Forestry reserves should be preserved for the uses for which they were intended. Before any change can be made, any honourable member for one reason or another has the means at his disposal to move for disallowance. That is a safeguard which the Bill gives to forestry reserves.

The other important matter is that in the townships of Nangwarry and Mount Burr houses have become, in effect, a forestry reserve, and certain difficulties were experienced by the present Government and previous Governments in making the land available for sale to the tenants. The Bill will rectify the anomalies that have existed in that regard.

Those are the main issues in this short and simple measure. It brings under one roof all the matters relating to the operation of reserves. The matters canvassed by my colleagues are most important, as is forestry in general. Adequate land is available to produce much needed supplies of timber and, as I can find no impediment in the legislation, I support the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition) : The matter canvassed by the member for Fisher and the member for Victoria affects an industry that is extremely important on the South Australian scene. The shortage of material supplies is having a disastrous effect on the building industry, and what is being done here will be advantageous.

Bill read a second time. ’

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move an instruction without notice.

The Woods and Forests Department has the opportunity to alter the environment considerably in the case of virgin land with natural vegetation. In recent times there has been concern about this matter. I believe a new clause should be inserted in the Bill to place an obligation on the Minister of Forests to send to the Minister of Environment and Conservation a report on any proposal of the department regarding the destruction of virgin scrub. The department owns large areas of land that is not virgin land, and in that case it would not be necessary to send a report, but where virgin scrub land is involved a report should be. made. This department would be the biggest Government offender, and the Minister of Forests would not be inconvenienced by having placed on him an obligation to send a report to the Minister of Environment and Conservation on any plans the department intended to carry out. In most cases it would be in relation to the destruction of native vegetation to allow for the planting of exotic trees, mainly conifers. I believe quite strongly that the Act should be amended in this way. We have the opportunity to do it now if the Government will allow the suspension of Standing Orders so that I can formally move to have a new clause inserted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): Much as I regret having to do this, I cannot support the motion, largely because there would be no way of enforcing a requirement on one Minister to give notice to another. However, it is Government policy, supported by the full Cabinet, that the Minister of Forests and the Minister of Environment and Conservation must co-operate on this matter.

Mr. Evans: What happened in the recent past?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They did co-operate, and that was how we got the result.

Mr. Evans: After the public outcry?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The matter was dealt with before that. As soon as the difficulty arose the matter was discussed in Cabinet. The only assurance I can give the honourable member is that it is Government policy that on this issue there must be an integrated policy involving both Ministers; that is the only way it can be done. Even if we were to put in legislation a requirement to give notice, if no notice was given there would be no way to enforce the requirement.

Mr. Evans: Even if there was no penalty there would be an obligation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the honourable member can accept this statement of firm Government policy. Once we have established clearly that this is Government policy, I am sure it will be followed by all future Governments in this State. I put on record the policy that there must be complete co-operation between the two departments on these matters. I give that assurance to the honourable member.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs. Becker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold, Blacker, and Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran, King, and McRae.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment. Committee’s report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ARTIFICIAL BREEDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 27. Page 2357.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): In the past year particularly, the Artificial Breeding Board has experienced much financial difficulty. In this respect, I refer members to pages 244-7 of the Auditor-General’s Report, which refer to the financial crisis (I think that term could be used) that the board has experienced. This is an important Bill, particularly in relation to the dairying industry and the development of this State’s beef industry. The Artificial Breeding Board supplies semen from

a few selected bulls for the artificial insemination of dairy and beef cows in this State. Regarding the dairy industry, it is important that we obtain the maximum genetic gain possible. This has been the great advancement made through artificial breeding. It is absolutely necessary to test all bulls adequately before they are used. To do this, it is necessary to inseminate a large number of cows, and then to carry out herd recording, and therefore production, tests on the progeny produced from those bulls and cows.

As many cows as possible are supplied under the herd recording scheme. Any young bull needs to be tested. If there are insufficient cows under the herd recording scheme, it is not possible to test a sufficiently large number of bulls and therefore pick bulls with a particularly high genetic rating. A bull that produces an offspring with an average production would have a rating of 100 per cent. In the case of an inferior bull, the rating would be below 100 per cent, and a superior bull would have a rating over 100 per cent. It is interesting that in the past the Artificial Breeding Board has been supplying semen from bulls at a premium rate, but the rating on the bulls has been below 100 per cent. One reason has been that they have not been adequately tested in the past. The blame does not lie with the Artificial Breeding Board; there are insufficient cows under herd rating in South Australia. In Victoria, the artificial breeding system works superbly.

Artificial insemination has allowed much benefit to be gained in South Australia by the beef industry. This has been done because, under Australian law, people are not allowed to import bulls into Australia, because of the threat of foot and mouth disease. The only way to introduce new genetic material into Australia is through importing semen, which must be frozen for two years before being allowed into the country. Some exotic breeds, such as Charolais, have been allowed in, and this has led to what I believe will be a great advancement in the South Australian beef industry. This Bill allows South Australia to make use of the excellent facilities available in Victoria, and these facilities relate to the large number of cows under herd recording. Bulls have been tested there with particularly high genetic ratings. The necessary step taken in the Bill has been discussed for some time. I hope we can import many samples of semen from New Zealand, as that has an even higher genetic rating that has semen in Australia.

I seek information from the Minister about what sort of agreement has been entered into between the Artificial Breeding Board of South Australia and the Victorian Artificial Breeders Co-operative. This is important, as the Bill allows agreement. I think that primary producers in South Australia who are likely to use artificial semen should have some information about what sort of agreement is being entered into. It is suggested that samples are expected to be kept at the centre. If no bulls were kept here, that would destroy the hierarchy of the stud system in the dairying industry in this State. The Minister should appreciate the likely effects of that. It would be unfortunate if the stud system that we have built up over many years and the genetic benefit that these people have striven towards should be lost because there was no longer a market for artificial breeding of these bulls, although there would be a reduced market available in other areas.

I believe that the agreement between South Australia and Victoria, if accepted, would lead to cheaper semen within the State. It would also lead to the carrying out of activities economically. It would allow South Australia to benefit from the superior tested genetic material of the Victorian dairying industry. I should like to know from the Minister to what extent bull semen is likely to be kept at Northfield centre or whether the centre will be retained. Will the semen, when imported from Victoria, be sent direct to regional centres rather than to the central point in Adelaide? I support the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): As a member of the Federal Council of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, I object to artificial insemination in principle and in every respect. It is cruelty to animals, both male and female.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I thank both members for their participation in the debate, and I will refer to the Minister of Agriculture the questions raised by the member for Davenport.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Regulations."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It will be very important that the standard of bull is such that there is the maximum possible genetic gain. If agreements are entered into, they should be framed in such a way that South Australia gets the benefit. I am not reflecting on the board in any way, but some people have sold to the centre bulls that have not supplied the expected genetic gain; that is why people turn to private inseminators, rather than use the board.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I will refer the honourable member's point to my colleague.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): We have tended to take this Bill rather lightly and make fun of a serious subject. There is a great deal of milk production in my district. We have a group from Victoria that has built premises in the area. I agree with the member for Davenport that it is terribly important that we find the best possible stock for this purpose. I support the third reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, February 18, 1975, at 2 p.m.

I wish you, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk and the staff of the House, the members of the Clerk's staff, the messengers, the domestic staff, the cleaning staff, the *Hansard* staff, the Parliamentary Counsel—

Mr. Mathwin: What about those in the hole in the wall at the back?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —all members of the Public Buildings Department, the policemen, and everyone who has assisted us, a happy Christmas and an interesting new year.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): On behalf of the Opposition, I support the motion. It gives me much pleasure to encompass in my remarks all the various people to whom the Premier has just referred, including a temporary member of the press gallery whom we spied there this evening. I am sure he enjoyed his brief sojourn. I extend best wishes

for Christmas to everyone concerned with the running of Parliament, including you, Mr. Speaker, members, and our absent friends in hospital, whether voluntarily or involuntarily. I hope that, during the festive season, all members will enjoy safe driving and arrive home safely and, on behalf of the Opposition, I wish everyone a very happy and holy Christmas.

The SPEAKER: As Speaker, I express to members, staff, and all those connected with the conduct of the business of the House the very best for the festive season, and may all members come back fresh and full of fight in 1975. It has been a strenuous session, and the rest will be well earned. In the next few days I will forward a circular to all members informing them of the date that my office will be open for them to give me my Christmas presents.

Motion carried.

At 10.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 18, 1975, at 2 p.m.