HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

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

QUESTIONS

LAND TRANSACTIONS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General say what investigations he is making into the land transactions which took place at West Lakes and which were detailed in this House during the no-confidence debate yesterday? Further, will he explain to the House why the transactions were not subject to urban land price control and will he give a full report to the House as soon as it is available?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am most surprised that the Leader of the Opposition has raised this matter again today, in view of the total lack of substantial matter that he was able to produce yesterday. Nevertheless, I do not intend to order an investigation into this matter. I think the State Public Service and particularly those officers servicing my departments are more than busy spending their time on matters of importance to this State, not on the sort of trivia that the Leader wishes to raise. I think it most appropriate that, in replying to this question, I tell the House that the officers of my departments and other persons with whom I am in contact and who know the situation concerning the real estate industry in South Australia hold not only the Housing Trust but also the Chairman of the trust in very high regard, and it has been most interesting to me this morning to see the sort of support and enthusiasm that has been expressed concerning the Chairman of the trust and the work that he is able to do. I think it is a credit to the Premier that he has been able to encourage and obtain the services of Mr. Liberman for the State of South Australia, and I do not intend to involve myself or my departments in the sort of smear campaign and unsubstantiated allegations in which the Leader wishes to engage.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Attorney-General say why the Government refuses to investigate the activities of its appointee as Chairman of the Housing Trust involving land dealing at West Lakes, in view of the evidence presented to the House yesterday? The Attorney-General said that the Leader of the Opposition had no evidence. First, I point out that the statements made by the Leader can be proven to be absolutely correct because of the documented evidence we have of folio numbers and other material. I remind the Attorney that the activities of the Chairman of the trust included the transfer of land in three separate transactions from three companies in all of which Mr. Liberman had an interest.

The Premier said that there had been some increase in valuation. One transaction took place a day later than the first transaction. The sum paid for six blocks in Cormorant Court, West Lakes, when first purchased (by a company in which the Chairman has an interest), was $89 200. A day later, four allotments were transferred for the sum of $112 000 to another company in which the Chairman has an interest. About seven months later those allotments were sold for $200 000. That information has been verified; the documentation is available to do so. In view of this evidence, why does the Attorney persist in saying that the facts are unsubstantiated and that the Government will not carry out an investigation, when the Premier yesterday undertook to do just that?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What I said to the House earlier this afternoon was that not one shred of evidence was produced yesterday by the Opposition. I did not say that it did not produce any facts; of course it produced facts. The Lands Titles Offices is full of facts; each document there is a fact of the transaction it represents. The L.T.O. documents are available to any member of the public, and the Opposition well knows it. What is tragic about this sorry event is that the Opposition has shown a lamentable lack of knowledge of business activities in this State. It is tragic that the Opposition is taking the sort of line it is taking, which is likely to deprive South Australia of the services of people who can really contribute to the future of this State. If the sort of campaign of innuendo being carried out by the Opposition continues, the future of this State will be put in grave jeopardy, because the sort of people we have been able to attract to South Australia to act in capacities of importance to the Government will not make themselves available.

How are we going to get the services and support of people of high character and ability if we are to have the sort of smear and slur campaign that the Opposition has been conducting? This is a question of great relevance to the State, and it is a question gravely concerning the Government. How can we conduct the business of the State at the best possible level for the people of South Australia if the Opposition continues to conduct a smear campaign against the calibre of the officers we have been able to obtain? The conduct of the Leader and the Deputy Leader in this matter is absolutely appalling. I hope that they will recognise the error of their ways, cease this stupid, ridiculous and unsubstantiated campaign, and accept that we have been able to obtain the services of one of the most capable people in Australia as Chairman of the Housing Trust.

CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Transport say how the introduction of the new Christie Downs railway service has developed? I have noticed when travelling to Adelaide in the past two days that several radio programmes have been referring to the advent of this new service and that there has been considerable public interest in its development. As the service has now been open for some time, the Minister may be able to give some information on its operation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, I receive reports on these ventures as they are introduced, because we have a keen interest in the promotion of public transport. I am pleased to say that the service, which commenced at the beginning of last week, has been an outstanding success. I cannot give details of passenger numbers, because the Railways Department has concentrated its efforts on providing services rather than counting the number of passengers, but I have been told by the officer in charge at Christie Downs that 80 to 100 people have boarded each peak-service train at that station. That is a clear indication of the success of the new service and shows that, if the public can be provided with a sophisticated transport system, people will use it. I hope that what we were able to open last Friday week at Lonsdale will be the forerunner of further improvements in the public transport system. However, I should warn members that the future of these improvements is now in jeopardy. We had received an assurance from the former Commonwealth Minister of Transport (Mr. Jones) that finance would be forthcoming, and I point out that this new service would not be operating now but for the financial support we received from the former Commonwealth Government.

Whether we will receive any support from the present Government remains to be seen, but I can only say that the present incumbent of the position of Minister of Transport in the Commonwealth Government has never been keen on this service and bitterly opposed it when he was last a member of the Australian Transport Advisory Council.

JOB HUNTERS' CLUBS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare give any information in the nature of a progress report on the operation of Job Hunters' Clubs? Members well know that the Government has set up these clubs to try to help young people to find employment and to sustain their confidence while they are experiencing difficulty in trying to obtain employment.

Mr. Gunn: It's because of Gough Whitlam's incompetence.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The House and the public can well do without that sort of inane remark. There is considerable interest in this matter, and people of the age concerned who will be helped by such clubs will not be helped by that sort of interjection.

Mr. Gunn: You can't escape the fact though, can you?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If the honourable member will keep quiet for a moment I will continue with the facts. I should like to tell the House and the public that 20 youth services assistants were employed on December 8, 1975, to co-ordinate the running of Job Hunters' Clubs in 12 metropolitan and seven country areas. All of the youth services assistants were previously unemployed, although the majority of them are graduates. After a period of training, the youth services assistants undertook the task of investigating existing community resources that could be used to provide support programmes for unemployed young people. During the week commencing January 19 this year, 19 centres were opened as meeting places. In some centres meetings were held to advise the young people about the purpose of the clubs, and to give them an opportunity to talk about some of the problems they experienced. In response to the needs expressed at these meetings, special programmes are being developed to help young people learn about how to choose and apply for jobs, to maintain or restore their confidence to go on seeking jobs (that is an important facet of this activity), and to offer some worthwhile activities that they might engage in during their unemployment.

The initial response has been encouraging. The response from some members here has also been encouraging. The member for Davenport, contrary to the conduct displayed by the honourable member to whom I referred earlier, took the trouble to attend the Norwood meeting held recently and offer his support. I commend him for it. At a lunch-time meeting held in a park at Whyalla, 40 enthusiastic young people turned up to talk about the type of help they wanted. The idea of having a meeting in the park was suggested by a group of eight unemployed young people who did most of the planning needed to set up the meeting. On the local scene 20 young people attended a first meeting in a church hall at Glenelg, while more than 50 were interviewed at a special information desk set up at the Elizabeth Town Centre for two weeks.

The co-operation from the public and the press has been excellent, and I thank them for it on behalf of the young people of this State who are endeavouring to obtain employment in times that are somewhat difficult. Irrespective of where the blame lies, young people still need employment, and I think the Government of this State is to be commended for trying to do something about it. Excellent co-operation from the Commonwealth Employment Service, Department of Social Security, Further Education Department and Education Department has been a significant facet of the programme at the central organisation level, while at the local level the community appears to be responding sympathetically and constructively to the needs of unemployed youth. . Already more than 600 young people have been contacted at this preliminary stage. Thanks to a high degree of co-operation from the Commonwealth Employment Service, young people have already been placed in employment.

JUVENILE COURT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say what action, if any, the Government is willing to take concerning the manning of the Adelaide Juvenile Court and the jurisdiction of the Family Court? Pursuant to the Act, a report by Judge Andrew Wilson of the Adelaide Juvenile Court was tabled yesterday by the Minister of Community Welfare. In that report His Honour draws attention to the lack of judicial officers, saying that this is hampering the work of the court. He states:

> As an examination of both the statistics and day-to-day operation of the Adelaide Juvenile Court would indicate, the workload of the court has grown to such an extent that at the end of the year just concluded the full-time services of four judges working on Juvenile Court matters alone were required in order to provide the public of South Australia with the extent and quality of service envisaged when the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971, first came into force. The Act itself provides for judges to preside in the courts.

Then he points out that Judge Marshall was away for most of the time, resulting in not only additional pressure of work for Judge Murray, Mr. Newman and himself but also something which was regretted, namely, a reduction in the extent of the service offered to the public of this State. He continues:

> Unless steps are taken to overcome the shortage of judicial manpower in the Adelaide Juvenile Court the aims and ambitions of the Juvenile Courts Act cannot be achieved.

That is a signal warning to us if we are happy, as I think the majority of us largely are, with the way in which the court is operating. I couple that with a reference to the jurisdiction of the Family Court, particularly in relation to divorce, that appeared in a report in today's *Advertiser*. The Federal Attorney-General, Mr. Ellicott has asked all States to set up their own family courts to administer the new divorce laws. So far, Western Australia is the only State that has decided to co-operate. We have not, to my knowledge, made a decision on this matter (maybe the Government has decided, and it is the purpose of my question to find that out). I ask two questions: first, in relation to the shortage of judges in the juvenile court jurisdiction, not only the Adelaide Juvenile Court, but also in relation to the jurisdiction of the Family Court. We already have a family court, but it does not presently exercise jurisdiction in matrimonial matters.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member has, in effect, asked two questions. However, I do not take a point about that: I am willing to answer them both, dealing with the second question first. The South Australian Government's view as to the Family Court and the new Family Law Act has been consistent throughout. It is the Government's belief that, in view of the fact that the Australian Constitution has given paramount power in this area to the Australian Parliament and that that Parliament has chosen to exercise that power to the full, the court structure and the administration of this area of law

should be with the administration of the Australian Government. Because of that reasoning we believe that the Australian Family Court should handle all matters appertaining to matrimonial cases, divorce, maintenance, property settlement, custody of children and the like. For these reasons the Government of this State has decided not to agree to the Australian Government's proposal that we should set up a court to handle jurisdiction in this area. That has been the principal reason why the South Australian Government has acted in the way it has. The second reason is that, whilst the legislation provided for the alternative setting up of State family courts, the South Australian Government could see no benefit in this for the people of South Australia, because the duplication of courts would simply have lead to a situation where our constituents would be completely confused by the multiplicity of courts dealing with these matters. I believe the South Australian Government has acted quite properly in this matter in rejecting this second approach by the Australian Government to set up State family courts.

The Liberal Governments in New South Wales and Victoria have adopted a similar attitude to that of the Government of South Australia, as has the Country Party and Liberal Party Government in Queensland. This clearly indicates that most States in Australia recognise the merits of the attitude taken by the South Australian Government. The honourable member has quite properly raised publicly the matter of the juvenile court and I thank him for that. This is a matter that should be raised and aired publicly. Not only the member for Mitcham but also the Leader of the Opposition and many members on both sides of the House are genuinely and particularly interested in the area of the juvenile court; it is an area of the law in which I have taken a considerable interest. I can imagine that, in view of the publication yesterday of the report of the juvenile court Senior Judge, the honourable member should be concerned and should accordingly ask this question today. The situation on which the Senior Judge reported was, in effect, the situation that existed late last year. However, that situation has been relieved since the report was written: in fact, it had been relieved before the presentation of the report to the South Australian Government. Early last year, with the establishment of the Australian Family Court and the decision to disestablish the South Australian Family Court (as it then existed), the Australian Government requested that we provide officers of our court to assist in establishing the Australian Family Court and in introducing the Family Law Act. We were only too pleased, as a Government, to agree to the Australian Government's request and, as a result, Judge Marshall, from the South Australian Family Court (as it then was), and Judge Burnett were seconded temporarily to the Australian Government to assist in the work of drawing up the rules and establishing the Australian Family Court.

I place on record my strong appreciation of the work that these two judges did in this area. I know that I can also speak for the former Australian Attorney-General (Mr. Enderby) and, I think, the present Australian Attorney-General (Mr. Ellicott), because both of those gentlemen have expressed to me their appreciation of the work done by the judges of our courts in helping to establish and assist the Australian Family Court. I will now relate that matter to the honourable member's question, because the result of seconding those two judicial officers from the South Australian Family Court or the Adelaide Juvenile Court to the Australian Family Court was that for some time last year our court was left with fewer judicial officers than we would have desired but, in the circumstances, we believed that the overall good was to be served by acting in this way. Since my appointment I have taken a keen interest in this problem, and shortly after my appointment I was able to recommend to Executive Council that two magistrates (Mr. Kiosoglous and Mr. Brendan Burns) should be appointed as judicial officers of the juvenile court. Their appointment has meant, in effect, that the strength of the juvenile court has been increased to four judicial officers.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. When the House decided on a shorter Question Time, it was agreed that questions and replies should be as brief as possible. I understand the Attorney-General's concern in this matter, but his reply has really reached the stage where it could be given as a Ministerial statement tomorrow. Would you, Mr. Speaker, in fairness to all members intervene and ask the Attorney to be briefer in his reply?

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister was asked this question and, whilst it may not be of great interest to some honourable members, undoubtedly other honourable members wish to hear the reply to the question. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I point out to the member for Fisher that I. was asked two questions. The honourable member had the opportunity at that stage to raise a point of order on that basis, but he did not exercise that right.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As a result of that, I think that quite properly I should be given the right to reply. Apart from that matter, as important issues are involved here, I think that the matters I am setting down on record for the benefit of Opposition members are of vital concern not only to members of the House but also to the people of South Australia. I want to return to the fact that, in taking up my portfolio, once I had had the opportunity to consider the situation, I soon realised that the juvenile court was at that stage understaffed, and I took the opportunity to appoint two magistrates to the court. Moreover, at that time I recommended to Executive Council that Mr. Newman, S.S.M., as he then was, should be appointed a judge of the juvenile court. The effect of that has been that the court now has four full-time judicial officers, plus a special justice to hear minor matters such as traffic cases. I think that, if honourable members opposite read the report of the Senior Judge of the juvenile court, they will see that this basically satisfies and answers his criticisms. I want to take this matter one step further, and this is the final point I will make.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I refer to the question of the judicial standing of officers of the juvenile court. Ever since the establishment of the court, in its present form members on both sides of this House have commended the then Attorney-General, Mr. King as he then was, for the foresight that he showed in establishing the court, and I think it fair to say that most people in South Australia are very grateful to him for the work he did in establishing that court. We only have to consider seriously the work that the judicial officers have done in the juvenile court to see how this court is operating with great ability—

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: —on the part of the judicial officers.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, I think the Minister now has had 13 minutes to reply to this question. What I particularly object to is the way the Minister thinks this is very smart, since he has been smiling for about five minutes about how he is stringing the reply out.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I call the honourable Attorney-General, and I ask him. to be brief.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I certainly was smiling, but it was because of the recent interjections from the other side, which have been quite humorous: they were hilarious. I will be brief in. stating finally that it is this Government's continuing policy that the juvenile court should be manned by judges of the district court, magistrates and special justices. It has always been the policy of this Government that similar matters to those dealt with in the adult courts by judges should be dealt with by judges in the juvenile court, and that similar matters to those dealt with by special magistrates in the adult courts should be dealt with by special magistrates in the juvenile court.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Again, I am embarrassed by the interjections, but, nevertheless, in winding up, I think that any member who cares to take the opportunity to read the second reading explanation given by the then Attorney-General at the time of the introducing of the Juvenile Courts Bill will see that this was the policy of this Government then, and it is still the policy of the Government.

APPRENTICE HAIRDRESSER

Mr. MAX BROWN: I will ask a fairly lengthy question of the Minister of Labour and Industry. Will he have his officers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not tolerate these incessant interjections and the whispering that is going on, some of which, I suspect, may have been directed at me. I am not sure of that but, if I was certain, I would take action against the honourable member responsible.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister have his officers examine (and he may have done this already) the possibility of amending the Hairdressers and Toilet Salons Award as it applies particularly to hairdressers outside the metropolitan area, with a view to overcoming the difficulty whereby this award has no wages fixed to cover females apprenticed to male hairdressers? Recently I was involved in a case in which a young apprentice female men's hairdresser was dismissed by her employer. The Minister would be well aware that, under the Apprentices Act, employers are required to apply for cancellation of an indenture, and cannot merely apply the dismissal clause in the award. In this case the employer was guilty but, because of strained relationships that obviously would have existed between the employer and the young female apprentice, the board, quite rightly in my opinion, arranged a transfer of indenture to another employer. Unfortunately, the young girl in question apparently is not legally entitled to her wages for the time lost. I consider that this is a gross miscarriage of justice and I further consider that, when an employer decides to take the law into his or her own hands, he or she should pay for that decision, particularly when it involves innocent people in loss of wages.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: So as not to upset the Opposition, I will try to be brief.

Mr. Mathwin: You're a bit late.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I may try to prolong the reply, if members start being cheeky.

Mr. Chapman: That's your form.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will be as long as I have to be now.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Minister to reply to the question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will do that. I commend the member for Whyalla for his thoroughness in investigating this matter, because I consider that, if it had not been for his intervention, this girl may have ended up in a more difficult position than has been the case, although it is difficult enough. The position is that over a long period the personal relationship between Miss Jillian Dick and Mr. Theodoropoulos, the employer of the hairdresser in Whyalla, deteriorated markedly. There was nothing wrong with Miss Dick's work. In fact, my officers learned that the employer was high in his praise of that aspect. Things became so bad between them that it was impossible for the situation to continue, but it was not easy for the Apprenticeship Commission to immediately arrange a transfer of indentures to another employer, mainly because Miss Dick was employed as a men's hairdresser. It is not unusual these days for females to be apprenticed as men's hairdressers. I may add that, in the metropolitan area, there is a protection for these workers. After some weeks it was possible for the Apprentice Supervisor in Whyalla to arrange a suitable transfer of indentures and, in fact, on December 1, 1975, Miss Dick transferred to Nick's Hairdressing Salon, in Westlands, Whyalla, where she is now employed, I understand, quite happily. However, she had not been working for about six weeks during the disputation period. The exact time is not known but, from what officers have been able to piece together, it seems that she ceased working with Mr. Theodoropoulos on October 15, 1975.

She commenced with Nick's Hairdressing Salon on December 1. She has lodged a claim for wages on Mr. Theodoropoulos for the period she was unemployed, and he has refused to pay because of the previous difficulties and the fact that during the whole of that time she had not worked with him. During the period, for which he would not let her work, she was under instructions from the Apprentice Supervisor in Whyalla. to go to work every day, and she did appear for work for most of the days in the period of six weeks. One can imagine the sort of situation that could develop during that time. Her parents went with her, and difficulties occurred, with the point being reached where they were abusing one another, and so forth. However, Mr. Theodoropoulos would not let her work and would not pay her. As I have stated, if the incident had occurred under a metropolitan award, he could not have dismissed her or, if he did, he would have had to pay her for that period. The dispute was referred to the Industrial Inspection Branch of my department, but the Hairdressers and Toilet Salons Award, which covered hairdressers outside the metropolitan area, at that time had no wage rates for female apprentices in men's hairdressing. That is where the difficulty lay. No-one had any control of the situation, and Mr. Theodoropoulos was allowed almost to do as he wished. I criticise no-one: it may have been one fact overlooked by the union, or someone responsible for arranging this cover for apprentices had not carried out his duties, but

unfortunately the girl had to suffer. As from November 28, after the matter came to the notice of my department, the anomaly was corrected, but at all relevant times there were no award provisions, so the claim could not be pursued by my department. My officers tried all they could by counselling the employer, the apprentice, and the apprentice's parents, and eventually arranged a satisfactory transfer for the girl. However, the department could not assist with the wage claim, but because of the intervention of the member for Whyalla in this matter a similar situation should not occur again in country areas.

GOOLWA LAND

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Planning say whether the Government is considering financial support for the purchase of waterfront land in the South Lakes area of Goolwa by the Port Elliot and Goolwa Council and whether this purchase has been approved or recommended by the State Planning Authority or any other State authority? I identify the land as being that which is known as Aggies Knob and which is contained in Certificate of Title Volume 3452 Folio 86 and held by the registered proprietors D.P.F. (S.A.) Proprietary Limited, formerly John L. Hindmarsh Proprietary Limited. On November 11 last year I was asked to interview members of the Port Elliot and Goolwa Council, the District Clerk, and Mr. Liberman, who had a financial interest in the company to which I have referred. I have correspondence from the manager of D.P.F. (S.A.) Proprietary Limited that was directed to the District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa, and I refer to a couple of paragraphs in it. The letter on behalf of the company explained to the council that it intended to establish a cluster group home development project on this land but, whilst the company held the State Planning Authority approval to do this, the council wished the land to remain as open space, because it was in a vulnerable part of the district regarding open-space requirements. The writer went on to say to the council that, having regard to its position on the lakeside frontage area and as it was a valuable property, a fair and realistic price should be calculated on the basis of about $20 000 for each 0.4 hectares. One other point I raise that was cultivated in my mind as a result of the recent Mr. Liberman exercise is that, Mr. Liberman being of the opinion that the price of $20 000 for each 0.4 ha was fair and realistic, in the balance of the correspondence it is suggested that the acquisition of the land should be finalised as soon as possible. Perhaps more interesting to members would be the fact that Senator G. McLaren, of the Australian Senate, has particularly requested that he be kept informed of the proposal to the council and about whether the council wished to seek monetary assistance elsewhere. At what point of involvement is the Government situated in this project?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I understand that the State Planning Authority has told the District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa that it will not purchase the land in question. I think Mr. Hart has informed the council that, if it wishes to proceed with the purchase, it should seek an application for subsidy under the Public Parks Act through the Minister of Local Government. I am not sure whether or not it has decided to do that. I will check whether D.P.F. (S.A.) Proprietary Limited is one of the companies from which Mr. Liberman has divested himself of any interest and whether he did so before becoming Chairman of the Housing Trust. However, the proposition that the Government should purchase the land was turned down.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Deputy Premier say what the Government intends to do concerning the sittings of the House for the next session of Parliament? As the Government Whip has already asked the question today, I raise this matter, because I am sure the details will be of interest to all members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that this question is already on the Notice Paper in my name.

The SPEAKER: Order! After reviewing the situation, I find that there is a Question on Notice regarding this matter.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will amend immediately the Pay-roll Tax Act to enable companies with a pay-roll greater than $72 800 to obtain an exemption of $20 800, irrespective of the size of the pay-roll? In addition, now that State Governments will receive vastly improved financial commitments and autonomy under the Fraser Commonwealth Government, will the South Australian Government reduce the present pay-roll tax rate of 5 per cent? It is interesting to notice that members on the front bench opposite are laughing, but they know only too well that South Australia will get a vastly improved financial commitment from the Fraser Government than it ever received from the Whitlam Government, and this Government will have autonomy as to how the money will be spent. I will explain my question if you will call the House to order. During November, 1975—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark. It is a reflection on the House, as he will realise. The honourable member is one of the worst offenders. There are always some interjections when honourable members are speaking, and I will allow only a certain amount of interjection, but I demand that the honourable member for Davenport withdraw that remark.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I withdraw that remark and apologise for making it, Mr. Speaker, but there was some noise at the time. During 1975 the Dunstan Government amended the Pay-roll Tax Act so that the base exemption was doubled. However, this exemption was reduced as the pay-roll tax increased, so that, with pay-rolls greater than $72 800, the amount of pay-roll tax paid by companies was actually increased. Despite requests by the Liberal Party, the Government refused to allow an exemption of $20 800 over the $72 800. Many companies are now experiencing considerable financial difficulty because of increased pay-roll tax. During a period of high unemployment, it is ludicrous and irrational for any Government to increase pay-roll tax, which is virtually a tax on the total wages paid. A reduction in pay-roll tax would help to hold company costs and, therefore, to hold inflation in this country. I therefore—

Mr. WELLS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is debating his question and not explaining it. I suggest that he is definitely out of order.

The SPEAKER: As a matter of fact, I was about to point out to the member for Davenport that this is Question Time and that he should not be debating his question. I take it that the member for Davenport has put his question. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The reply is "No". The honourable member, in posing his question, made certain statements on which I should comment. I have replied to his specific question, but he said that, under the new

Administration in Canberra, this State would be much better off than it has been previously and that, in the light of that, the South Australian Government should make an adjustment to pay-roll tax. That comment seems to run counter to statements made by his Leader about a week ago when he returned from a meeting with the Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser) and said, "Ha, ha, South Australia; you've been getting too good a deal under a former Labor Administration in Canberra, but look out in future, because you're not going to get as much." That comment is borne out by the headlines in today's *News,* which state: "Not one cent extra for South Australia." The Prime Minister has told the Premiers that no extra funds will be available for the States, yet the member for Davenport says that, under the Liberal Administration, we will get such a good deal. Only last evening we heard about the $360 000 000 expenditure cuts in areas that could and will affect the State's administration on matters that this State administers. I ask the honourable member whether he is really serious in saying what he says in support of a question when he knows damned well that the Government can do nothing about the situation and will do nothing about it. He also knows that pay-roll tax is a matter to be considered by all States in concert; they do not act unilaterally, and they will not do so in this matter.

Mr. Dean Brown: Queensland has.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is not uncommon.

PRIORITY ROADS

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport say whether a reflectorised material could be used, perhaps embedded into the roadway, at the entrance to priority roads? The use of a reflectorised material would ensure a more permanent type of indication to motorists than does the current painted, broken white line, which I understand wears away fairly quickly and often needs to be replaced. Using reflectorised material would help motorists approaching priority roads at night.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When we were considering the details of introducing the priority road system we went to great pains to try to launch the system on a basis that would be readily understood and accepted by the public. Serious consideration was given to the type of marking and marking material to be used. My understanding of the situation is that the paint that was to be used to mark the throat of roads entering priority roads was to have a reflective ingredient to achieve the effect to which the honourable member refers. I will discuss the matter with the Commissioner of Highways to see whether an improvement can be effected.

STATE PLANNING

Dr. EASTICK: I could ask the Minister for Planning whether he is gravely concerned that the accolade of "supremo of prolixity" has been wrested from his shoulders by the Attorney-General, but instead I ask whether he has discussed with the Premier a letter from the Barossa District Council to the Premier in which was expressed deep concern about the operational direction being taken by the Slate Planning Authority. In addition, I ask what initiatives the Minister has taken since acquiring responsibility for the State Planning Office to have more clearly outlined the direction planning is taking in South Australia and to effect necessary improvement in communication between all responsible bodies. The Minister will be aware that a letter of some depth was sent to the Premier by the Barossa District Council regarding the grave difficulties that that and other councils were having with planning matters. Indeed, a feature article published in the *Advertiser* since Christmas highlighted several difficulties that had arisen. I believe that councils which have taken the responsibility for implementing planning regulations and planning legislation and which have undertaken to employ competent staff to administer these matters need the type of action referred to in my question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to the member for "Bumf and Turgid Prose", I have—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Minister that that is unparliamentary.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, I unreservedly withdraw the remark and substitute "the honourable member for Light, but not for Air". I am replying to the Barossa District Council suggesting that it send a delegation to meet with me and discuss the complaints in more detail. So far, the complaints have been in general terms. Whenever a specific complaint is investigated, it seems to disappear. In addition, I have had letters written to me complaining about the way in which one or two district councils in the area have administered their affairs and about the manner in which the councils have allowed the environment to be damaged. Be that as it may, I hope, by means of discussion with this council and with others on specific matters of complaint, that we will be able to get down to the difficulties causing concern and to solve those difficulties.

HOUSING TRUST CHAIRMAN

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister for Planning say whether he has had any communication from the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust in relation to the appointment and role of the Chairman of the trust?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the honourable member for asking the question, because only this morning I met with the General Manager of the trust, and he presented me with a memorandum which, I might add, I had not requested. The memorandum, which is addressed to the Minister for Planning, states:

Following the debate in Parliament yesterday, I believe it is desirable that I should, from the management point of view, make some observations.

1. When Mr. Liberman was appointed to the board of the trust, and subsequently to the chairmanship, I was made aware by the Premier's Department that he had made a full and frank disclosure of his total business interests to the Government, and subsequently a similar full disclosure was made in writing to the trust. This was reported to the board and the document is, of course, within the trust's records. Subsequently, Mr. Liberman resigned from certain companies. This, too, he conveyed to me by letter and this information also is within the trust's records. Such a course of procedure has been followed by other board members who have had business or private interests.

Mr. Ramsay added that there had been other members who have had lists of disclosures of interests as long and complicated as that of Mr. Liberman. Regarding the purchase of land at West Beach, a matter that was referred to by the Leader yesterday, the memorandum states:

I would like to say that I personally took a principal part in the negotiations to purchase the 100-odd acres in that area, possibly because I had been associated with the development of the Upper Port Reach since the late 1950's. The price I recommended to the trust was arrived at after most careful checking with experienced valuers within the Government, and I believe the recommendation which I made to the board to purchase the land was a good one from the point of view of the trust.

That land was purchased in 1971. The memorandum continues:

The fact that the trust itself (and, of course, Mr. Liberman was not a member of the trust at that time) decided to build a certain type of housing on it which, in the initial stages, is more expensive than orthodox housing, is quite a separate and distinct decision from the decision to buy the land. This purchase of the land thus followed through all the normal staff and board channels.

By implication, Mr. Ramsay makes clear that the decision to build was made well before Mr. Liberman became a member of the board. The memorandum continues:

Since he has been on the board and Chairman, my senior colleagues and 1, who naturally work closely with the Chairman of the board, have found Mr. Liberman knowledgeable, approachable and pleasant to deal with. We believe that in no way has he sought to influence our decisions in any of the recommendations we might make to the board or in matters which are normally the province of management before board recommendations are made or other action taken. In conclusion, I think I can say that I have known Mr. Liberman virtually since he came to South Australia, and our personal relationship has always been cordial.

That was not solicited by me: it arose out of a meeting which I had with Mr. Ramsay this morning and which occurred because I wished to discuss with him the position of the Australian Housing Corporation, which it seems may have been scrapped yesterday by the Australian Government. Mr. Ramsay is the Chairman of the Australian Housing Corporation. I think it is relevant to the discussions of this House and also to ensure that Mr. Liberman's reputation is defended that I should make public that memorandum from the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust.

BURRA SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Education put the record straight regarding the building of the new community school for Burra? Members will recall that provision was made in the Loan Estimates last year for that school at Burra. However, when the Minister visited Burra just before Christmas he told the Burra people that possibly the school would not be commenced during this financial year. The Burra people were amazed to read an article in the *Advertiser* on January 19 in which the Minister of Education was quoted as saying that Mr. C. J. McCabe had been appointed principal of the Burra community school. The people of Burra are pleased with this appointment, but they were amazed to read the article that said that Dr. Hopgood had said the school had been brought about by the comprehensive rebuilding of the existing primary and secondary schools to provide an integrated community education centre. This gave the impression that the school had been rebuilt, but the Burra people knew this had not been done. The article created a wrong impression in the minds of people in South Australia, and many people in other districts have remarked to me that at last Burra has its new school. Furthermore, in the country press (apparently the Minister of Education's press secretary had been busy) an article appeared which said that the Minister of Education had announced the appointment of Mr. McCabe, and it went on to say:

Burra is South Australia's first country community school. It was brought about by the comprehensive rebuilding of the existing primary and secondary school to provide an integrated community facility. An important feature of the rebuilding was the preservation of Burra's original school, a building of considerable historic interest which has a National Trust classification.

That gave the impression that the school had been rebuilt. Further on the article states:

In the rebuilding process the shell of Burra's original school will be retained.

That gave the impression that the school had not been rebuilt. The article concludes by saying:

"I am sure the people of Burra and districts will make good use of their new community school," Dr. Hopgood said.

Will the Minister put the record straight for the people of South Australia?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I, too, saw the articles in the press which obviously contained errors of tense. I am sure the honourable member knows that no significant work has yet been done on the upgrading of the school. What is stated in the article is what we will be able to do during the rebuilding of the school. Probably I should have taken action before now to correct publicly the wrong impression that some people may have got from the articles. I appreciate that that impression would not exist at Burra, where people know the situation, but they would be puzzled by the wording of the announcement. In view of the time of the day I think I should at this stage merely undertake to bring down a considered reply on the situation. I do thank the honourable member for the opportunity of putting the record straight by saying that what we hope to do in Burra is in the future.

MORPHETT VALE EAST HIGH SCHOOL

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

Ordered that report be printed.

OIL REFINERY (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) INDENTURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2026.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I support this Bill, as I. understand it must go to a Select Committee. Its effect is to increase the rates and taxes that local government can charge for the area of land concerned. The original amount of $20 000 will be increased to a base level of $35 000, and this can be increased as other rates and taxes within the area are inflated. This is a logical amendment to the indenture agreement, and it is caused by the high inflation rate we are experiencing currently. The Liberal Party certainly supports reference of the Bill to a Select Committee to hear the evidence of the two parties concerned. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Chapman, Hopgood, Hudson, Olson and Wotton; 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 12.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE (CASUAL EMPLOYMENT) BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. J. D. Wright: That the report be noted.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2031.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I thank the witnesses who presented evidence to the Select Committee, and, also, the other members of that committee. The information obtained was most valuable, as is reflected in the report presented to this House. I support the report which was

presented by the Minister and which clearly indicates the rather radical changes that have been made to the Bill since it left this House to go to the Select Committee. The report shows the wisdom of the Liberal Party's request that a Select Committee should collect evidence and examine the Bill. It is interesting, on looking back at some of the remarks I made during the second reading debate, to see some of the areas in which the Liberal Party believed changes should occur. The report shows that these changes have, in fact, occurred.

I said that previously in no circumstances could the Liberal Party support the Bill in its original form and that substantial amendments would need to be made. Those substantial amendments have largely been recommended, although I should like to see certain aspects of the Bill presented in a different form. As the Minister pointed out yesterday, there was unanimous support for the report. Although there may have been still some personal differences of opinion it is a tribute to the committee that agreement was reached. The most important change the report recommends is that the Bill should apply only to the building and construction industry. When the Bill was first presented I indicated that the building and construction industry was in a somewhat unique position as it could pass on the costs, because of the contract nature of that industry. Other industries cannot pass on costs so readily.

The committee received evidence, particularly from the rural industry, which indicated that costs could not be passed on. Therefore, any increase in the actual cost of labour would automatically have to come from the overall price received for products, even though, no increase in price could be obtained. Other matters I mentioned during the second reading debate were also examined by the committee. The committee went to some lengths to consider the problem of administration costs and has come up with what could be regarded as the ideal solution, which is along the lines of the Tasmanian scheme, with modifications to make sure that the money is collected on a monthly basis rather than on the termination of employment of the individual concerned. This will mean that the fund is guaranteed to receive the money and that if a company goes bankrupt only money for one month's payment will be lost rather than a large sum.

The witness from Tasmania pointed out that in this area was the one weakness of the Tasmanian scheme of administration. The scheme adopted does not have the disadvantages the New South Wales scheme has where, I understand, 80 to 100 people are employed on purely administrative work. One of the recommendations in the report is that a prescribed amount of money would be paid, according to the total wages for a certain month. I understand that this amount will be 2½ per cent. At the end of the year details are given as to who the employees are, what their total wages have been, and the period they have worked.

The committee heard much evidence and gave some time to considering what the prescribed rate should be. It was finally accepted that 2½ per cent would be the initial rate, and it will be written into the Bill that 2½ per cent will be the rate for retrospective payment. That was another request I made during the second reading debate. The 2½ per cent was accepted by the committee as the logical rate to adopt initially, although the final rate will depend on inflation. If the inflation rate is high then, obviously, the figure of 2½ per cent will be increased. If a large percentage of the employees remains in the industry, the rate is likely to be increased. However, if inflation is low and few people achieve the minimum of seven completed years, and the ultimate minimum to receive long service leave of 10 years, the amount to be paid out by the fund will be less than the 2½ per cent and may be adequate.

The committee also considered the period for which an employee could be absent from the industry. It was finally recommended that an employee could not be absent for more than 18 months up until the end of seven years of service; and, after that, he could be absent for long periods. The latter portion of the agreement is most valid, because under the existing Long Service Leave Act, any other employee is entitled to pro rata long service leave payments, and it was valid that some particular benefit should be built in for those employees who completed seven years. I was doubtful that any down-turn in the industry would last for 18 months. However, I conceded there could be exceptional circumstances and, unfortunately, we may be moving into a situation at present, where the down-turn in the building industry may last for 18 months. As the purpose of this Bill is to protect people who have no chance of obtaining long service leave because of the seasonal nature of an industry, and because they are forced to work for different employers, I accept the decision of the committee on this matter, although I thought originally that 18 months might not be necessary.

The other major aspect of the report was the reduction in the penalty from $5 000 to $500 for employers who dismissed employees. This reduced sum seems reasonable, although evidence was presented that the amount should be $200. Any employer who dismisses employees deliberately in order to escape the provisions of this Bill deserves to be hit and hit hard. It is unfortunate when employers dismiss employees simply to escape certain provisions of legislation. I request (because this is the important period) that employers take note of the penalties involved, and not even attempt to escape the provisions of this Bill, if it is passed.

One interesting witness, whose evidence I would like to comment on, is Mr. Ruse of the Premier's Department. Members might wish to read his evidence on pages 219 to 321 of the transcript. Mr. Ruse's evidence indicated a great amount of thought had gone into the philosophy behind long service leave. I also raised this point in my speech during the second reading debate. I see long service leave as a benefit to those people who have served for a long time with the one employer, but I should not like to see that aspect of long service leave break down under the new provision. However, as I think we had an exceptional circumstance, we have suggested that employees must serve for a certain period of time in the one industry instead of with the one employer, because few employees would last long with the one employer. I should not like to see the whole concept of long service leave, particularly as carried out under the existing Act, destroyed as a result of this Bill's being introduced.

I see the Bill supplementing the existing Act: I do not see it as attempting to create a new concept of long service leave that will eventually replace the existing Act. If the Bill replaced the existing Act, I think that the committee's recommendation would be most unfortunate. This now leads me to the point that I do not believe that Bills similar to the one we are debating should be extended widely to other industries. I could think of possibly one other industry serving a restricted number of employees to which some attention could be given, but I would be opposed to this provision's being adopted for all casual employees, irrespective of the industry. I think

the evidence we received also backed up my contention that it would not be in the interests of some industries to have the provision widely spread to them. One witness presented evidence to the effect that Australia was the only country with long service leave provisions. I found that interesting, to say the least, and I hope that we do not develop an attitude, because of this fact, that we are accepting that a benefit should be available to all employees. If that position should obtain, obviously the whole concept of long service leave would need to be thrown aside and a regular payment of 2½ per cent be made in addition to the salary that would be paid on a weekly or fortnightly basis. That would be a benefit for the sake of giving a benefit, but no real benefit would accrue to the employee or the community.

In supporting the adoption of the committee's report, I draw the attention of the House to the reservations which I have and which,I believe, other members of my Party have, and I urge the House not to accept these principles for other industries without careful assessment. I think a further Select Committee on each individual industry would be necessary if the House were to agree to consider other industries. Once again I thank the committee's members, who, I think, worked in such harmony. I make the comment to the Minister of Mines and Energy that, having recently served on a Select Committee with him, he could learn a lesson in the chairing of a Select Committee from the Minister of Labour and Industry, whose chairmanship I found much more co-operative than I found the previous chairmanship to be. Perhaps the two Ministers should put their heads together and one learn from the other. I support the adoption of the report.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This was the first time I had been on a Select Committee since the Liberal Movement became an independent Party (and that is several years ago now), and it was amusing that, in order for me to be accommodated on the committee, it had to be larger than Select Committees normally are. Although Select Committees normally consist of five members, this one had to consist of seven so that the Liberal Party would not lose either of its two representatives on the committee. That matter aside, I found that being on a Select Committee again was a valuable experience and it confirmed me in my view that, as a rule, a Bill of this nature ought always be referred to a Select Committee rather than be passed through Parliament without having the benefit of that form of inquiry. The fact that the amendments recommended by the Select Committee to the Bill significantly alter its thrust is a good illustration of the working of this principle. I do not want to go over the ground again that was covered yesterday by the Minister of Labour and Industry, nor what has been said by the member for Davenport today. By and large, I agree with what has been said by them, although that must not be taken to be on every point.

To me, the most important point at issue during the sittings of the Select Committee was whether the legislation should be open-ended, as it was when introduced into the House, or whether it should be restricted to one industry. I started on the inquiry with a completely open mind about the question of long service leave for casual employees and I was willing to accept the principle (and I still do) that people so employed should have available to them the benefit of long service leave. However, it was not until we got quite into the sittings of the committee that I came firmly to the conclusion that, for the time being anyway, this legislation should be restricted to one industry. There were several reasons why I came to this conclusion, and I summarised them at the time for my own benefit.

First, there is considerable doubt about the viability of the funding of the scheme. Evidence was given to that effect, as has been said, and I am sure that it is better to see how we get on with one industry than take the risk with several industries. The building industry can be, as it were, a pilot industry in this respect. Secondly, presumably for good reasons, this has been the approach in every other State where such a scheme has been introduced. Thirdly (and this is an echo of what I said, or the point of view I tried to put, yesterday on another Bill), the Bill as introduced was a blank cheque allowing for the application by the Government of long service leave for casual employees in any industry. While the present Government promises consultation (andI accept without reservation the genuineness of that offer as regards the present Minister), that is really meaningless. Consultation is one thing, but agreement is another. There can be consultation with all kinds of parties, but one of the parties has the final say, irrespective of what the others think. All the consultation in the world will not necessarily help them.

As the Bill was introduced, a scheme of long service leave could have been imposed on any industry. My final reason for feeling that the Bill should be restricted in this instance was that the scheme reflected in the Bill had been devised obviously with the building industry in mind. The committee, which reported to the Government, and whose recommendations were the basis of the Bill (they were not all accepted, of course) had, shall I say, a bias (and [do not use that word in any critical sense) in favour of the building industry. Mr. Jack Horton Evins, who is a well-respected employer in that industry, was a member of the committee. What is appropriate to the building industry may not necessarily be appropriate to other industries. For those four reasons I came to the firm conclusion that the Bill should be restricted to the building industry in this instance, and I said as much at the meeting of the Select Committee at which we had to decide. I am glad to say that, after a little debate, that point of view was accepted.

I must, as the member for Davenport has done, agree that the Minister was a good Chairman and that the atmosphere of the committee, apart sometimes from a bit of cigarette smoke that upset me, was excellent. I certainly appreciate how the Minister handled it. I think that in this legislation we have an experiment. I hope to goodness it works, because if it does not we will be in a real pickle. We must acknowledge that it will mean an extra cost on the building industry that will flow through to other areas of the community, but I think that the risk of this cost having an adverse effect is worth taking because of the principle embodied in the legislation. I will be waiting to see how it works, and I think it will be several years before we see that. In the meantime, I would not be willing to see the scheme extended to other industries. I have an open mind on that matter and will be influenced by what happens in the building industry.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): In supporting the adoption of the committee's report, I first pay a tribute to members of the committee, including the Minister of Labour and Industry, who was Chairman, for the way in which the committee was able to reach unanimity on the recommendations and amendments considered necessary. It was my first Select Committee since becoming a member of this Parliament, and I found the exercise interesting. I thank all members of the committee for their co-operation.

Long service leave for casual employees in the building industry is many years overdue, and the Government deserves credit for its initiatives in introducing this important legislation.

It is acknowledged that providing long service leave for employees in the casual employment areas of industry can be quite difficult. However, that is no reason why such employees should be deprived of a benefit that most people in the community enjoy. Consequently, the committee, in considering the evidence given by the many witnesses, thought it appropriate to legislate for only the building industry in the first instance. The committee recommends that, if this legislation proves successful (and I am certain that it will), consideration be then given to introducing a scheme for other industries where casual labour is common practice. Tn my opinion, that should be done soon. The casual worker, particularly in South Australia, is at a disadvantage compared to workers in other industries.

On the question of absence from the industry, whilst many witnesses considered that there should be some time limit on the length of absence from employment in the industry, the committee listened with much interest to the evidence of Mr. Urquhart, from Tasmania, where a similar scheme has been in operation since March, 1972. The experience with the Tasmanian scheme was of much value to the committee, and it seemed that one problem with that scheme was the lack of a time limit to cover absences from the industry. No maximum periods of absence are specified in the Tasmanian Act.

However, other views were put forward because of the nature of the building industry, which is essentially a day-to-day or week-to-week job, and any time limit must be sufficient to allow for enforced absences from the industry. Therefore, the committee recommends that a period of 18 consecutive months be set. In addition, because of the threat of retrenchment, the possible failure to acquire contracts, and the effects of economic downturns on the building industry, the committee considered that these factors supported a provision for pro rata entitlement. The committee considers that this will serve as some recompense to those employees who have given at least seven years service to the industry. Accordingly, the provision regarding 18 months absence will not apply to a worker with seven years service or more.

I support the increase in the number of board members from three to five, believing that the major organisations have every right to be represented. I also support the amendment to clause 42 that has been recommended, to provide that the penalty be reduced from $5 000 to $500. I believe that this figure is quite fair and should be effective in discouraging dismissal of employees with intent to avoid any obligation to contribute to the fund. I will not speak on all the recommendations in the report. Other members of the committee, including the Minister, have adequately covered them all. I join those honourable members in recommending that the Bill be passed, with the amendments to be made to it.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher):I speak to the Bill with no real enthusiasm, because to my knowledge this is the only country in the world that has long service leave. That is the first thought that passes through my mind.

Mr. Wells: That's not a shame.

Mr. EVANS: It would not be a shame if we could compete with other countries in world trade. At present, that is not the case, so it is a shame. Secondly, the Bill will add to the cost of the average house, although it will not add a large amount. Over the past few years this Parliament has passed much legislation that has put South Australian housing costs up to nearly the highest in Australia. In fact, Victoria now has cheaper housing costs on a square metre basis, regardless of the type of house. South Australian housing costs have surpassed Victorian costs for the first time since Federation, and that is nothing for this Parliament to be proud of.

The cause of that position arises from this Parliament, with workmen's compensation and with the licensing of builders because we thought that licensing would solve all the problems. However, it has not solved them. At present, equally as many people are suffering through bad workmanship and poor quality houses. We are now moving into the field of long service leave for casual employees. I can see merit in the point that they are moved from job to job when buildings are completed and that they face difficulties. They have received some extra amounts in their wages, because that matter has been considered by the courts when fixing the hourly casual rates. I am willing to go along with the measure and support it, but. I offer the word of caution that we have now gradually increased our housing prices to a position where many of our young people cannot own a house at any time in their lives. [do not say that that is totally the fault of Parliament. It is partly because of the attitude of our society, including our young people, about having their own house.

People will spend money on other things, such as trips around the world and motor cars, and then they cannot buy a house. I am not suggesting that it is fair that the employees should carry the burden for that, but I am offering a word of caution, because this Parliament has put the cost of houses beyond the ability of our young people to pay, and some of those people would be the tradesmen working in this field. I am not speaking so much of the casual employees but rather of the many tradesmen in the building industry today who are not paid a high wage compared to wages in other fields of endeavour. Employees in the building trades are not highly paid, but if they pursued some form of comparative wage justice the cost of housing would become out of reach of many people in the community. I support the measure, but suggest that Parliament should be conscious that we have achieved one record in the past two years: we have made the cost of our housing higher than the cost of housing in Victoria, and that is a record about which we should not be proud.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): In supporting the motion, I congratulate particularly the Minister for his handling of this Bill, not only as Chairman of the Select Committee but also because of the formula that was adopted after many tedious hours of discussion. I congratulate members of the committee for their co-operation, and I must say that the member for Mitcham added lustre to our meetings. I sincerely thank trade union officers who gave evidence to the committee, because they made sincere submissions and answered questions frankly and fully. It must be with a feeling of great satisfaction that they know that this Bill is now before the House, because they would be aware of the many years of injustice that have been suffered by their members, who could give a lifetime of service to an industry and receive no ultimate reward, which is available in other industries. It gives me much satisfaction to have been a member of the Select Committee and to have the privilege of being present in this Chamber when the Bill is being examined. In my maiden speech I referred to the injustice I considered was being imposed on casual workers because of the lack of long service leave. Also,

it is appropriate to congratulate the Parliamentary Counsel for his work in connection with the drafting of this measure: it was an extremely difficult job done with expertise and to the satisfaction of members of the committee.

The member for Davenport referred to Mr. Ruse as a witness before the committee and seemed to place some weight on his submission, but I discounted anything that Mr. Ruse said. He is from the Premier's Department (God knows where he got him), and he said that he did not believe in long service leave of any description for any industry in any circumstances, and that the weekly wage paid to the employee should enable him to provide for his long service leave. Mr. Ruse said (and to me this statement was laughable) that it would be appropriate for an employer, after a lifetime of service by an employee, to consider some payment to the employee because of the loyalty given during his long years of service. There would be no specified amount, but, if an employer considered that the employee's loyalty should be rewarded, he should be given a few dollars and perhaps an *ex gratia* payment. I can imagine some Opposition members (and one in particular, old school pal) offering a few hundred dollars to a shearer who had worked on his property! One can imagine how generous some people would be, but if they are bound by legislation they will have to make the necessary payment. An important factor in the work of the Select Committee was the untiring efforts of Geoff Mitchell as Secretary. He performed his duties extremely efficiently and was helpful in every way. Mr. Mitchell was available at any time outside the working hours of the committee, and I express to him my appreciation and that of the committee for his services.

The member for Fisher seemed to be rather aghast at the fact that Australia was the only country in the world that provided long service leave for its workers. So what! Australia should lead the world in many things. The member for Fisher said that the cost of housing would rise because casual workers in the building industry would receive long service leave. All I can say is: so what! The increased cost of a house would be infinitesimal, but, even if it were greater, surely to God people in this country (and even house buyers) should recognise that a worker should have some recompense for a lifetime of service, and some wage justice, too. I believe that any increase would be accepted without argument. However, the honourable member always refers to the increase in cost of housing, but never says anything about the low price of land in this State compared to the prices in other States. The low price of land in South Australia is purely and simply a result of the efforts of this Government.

The employer representatives who appeared before the Select Committee were good and frank witnesses. Although they were asked questions that sometimes embarrassed them, they nevertheless replied without hesitation. The evidence will show that the witnesses indicated that industries employing casual labour on a larger scale could not continue without the assistance and availability of casual workers. That in itself indicates that an employer is obliged to give wage justice and provide long service leave benefits to his casual labour work force. I support the motion.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): So far members have all been congratulatory, which is all very pleasant. I enjoyed working on the committee and commend the other members of the committee for the work they did. The wisdom of the Opposition's asking that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee is clear, because out of that committee has come a far better Bill than was first introduced. The eight or nine pages of amendments contained in the report would not have resulted from the normal passage of a Bill through the Chamber. Many of the amendments are necessary because of the important decision of the committee to confine the Bill to the building industry. It is now a normal type of Bill instead of an enabling Bill to catch several industries in its net.

During the committee hearings, witnesses from local sources and from Tasmania raised many points that have led to amendments that improve the Bill. As far as I can ascertain similar legislation in other States deals only with the building industry. If a different type of industry wishes to implement provisions of this type, I believe representatives of that industry will go before the tripartite committee which is capably chaired by Mr. Max Johnson, and which would then report to the Minister of the day with the result that appropriate legislation would be introduced. During the course of evidence various other industries were discussed. Some witnesses were in favour of encompassing other industries in the Bill, but the majority wanted it to apply only to the building industry. Some witnesses were opposed to the principle of casual workers receiving long service leave benefits.

The Opposition members who spoke during the second reading debate indicated their support for the principle of the Bill, but said they were not satisfied with its format. Now that it has been through the rigour and investigation of a Select Committee it is in a more acceptable form. It is important to note that employer organisation witnesses from the building industry were in favour of the principles of the Bill. The committee heard evidence from large organisations such as the Master Builders Association, the Employers Federation and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Although some employer organisations of other industries raised certain doubts about it, representatives from the building industry were in favour of this type of legislation being introduced.

The Bill, as it comes from the Select Committee, encompasses many of the draft regulations that were placed before members during the November sitting. It is a major step forward to see important laws enshrined in legislation rather than in regulations. If other industries or types of employment are to be encompassed by this legislation, members will now have an opportunity to debate and decide whether those industries should be included. If the legislation did not cover these matters, other industries would have to run the gamut of the regulations being disallowed or of lying in Parliament for at least 14 days. I suppose the proper procedure would have been for the Government to wait for the regulations to have been passed.

It is rash to say in these times of inflation that the fund will be viable, but the South Australian method of accounting (as recommended by the Select Committee) will be simpler and less cumbersome than the system used in New South Wales, where the system of keeping records is chaotic. The Tasmanian witness agreed that the monthly return method South Australia intends to adopt would be a simple method. The Opposition's request to have the Bill referred to a Select Committee has been vindicated, because the Bill is now more workable. Before, it spelt out certain principles, but there were areas of doubt, that have now been largely cleared up. It now remains to see how the legislation works in practice.

Undoubtedly, the member for Fisher is right when he says that housing costs will increase, but that cannot be avoided. However, I do not know what the increase will be, because it is difficult to calculate. Many employees already

qualify for normal long service leave entitlement. We are adding a certain percentage increase to the costs of this industry, but I find it almost impossible to calculate. The increase must be balanced against the justice of the case. The Liberal Party stands for justice in employment and working conditions. One also has to balance the increase against other employers who already compulsorily pay long service leave contributions. A balance and check situation therefore occurs. As I believe this Bill is better than the one we had before, I support it.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support this Bill with mixed feelings. I am particularly concerned about the added cost to the building industry. The report states that the building industry is the guinea pig in this matter. On page 2 it states:

On balance it was felt appropriate to legislate only for the building industry in the first instance as a pilot scheme.

That may well be, but I am sure the main problem will be that of cost. I do not have to tell the House what is the present situation of the building industry in this State. I do not have to remind the House of the low-cost building we used to have in this State not long ago, when our costs were the lowest in Australia. The member for Fisher has said that even Victoria has cheaper housing costs than we have in South Australia at the moment. Many thousands of young people still wish to own their own house. We know it is not the policy of the Labor Party for young people to own their own houses, but the Liberal Party acknowledges the need for young people to be house-owners.

The young people in this State now find it virtually impossible to have a house built. They have the problem not only of getting a builder to cost down to a price they can afford but also the problem, of obtaining finance at a reasonable rate of interest. I understand the waiting time for a house loan from the State Bank of South Australia is now about two years and the intending borrower must have about $3 000 in that bank, and I understand that sum will be increased soon to $5 000. These young people never seem able to get in front. I do not believe this Bill will help the situation at all; in fact,I am sure it will aggravate it. Although I have read the report, I have not yet read the evidence taken by the committee but I wonder whether any costing has been done. Does the Minister know how much this Bill will add to the cost of a normal type of house in the range of $23 000 to $30 000? I believe some representatives of the building trade said they did not object to the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: They said they favoured it.

Mr. MATHWIN: That may well be, but the firms that will be hit most will be the smaller firms; the larger firms will be able to cope. I believe the smaller builder and the subcontractor will suffer under the provisions of this legislation. The member for Florey spoke about the injustices in the past to the workers in the building industry. I have been in the building trade all my life, and I have worked in the building industry in South Australia. In my time there was always a loading for this type of thing within the payment to the tradesmen. I worked on many building sites throughout South Australia, and there was no great grievance about long service leave for the casual workers in the building industry because they realised they had a loading for it. It was at their pleasure they did this work because they had decided it was the type of work they wanted to do.

They were satisfied to do it and they had a certain amount of satisfaction in producing something of value—a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. The sock-it-to-them attitude of the member for Florey to the employers surprised me because he should know that many people within the industry, be they subcontractors or builders, employ tradesmen at over-award rates. In my time in the building industry most of the men who worked for me were receiving more than the award rate, and they appreciated that. I believe this still happens in many cases. The member for Florey also said that the effects on costs really did not matter anyway. Of course, it is all right for someone who has a house to talk like that, but the people it affects are the people who do not own a house, particularly the young people of this State who want their own houses and will be affected by the increased cost to the building industry.

The low cost of land was mentioned by the member for Florey, but he did not say that at the end of last year the then Minister in charge of housing said that the average cost of land in the metropolitan area was $5 800. If that is the yardstick the member for Florey was using when he referred to the good effects of the Land Commission, he was well away from the facts, because I would like to see a block of land in the metropolitan area that has been available in the past two years for $5 800. I support the Bill and appreciate the remarks made about the members of the Select Committee doing their work so well. However, I wish to put on record my concern about the increase which might be added to the building costs in this State in an industry that is already facing great problems, as are the people the industry is providing for.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short titles."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

Page 1, line 5—Leave out "Casual Employment" and insert "Building Industry".

This is a formal amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Arrangement."

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

Page 1, lines 11 and 12—Leave out all words in these lines.

This amendment merely leaves out words in the provisions of the Bill relating to the heading of a division that will be struck out.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—"Definitions."

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

Page 1, lines 21 and 22—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

"employer" means a person who employs a worker in the industry:.

This amendment is designed to insert definitions of "employer" and "worker" and to make certain other formal amendments.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 2, lines 1 to 4—Leave out all words in these lines.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 2, line 7—Leave out "Casual Employment", insert "Building Industry".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 2, after line 8—Insert—

"the industry" means the activity of carrying out the construction, reconstruction, renovation, alteration, demolition, maintenance or repairs of or to—

(a) buildings;

(b) roadworks, railways, airfields or other works intended to facilitate the carriage or movement of persons, animals or goods;

(c) breakwaters, docks, jetties, piers, wharves or works for the improvement or alteration of any harbor, river or watercourse for the purposes of navigation;

(d) works for the storage or supply of water or for the irrigation of land;

(e) works for the conveyance, treatment or disposal of sewage or of the effluent from any premises;

(f) bridges, viaducts, aquaducts or tunnels;

(g) chimney stacks, cooling towers, drilling rigs, gas holders or silos;

(h) pipe lines;

(i) structures, fixtures or works for use in any building or works referred to in paragraphs *(a)* to *(h)* of this definition;

(j) navigational lights, beacons or markers;

(k) works for the drainage of land;

(l) works for the storage of liquids other than water, or for the storage of gases;

(m) works for the transmission of electric power;

(n) works for the transmission of wireless or telegraphic communications,

and includes pile driving and the preparation of the site for any building or other works referred to in paragraphs *(a)* to *(n)* of this definition, but does not include any such activity carried out by—

(o) a council within the meaning of the Local Government Act, 1934-1975;

(p) any body whether corporate or unincorporate, constituted under any Act, in relation to which the Governor or a Minister of the Crown has the right to appoint the person or any of the persons constituting that body or constituting the body responsible for the management of the affairs of that first mentioned body;

(q) any prescribed body;

(r) any person or body where that activity is subsidiary to the principal activity of that person or body.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 2—

Line 11—Leave out "declared".

Line 13—Leave out "declared".

Amendments carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 2, after line 13—Insert—

"worker" means a person who is engaged under a contract of employment for hire or reward in the industry in the occupation or calling—

(a) of the kind usually performed by a builder's labourer, as so classified, in any award, from time to time made or having been made under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1975, or any corresponding previous enactment;

(b) of the kind usually performed by an asbestos cement fixer, bricklayer, bridge and wharf carpenter, decorator, drainer, electrical mechanic, gas fitter, glazier, joiner, painter, plasterer, plumber, roof tiler, signwriter, slater, stonemason, terrazzo worker, tile layer, tuck pointer or welder or by an apprentice, improver or assistant to any of the foregoing occupations or callings;

(c) of a kind usually performed by a person engaged in a prescribed occupation or calling;

or

(d) of a general foreman, supervisor, charge hand, sub-foreman or leading hand in the supervision of a person or any work performed by a person engaged in the occupation or calling referred to in paragraphs (a) to (c) of this definition,

but does not include a person who having been a worker has received a payment under section 37 of this Act.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 4a—"Determination by Industrial Magistrate."

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

After clause 4—Insert the following new clause:

4a. If a question arises as to whether or not—

(a) a particular activity is comprised in the industry;

(b) a particular person or person of a particular class is a worker;

or

(c) a particular person or a person of a particular class is an employer,

that question shall be determined by the Industrial Court of South Australia constituted of an Industrial Magistrate appointed under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1975.

This new clause provides for determination by the Industrial Court constituted of an Industrial Magistrate of certain matters set out in paragraphs *(a), (b)* and *(c)*.

New clause inserted.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Non-application of the Long Service Leave Act to declared worker."

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

Page 2, line 17—Leave out "declared worker or declared employer" and insert "worker or employer".

It is a formal amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7—"Constitution of Board."

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

Page 2—

Line 23—Leave out "three" and insert "five".

After line 29—Insert—

(ba) of whom one shall be appointed on the nomination of the South Australian Employers' Federation Incorporated (in this section referred to as "the Federation").

Line 30—Leave out "one" and insert "two".

Clause 7 recognises the increase in the board from three members to five, the increase being provided by one member appointed from the South Australian Employers Federation and one additional member from the United Trades and Labor Council.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 2—

Line 33—After "Chamber", insert ", the Federation".

Line 34—After "Chamber", insert ", the Federation".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Removal from office of a member."

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

Page 3—

Line 39—Leave out "The nominating authority" and insert "At the request of a nominating authority, the Governor".

After line 45—Insert—

(ba) the member of the Board referred to in paragraph *(ba)* of subsection (2) of section 7 of this Act, means the South Australian Employers' Federation Incorporated:.

Page 4, line 1—Leave out "member" and insert "members".

These are formal and consequential amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Common seal, meetings and quorum."

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

Page 4, line 25—Leave out "two" and insert "three".

This amendment increases the number required for a quorum from two to three and consequently means an increased number of members on the board.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 12 to 14 passed.

Clauses 15 to 17 negatived.

Clause 18—"Establishment of Fund."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 5—lines 17 and 18—Leave out "Casual Employment" and insert "Building Industry".

Line 21—Leave out "declared".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 19 and 20 passed.

Clause 21—"Investigation of state and sufficiency of accounts in the Fund."

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

Page 6, lines 5 and 6—Leave out "each account, being an account maintained in relation to a declared industry", and insert "the Fund".

This is purely a formal amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 22 negatived.

Clauses 23 and 24 passed.

Clause 25—"Return of declared worker."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 7—

Line 3—Leave out "declared worker being employed as" and insert "person becoming".

Line 4—Leave out "declared" thrice occurring.

Line 6—Leave out "declared".

Line 9—Leave out "declared".

Line 10—Leave out "a declared employer" and insert "an employer".

Line 10—Leave out "declared" secondly occurring and insert "former".

Line 11—Leave out "declared" and insert "former".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 26—"Contributions by declared employers."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 7—

Line 14—Leave out "declared".

Line 16—Leave out "declared".

Line 19—Leave out "a declared" and insert "an".

Line 20—Leave out "declared".

Amendments carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 7, lines 27 and 28—Leave out all words in these lines and insert "in relation to the industry means the percentage for the time being prescribed in relation to the industry".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 27—"Special arrangements."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 7—

Line 29—Leave out "A declared" and insert "An".

Line 33—Leave out "declared" twice occurring.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 28—"Refund of overpayment."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 7, line 39—Leave out "declared".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 29—"Application of money paid into funds of employers."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 8—

Line 1—Leave out "a declared" and insert "an".

Line 2—After "has" insert ", before the commencement of this Act,".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 30—"Entitlement to leave under Long Service Leave Act."

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

Page 8, lines 12 to 17—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

30. Where a person who on the commencement of this Act became a worker in relation to an employer and that person had, in respect of his service before that commencement with that employer become entitled to a grant of long service leave or payment in lieu thereof pursuant to the Long Service Leave Act, 1967-1972, then in relation to that service that Act shall apply and have effect as if this Act had not been enacted.

This provision recasts clause 30, with no change in actual principle.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Certain people were concerned that some employees would be under the old Act and some under the new Bill, and evidence presented to the committee emphasised the words "that service" in this provision. The Minister would no doubt agree that employees will complete their obligation under the old Act, so that all employees would be under the new Act as at the same date.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 31—"Service within the meaning of the Long Service Leave Act."

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

Page 8—

Line 18—After "31", insert "(1)".

Line 18—Leave out "declared worker" and insert "worker of an employer".

Lines 18 and 19—Leave out "immediately before he became a declared worker of a declared employer," and insert "on the commencement of this Act he became a worker of an employer and that immediately before that commencement".

These amendments again recognise that the obligations of the parties arise immediately the Act comes into operation, and also simplifies the method of calculating amounts payable for past service.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 8—

Line 24—Leave out "employee" and insert "worker".

Line 24—Leave out "that service as".

Amendments carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 8—

Line 25—Leave out all words in this line and insert "the amount of effective service determined to be effective service in accordance with subsection (2) of this section in relation to that service".

After line 25—Insert—

(2) In determining effective service for the purposes of subsection (1) of this section—

(a) any service that occurred on or before the thirty-first day of December, 1965, shall be brought to account at the rate of half of one year's effective service for each year of that service;

(b) any service that occurred during the period commencing on and including the first day of January, 1966, and concluding on and including the thirty-first day of December, 1971, shall be brought to account at the rate of two-thirds of one year's effective service for each year of that service;

and

(c) any service that occurred on or after the first day of January, 1972, and before the commencement of this Act, shall be brought to account at the rate of one year's effective service for each year of that service.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 32—"Liability of declared employer in relation to effective service certified under section 31 of this Act."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: 1 move:

Page 8—
Line 27—Leave out "declared" thrice occurring.
Line 28—Leave out "prescribed".
Line 29—Leave out "declared".
Line 30—Leave out all words in this line and insert "reference to the following table—

	Prescribed percentage %
Where the service, in relation to which effective service was determined commenced—	
Seven years or more before the commencement of this Act ...	2½
Five years or more before the commencement of this Act, but later than seven years before that commencement.....	1¼
Three years or more before the commencement of this Act, but later than five years before that commencement.....	1
Before the commencement of this Act, but later than three years before that commencement ...	¾"

Line 31—Leave out "a declared" and insert "an".
Line 35—Leave out "a declared" and insert "an".
Line 37—Leave out "a declared" and insert "an".
Lines 39 to 41—Leave out all words in these lines.

This clause also relates to payments for past service. The table simplifies the method of calculating such payments. The remainder of the amendments are of a formal nature.

Amendments carried: clause as amended passed.

Clause 33—"Return of service."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 8—
Line 42—Leave out "declared".
Line 45—Leave out "declared".
Line 47—Leave out "declared".
Page 9, line 1—Leave out "A declared" and insert "An".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 34—"Entitlement certificate."

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

Page 9—
Line 4—Leave out "As" and insert "Subject to subsection (la) of this section, as".
Line 5—Leave out "declared".
Line 7—Leave out "declared".
Line 10—Leave out "declared".
Line 14—Leave out "declared".
After line 19—Insert—

(la) Where the board is satisfied that a worker, who has less than 84 months accumulated effective service, has not been employed in the industry for a continuous period of eighteen months or more otherwise than on account of illness or injury, the board shall in its certificate referred to in subsection (1) of this section disregard any effective service entitlement accumulated by that worker prior to the commencement of that continuous period and this Act shall apply and have effect accordingly.

Line 20—Leave out "declared".
Line 21—After "subsection (1) of this section", insert ", in the prescribed manner and form".
Line 23—Leave out "declared".

The amendments are formal, with the exception of new subsection (la), which provides that a worker who has less than 84 months accumulated service and who is absent from the industry otherwise than on account of injury or illness will lose all his previously accumulated entitlements.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 35—"Payment to declared worker."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 9—
Line 39—Leave out "declared".
Line 41—Leave out "declared".
Line 42—Leave out "declared".
Page 10, line 3—Leave out "declared".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 36—"Permitted absence."

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

Page 10—
Line 6—Leave out "declared".
Line 7—Leave out "declared" twice occurring.
Line 8—Leave out "declared".
Line 11—Leave out "declared worker" and insert "person".
Line 15—Leave out "declared worker" and insert "person".
Line 16—Leave out "declared worker" and insert "person".

These are all formal amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 37—"Entitlement to payment from the Board."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 10—
Line 19—Leave out "declared".
Lines 22 and 23—Leave out "declared industry in relation to which he was a declared worker" and insert "industry".
Lines 24 to 26—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

(c) ceases to be a worker in circumstances that suggest that he will not again become a worker.

Line 28—Leave out "declared" twice occurring.
Line 33—Leave out "declared".
Line 35—Leave out "declared".
Line 36—Leave out "section" and insert "Act".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 38—"Promotion of a declared worker."

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

Page 10—
Line 37—Leave out "declared" twice occurring.
Line 38—Leave out "declared".
Line 39—Leave out "declared".
Line 41—Leave out "declared" twice occurring.
Line 42—Leave out "declared".
Page 11—
Line 2—Leave out "declared".
Line 11—Leave out "declared".
Line 17—Leave out "declared".
Line 18—Leave out "declared".

All these amendments are formal.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 39—"Powers of inspectors".

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 11—
Line 26—Leave out all words in this line and insert "worker is employed".
Line 32—Leave out "A declared" and insert "An".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 40—"Records".

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

Page 12, line 6—Leave out "declared" twice occurring.

This is a formal amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 41—"Declaration of ordinary pay."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 12—
Line 9—Leave out "each declared worker and each declared worker of a" and insert "a worker or a worker of a".
Line 10—Leave out "declared".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 42—"Employers not to dismiss or injure employees".

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

Page 12—

Line 16—Leave out "Five thousand" and insert "Five hundred".

Lines 17 to 22—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

(2) Where on or after the first day of February, 1976, and before the commencement of this Act, an employer dismisses an employee and had that employee not been so dismissed he would have, on that commencement of this Act, become a worker as defined in this Act it shall lie upon that employer to prove that the dismissal was not a contravention of subsection (I) of this section.

These amendments merely reduce the penalty from $5 000 to $500.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (43 to 45) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2022.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The brief Bill meets with the approval of the South Australian building societies. It is merely an administrative matter and authorises building societies to act as agencies for the Aboriginal Loans Commission. For some time the building societies have been active in this capacity, because it would be far too expensive for the commission to establish an organisation to process applications by Aborigines for housing loans. By including the retrospectivity provision in clause 2, we make it legal for the building societies to carry out their function on behalf of the commission. The move is worth while, because the people concerned consider that they have not had the opportunity to obtain housing finance. The Commonwealth Government made funds available to Aborigines who applied to the Aboriginal Affairs Department, and the department allocated to them a building society with a branch nearest to their new residence, or if the Aboriginal was a member of a building society he or she was asked to visit that society, which then processed the application, valued the property, and prepared the documents for settlement. The society does all the normal things that it does for any applicant. Aborigines are fortunate that the amount of loan can be a maximum of $25 000 for a maximum period of 35 years, and that the interest is at a concessional rate depending on earnings.

I understand that an Aboriginal earning up to $8 000 a year would have to pay a maximum interest rate of 2 per cent reducible; for earnings of $8 001 to $10 000 the maximum rate is about 5 per cent reducible; and on an income of more than $10 000 the interest rate is 10 per cent maximum. I understand that these rates are now being reviewed. The amount of repayment must not exceed 25 per cent of the breadwinner's income, and that rate applies in all instances. Particular benefits are available to Aborigines for interest rates, and no-one could criticise that situation. I think this has been a wonderful scheme to assist these people, but unfortunately, as in every other area of housing, not sufficient money is available to cope with all applications. Since the inception of the scheme in this State about nine months ago, 22 applications have been approved and processed.

Unfortunately, no money will be available until the end of the financial year, and I believe about 2 500 applications are pending throughout Australia. Let us hope that, whilst the headlines in the media this evening are not promising for South Australia, this will be one area in which the Commonwealth Government will not reduce funds, but will make additional money available. Building societies receive an income of about ½ per cent for the handling of the transaction, so that they are not making a large profit. It would be far too expensive for the Aboriginal Affairs Department to establish an autonomous body to handle applications, so it is in the interests of all members that this Bill be passed as expeditiously as possible.

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

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2045.)

Clause 8—"Keeping of pigs."

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

Page 3, lines 5, 6 and 7—Leave out subclause (1).

After line 8, insert paragraphs as follows:

(aa) the nature and condition of any buildings in which pigs may be kept;

(ab) the nature of lands on which pigs may be grazed;

I think that these amendments satisfy Opposition requirements.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I support the amendments, which allow the question of grazing of pigs and the conditions under which pigs will be kept to be controlled by regulations.

Mr. BLACKER: While the clause refers to a maximum number of pigs, it is important to provide a minimum, and I wonder whether the Government has used a set of model regulations as a guideline for local boards under this provision.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I can assure the honourable member only on the basis on which I have been advised. I have not actually seen draft model regulations, but I have been told by the Minister in another place that considerable consultation took place between the United Farmers and Graziers organisation and departmental officers on the matter, and a model draft was arrived at.

Dr. EASTICK: Is the Minister aware of an organisation in my district which has more than 40 000 pigs and which will soon have more than 60 000 pigs, and where there are grave difficulties with noise and odour pollution? I am not suggesting that the organisation has not taken every opportunity to fulfil its obligation to the local board of health in this regard. The Minister would accept that an organisation of this magnitude has much capital tied up in its existing piggeries, and for it suddenly to be charged with the responsibility of implementing major alterations as a result of this legislation or regulations made under it, would be beyond the capacity of smaller organisations, and even this organisation, to make the necessary alterations. From his discussions with the Minister in another place, can the Minister say whether due regard will be given to the continuation of existing industries, with every effort being made towards upgrading the facilities on a lime schedule that can be met by these organisations?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am not aware of the size of the installation referred to, but I am aware that pig raising forms a considerable part of South Australia's primary industry. I am pleased to give the member the assurance he is seeking, because I feel sure that the imposition of the measures contained in the Bill will be carried out in the manner he hopes, with common sense and sufficient time to effect the alterations.

Mr. VENNING: A butcher in my area recently leased a butcher shop and slaughtering and pig facilities that would be one of the best slaughterhouse set-ups outside Adelaide. It was erected about four years ago under the supervision of a health inspector from Port Pirie. The pig yards are about 60 metres too close to the slaughterhouse, so he was instructed to shift the yards before December 31 last. He approached me about the matter, and he has done nothing about it. When the Minister recently visited Clare, I took this young man with me to speak to the Minister. He has now to write to the Minister explaining everything to him. It is only fair that future facilities should comply with new regulations, but existing facilities should be considered in the light of the matter raised by the member for Light.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not believe that I can give an unqualified assurance that every existing installation will not have to be modified. I take it that the honourable member is not seeking that sort of assurance. Anyway, he has answered his own question by saying that the man concerned is to write to the Minister. Presumably, what this man is complaining about relates to slaughtering regulations and not to this Bill. I am not saying it is irrelevant to the Bill we are considering, but departmental officers use their common sense when measures such as this are introduced and will not suddenly become punitive. It was the member for Mallee who drew attention to the matter, anyway. I would expect that departmental officers would act fairly and that people could approach the Minister in specific cases.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 9 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Enactment of Part 1XD of principal Act."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 4, lines 7 to 14—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

> "pest" means any animal, plant, insect or other living thing that for agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, industrial, domestic or public health purposes is troublesome or destructive:
>
> "pest controller" means a person who carries on the business of using pesticides for the destruction or control of pests:
>
> "pesticide" means any substance that is capable of being used for the destruction or control of pests and is prescribed for the purposes of this definition.

The amendment recasts the definition of "pest", "pest controller", and "pesticide" by providing definitions which are rather more limiting and which more accurately give effect to the intentions of proposed Part IXD.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am pleased that the definition of "pesticide" has been modified, because I expressed concern that it was originally defined as a substance manufactured for use in controlling or preventing growth or development of any living organism. I considered this to be such a broad definition that I could see chemists having to apply for a pest controller's permit in order to sell the "pill" or similar substance.

Amendment carried.

Mr. GUNN: It seems that a farmer who decided to enter into an agreement to spray his neighbour's crop would need to have a licence under the provisions of this legislation. Some farmers do spray other farmers' crops for reward, and I believe it would be ridiculous if these people had to be included in this legislation. I believe there ought to be control, because some people who have gone around the country setting themselves up as pest controllers have been shady in their activities. However, I think the legislation should not go so far as to include the farmers I have mentioned. I ask the Minister whether the Governor could exempt farmers who wish to spray another farmer's crop.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think I can repeat safely what I heard another Minister say and feel confident it is correct. I do not know what the Governor by proclamation might exempt, but I surmise that he could, under the exemption clause, provide for exemption. The new definition of pest controller refers to a person who carries on the business of using pesticides for the destruction or control of pests, and it seems to me that that would take care of the situation raised by the member for Eyre where the persons are concerned with farming. I do not believe the member for Eyre need be worried about this matter.

Mr. VENNING: The point raised by the member for Eyre is pertinent to the farming community, as often a farmer sprays his neighbour's crop at his request. As recently as last week I attended a meeting at Kadina at which our present Minister of Agriculture was the guest speaker, and he was advocating the syndication of farm equipment amongst farmers. I hope that what is intended in this legislation in relation to the rural farming community is spelled out clearly. Does it mean that each farmer has to get a certificate to go through the fence and spray a farmer's crop at his request when he is in trouble? What docs it mean?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: We outlined the position as it stands in relation to the requirements of the Act. Pest controller means a person who carries on the business of using pesticides. The honourable member just described the case of neighbouring farmers operating by request on one another's properties. It seems to me that this is not caught in the net we are discussing. I will undertake to give attention to the point raised, so that if necessary it can be looked at in another place.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister take up these points with the appropriate Minister and contact us by letter informing us of what the situation is?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will do that. I move:

Page 4, lines 41 to 43—Leave out subclause (1) and insert subclause as follows:

> (1) Subject to this Act, no person shall have in his possession or control, or use, any prescribed substance for the purpose of destroying or controlling any pests.
>
> Penalty: Two hundred dollars.

The amendment redrafts that subsection in a more appropriate form.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE moved:

Page 4, line 44—Leave out "prescribed".

Amendment carried.

Clause 15—"Regulations".

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 5, line 22—Leave out "and the revocation of such a licence" and insert "or revoked".

The change is of a drafting nature, rather than altering what is meant by the wording.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE moved:

Page 5, lines 27 and 28—Leave out "and the cancellation of such a certificate" and insert "or revoked".

Amendment carried: clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2038.)

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I support the second reading of this Bill. A similar Bill was introduced in the House at the end of 1973. The Bill passed through this Chamber

but, when it reached the other place, certain amendments were made. When the Bill was returned to this Chamber, four of the five amendments were accepted, but one amendment was not accepted. The Bill was debated somewhat extensively at that time and, for that reason, I will be relatively brief.

The museum, as we know, was established in 1856, and many members will be aware that it has achieved an international reputation. The collections, scientific research, and displays within the museum are worthy of the highest recognition. I believe that praise should go to the staff and the board for the excellent standard they have set in the past, and I am sure that the standard will continue in the future. I make the point (and again I am sure that many members are aware of this fact, too) that the staff and the Director of the museum are working under poor conditions. Many reports have come from the museum of the deplorable conditions under which its staff are working, and I think that few of us realise how bad the conditions are.

The museum holds the largest collection of Aboriginal artifacts in the world. It is presently stored in most unsatisfactory conditions, and the perishable portions of the collection are suffering badly and even disintegrating. Although considerable work has been done recently on storage, the lack of room is acute. It is estimated that four times the present storage is needed for the Aboriginal artifacts collection alone. This would not allow for future expansion and further acquisitions to the collection; it would only provide accessibility. The museum also houses a large Pacific Islands collection, which is also cramped to the point of inaccessibility. The collection of biological material has grown considerably over recent years, due in part to the great increase in biological and ecological surveys. A 10 per cent to 15 per cent expansion is expected in this field.

We often read and hear of instances of the deplorable conditions under which many of the collections are housed in the museum. One instance involves an Aboriginal canoe tree that was brought to the museum to be preserved. The tree has had to be stored in a place where it has deteriorated as badly as, if not worse than, if it had remained in the spot where it was originally. We are told of basement corridors and rooms packed with priceless relics. Among other things, this can only cause frustration among the staff, particularly among the curators. An article appearing in the *Advertiser* of November 8, 1975, contains comments made by the museum's Director, as follows:

> In one room about 2 000 boomerangs of all shapes and sizes were lying in heaps of shelves alongside 5 000 spears which represent 95 per cent of the museum's entire spear collection. It is very frustrating for the curators. These items should not even touch one another, and there is no hope of looking after them properly when they are so crammed together you can't even see them . . . . . Deterioration of important historical items and much of the material held in the museum is taking place because of climatic extremes and completely unsuitable storage space.

The museum has over recent years changed from exhibition and display presentation to that of education; this includes class teaching with a consequent change in storage and exhibition techniques. While the present museum building is aesthetically beautiful, it is 60 years old and not built for the needs of 1976. It is inflexible and the lack of space makes an even greater problem. Some apprehension is felt, regarding the move to a new building, that by the time the move is made it would be barely adequate for storage needs let alone expansion. There would be advantage in a site that would be completely flexible, with plenty of space. The needs for flexible design and room for expansion (not just storage room) are manifest when looking to a new building or site.

If the Bill is to work, it will be even more necessary for a new building and for extra space. Work is unlikely to start on a new building for some time. Because of the time we will have to wait for the opening of the new building and because of the damage that may be caused to the items there at present, I believe there is a good case even at this stage for the museum to be provided with additional temporary facilities until the new building is ready for occupancy. The last major expansion to the museum took place in 1915. The Bill sets out clearly the functions of the board, including the responsibilities for the museum in all forms. Education is an important responsibility of the board and staff, and I am sure that it is the hope of all members that the board will watch the educational aspects carefully.

The board is empowered to disburse funds as it sees fit for the advancement of the museum, and to buy and sell objects of scientific or historical interest. The board makes available such objects for the purpose of research. Only one provision in the Bill causes me concern, and I will be moving an amendment in Committee. This matter relates to clause 13 (1) *(h)* which provides that the functions of the board are, *inter alia,* to perform any other functions of scientific, educational or historical significance that may be assigned to the board by the Minister. I object to that provision, because I believe that the board should be responsible to Parliament, and not necessarily to the Minister. Having spoken to the Director and members of the board of the South Australian Museum,I appreciate the importance of this Bill's passing in this and the other place as soon as possible. The Bill will only legalise much of what has been happening for some time at the museum. I support the measure and urge other members to do likewise.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): I welcome the support from the Opposition for this measure. I accept all the arguments and comments about the inadequacy of the present museum. Of course, there is nothing new in the situation. I remember that about 12 years ago some enterprising person took advantage of a report in the *Advertiser* about the possums spoiling valuable collections at the museum that were stacked in tin sheds, and put a notice in books at the Public Library telling people who wanted possums to contact the Minister of Education. The Minister was a Liberal, and the worthy knight took exception to this.

The position at the museum was a real problem, even in the early 1960's, and the problem has got worse. The Government has acquired storage areas outside the museum, and much of the museum collection is housed across the road in Goldsbrough House. That is an unsatisfactory stopgap and I, more than most other people, welcome the decision made last July to eventually build a new museum on the site of the present Hackney bus depot. I hope that it will be possible to start moving the museum to that new location soon.

Mr. Wotton: Isn't that involving park lands?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I do not want to get involved in that matter. The Government has made a wise decision. I think it is an admirable site for a museum, being near the Botanic Garden and the Zoological Gardens. I consider it the best possible site that could have been chosen for a museum. I hope that, when the new museum is built, it will be an adornment to the park lands in that area. The matter is being pursued actively,

a committee having been established recently to examine the problems about relocating the museum. The point raised by the member for Heysen can be dealt with in the Committee stage. I hope that this time (the third time it has been introduced) the measure will go through in a satisfactory form, because we badly need a new Act to govern the operations of the museum.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Constitution of Board."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is one matter of drafting that I have been discussing with a certain person, and I desire to raise that matter with the Minister and to protest about it. Subclause (1) provides that the board shall consist of the permanent head who shall be a member of the board *ex officio*. Who knows who is the permanent head? There is no definition. This is one of those things beloved in the Public Service (but thank heavens we are not all in the Public Service yet), that the permanent head means the permanent head of a department. That is not stated in this provision. It is worded as a matter of convenience, but we do not know whose convenience we are suiting. A lay person should be able to understand the measure. I should like the Minister to justify this phrase.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): I was satisfied with the definition of "permanent head" given in subclause (3). That seems to cover the point made by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: You could proclaim me!

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: That is fairly unlikely. The clear intention is to get around the difficulty that always occurs when we start naming particular persons, departments, and Ministers by their titles, which change. The Bill before us last time referred to the Minister of Environment and Conservation, and that title ceased to exist some months ago. In addition, the title of Director of Environment and Conservation ceased to exist on January 1 this year. This is an attempt to obviate the necessity continually to update legislation because of changes in titles and, if the honourable member does not like the way we have gone about it, that is unfortunate. I should have thought that in practice it would work satisfactorily. The permanent head will be the permanent head of the Environment Department.

Mr. MILLHOUSE:I do not blame the Minister, but we are here to make reasonably intelligible laws, not only to meet our own convenience or that of the Public Service. Subclause (3) provides:

> In this section the "Permanent Head" means the officer for the time being declared by proclamation to be the Permanent Head for the purposes of this Act.

Anyone could be proclaimed, and the reference to "officer" does not help. The whole thing is completely circular and does not get us anywhere. I do not know why we do not include in clause 7(1) *(a)* the phrase "the permanent head of the department or his successor". If departments are amalgamated (and I understand, again, that this is being done for the convenience of the Public Service), someone succeeds to the position of permanent head of a department. I ask the Minister whether putting in those words would be acceptable.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I cannot see how the suggested amendment will advance the issue. We would then have to define which department we were talking about. I think the present words are quite satisfactory. I assure the Committee that the board under this legislation will comprise the Director of the Environment Department and five other members appointed by the Governor. I think a precedent will be established there that will make quite clear to all concerned who will be the members of the board. I do not think the phrase "permanent head of the department", without stating what department it is—

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you specify it?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The name of the department could change suddenly. This is being done not for the convenience of the Public Service but for the convenience of Parliament. Parliament would have to spend much of its time bringing legislation up to date by changing titles.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I protest, because this wording is sloppy and probably will not be intelligible to those who do not know the workings of the Public Service. The legislation seems to be for the benefit of the Government and of the Public Service, and that is why I protest.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Functions of the Board."

Mr. WOTTON: I move:

Page 4, line 31—Leave out "the Minister" and insert "regulation".

The board should be responsible to Parliament and not to the Minister, and this amendment would allow the board, by regulation, to perform all its functions and not be dictated to by the Minister. As this is a reasonable request, I ask members to support the amendment.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I cannot accept the amendment. This matter has been adequately debated previously, having been the subject of Legislative Council amendments in previous years, when it was not accepted. As I have tried to streamline matters I see no merit in the amendment. To disallow regulations takes time, and the Minister's wishes could be carried out by the board before regulations could be disallowed by Parliament. If the Minister made an unreasonable demand on the board, I am sure that matter would be ventilated in Parliament. It will not be necessary to restrict the powers of the Minister, as the Committee should trust the Minister to act in a responsible way and not dictate to the board. Parliamentary recesses are inevitable and it is unreasonable to expect the Government to have to wait until Parliament is sitting to implement some action that might be urgent.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister seems to be unable to get out of the rut. It may be that the present Minister will act in a responsible way and not interfere with the functions of the board. We appreciate that the incumbent Minister would not be party to a decision that would cause concern, but he is not necessarily going to be the only Minister of his political persuasion holding that portfolio. The great Gough thought it was distant—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keneally): Order! The honourable member will come back to the amendment. I do not know that the gentleman to whom he is now referring has any relevance to the clause or the amendment.

Dr. EASTICK: The real relevance of the remark relates to the rapid change of events that can come about. This measure has failed for almost three years to be passed. Members accept that there are distinct advantages in the passage of most of the Bill. The Achilles heel of the measure is that provision which places authority in the hands of the Minister.

The persistence of members on this side of the Chamber and of members in another place relates to information and inquiry made by people in positions to know of the likely dangers or difficulties that could occur. Notwithstanding the Minister's statement about the time it would take to get the measure to the point of disallowance, we believe that, by regulation, it would be possible for this Chamber to scrutinise the issue causing concern. It ill-behoves all members to delay a measure for the time this measure has been delayed over a matter that the Minister suggests is trivial. However, members on this side believe it relates to an important principle.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am most disappointed with the Minister's attitude. I thought he would have been more flexible on this matter than he has been on other occasions. He said that the procedure of introducing regulations would not be right and that if authority was left with the Minister he could make a decision that could still be debated in the Chamber. If the matter was dealt with by regulation, not only would the Minister have a say but other members and the public (through the Subordinate Legislation Committee) could also have a say. The Minister also said that Ministers have not interfered, but that need not always be the case. Perhaps he might be elevated in the Ministry or there could even be a change of Government, which is indeed likely. I have much confidence in the Minister, and ask him to reconsider his decision, realising that we are on the right track and that we are not trying to take away power from him.

Mr. WOTTON: I thank members on this side for supporting the amendment. In the short time I have been in the Chamber I have been surprised and somewhat concerned at the number of times that Bills have passed that make a Minister all-powerful. I appreciate that, in some instances, such a provision is necessary, but this is a case where we can make a stand. I am disappointed that the Minister cannot support the amendment. I would have hoped that he would be a little more flexible. Perhaps he is changing his mind: we will wait and see. I believe that the board should be responsible to Parliament and not to the Minister.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I appreciate the confidence the member for Glenelg has in me, but he sadly disappointed me. The member for Light was referring to the rapid change of political events, and I could only assume he was thinking back to the middle of last year. I do not think that situation will pertain to this side of the House. I do not think I will get a more important folio than the one I have at present: I do not regard it as a lowly portfolio. I am not prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. RODDA: What the member for Heysen seeks to do by his amendment is see to it that Parliament has the last say in this matter. True, the Minister will not always be the encumbent of this position, but when this legislation goes on to the Statute Book it will be there forever. That is what concerns the Opposition.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton (teller).

Noes (21)—Abbott, Broomhill, Max Brown, Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons (teller), Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Coumbe and Gunn. Noes—Mrs. Byrne and Mr. Dunstan.

Amendment thus negatived.

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

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (14 to 20) and title passed.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen); I reiterate what has been said earlier in the House both by me and by other Opposition members who supported me, because I believe it extremely important that the Government look as soon as possible into providing South Australia with new museum buildings. Clause 13, which sets out the functions of the board, provides that the board is fairly well able to have a fair go regarding what it should decide for the betterment of the museum. The board, in being empowered to undertake the care and management of the museum and of all lands vested in or placed under its control, is able to promote research into matters of scientific or historical interest, not only in South Australia but also throughout Australia. The board is also empowered to accumulate and care for objects and specimens of scientific and historical interest and to accumulate and classify data in respect of such matters.

The board is also empowered to disseminate information on, and to purchase objects of, scientific or historical interest, to sell, exchange or dispose of any such objects, and to make available for the purpose of scientific or historical research any portion of the State collection. Other speakers andI have referred to the importance of the need for the board to investigate the educational requirements in regard to the museum. It is hoped that the museum will continue to promote the idea of being able to educate within the museum, particularly with the hope of new buildings in the not too distant future, so that the museum will be able to promote the interests of education within the sphere of the museum. In providing for the board to report on the administration of the museum each year and for a copy of its report to be laid before each Chamber, we hope that we will be able to keep a close watch on the museum's activities. We in South Australia should be proud of the museum and do all we can to ensure that it continues to flourish. I believe that, as a result of the Bill, the museum will be able to work in an even better manner in the future than it can under present conditions.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I compliment the member for Heysen on his comments made not only during the earlier part of the debate but also during the speech he has just made, and I listened intently and with interest to the Minister's comments in replying to the debate. The House is indebted to the member for Heysen for the extended history he gave on the museum's operations. Undoubtedly the museum (with which I have had something to do in the past) is unique in relation to some of its collections. On behalf of all South Australians, members have the obligation to ensure that the unique collections we have are housed adequately so that they do not deteriorate to any extent (and that is the danger at present). Another aspect of museum preservation is the manner of display, so that students and other interested parties within Australia or from overseas may examine the *objet d'art* displayed. If we think for a moment of the unique numismatic and philatelic collections displayed in the museum, we realise that we owe a debt to benefactors of the past.

What the present generation must remember is that these valuable collections must be preserved and shown to their best advantage, not only to researchers but also to interested members of the public. Considerable publicity has been given to this subject, which was raised by the

member for Davenport recently regarding the coin collection, some of which was sold in London. A reply was given in the House yesterday to some of the matters he raised on that occasion. We must realise that we have a heritage from the past that the present generation must preserve for the future. Whatever plans the Government has (and it has announced some of them), Jet us hope that the ideals on which I have briefly touched are preserved for the people of the future. In those circumstances, I support the Bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FRANCHISE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2028.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): First, I express concern that a Bill of this kind was introduced into this place only yesterday and, within 24 hours, we are expected to research it, consider the detail, and then debate it today. Secondly, we have been given details of the programme that will be adopted from day to day. I note on the copy of that programme that has been given to me that, on both the Orders of the Day and the programme which was, in my opinion, agreed, this measure is quite a way down the list, coming after other measures that have not so far been debated.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The changes were made at your request.

Mr. RUSSACK: It does not alter the fact that only 24 hours has expired since this Bill was introduced, and we are expected to debate it. It contains 99 clauses. I know many of them are consequential, but the Opposition should have the right to examine every clause and see what its impact is and what the outcome will be. Further, it is only right that every member of Parliament should have the time and the right to contact those people who are concerned with such a Bill so that we can learn what the electorate thinks and how the Bill will involve those people and so that we can portray the true feeling and understanding of those people we represent. I cannot speak too strongly of my opposition to the way in which business is being conducted in this House.

Mr. Langley: You used to have eight months off.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSSACK: This Bill was introduced only yesterday. In the short time I have had to look at it, I find that it has two major purposes or intents. One is to introduce universal adult franchise for local government, and the other is to eradicate all multiple voting and to have a single-vote system. As regards universal adult franchise, in my research of the Bill I find that an electors roll will be compiled and that it will be of three categories: one, a roll similar to a House of Assembly roll applying to people residing within an area, the definition of the area being a municipality or district council; and secondly, a natural person who is a ratepayer in respect of a ratable property: that is, any person in an area who is paying rates can be placed on the electors roll. The third is a nominated person representing a body corporate. So this roll will be established and all people who are eligible to vote on the House of Assembly roll will be eligible to vote, plus people in those two categories I have mentioned.

As far as multiple voting is concerned, the Act now provides that, where a body corporate is represented in council, that body, according to the value of the property it owns, can have up to three representatives. On my understanding, the Bill reduces that representation to one representative. However, this does not impair the right of that representative to vote in his own right in his own ward of the corporation or council, and it does not preclude that person from exercising his vote for the election of a mayor or aiderman.

The system of voluntary voting will be retained. I understand over the years the Party to which I belong has insisted that this form of voting be retained in local government elections. I am pleased to see that the Government has seen fit to retain voluntary voting in local government elections. Several years ago, the Government introduced legislation denying an elector a vote anywhere but in the ward or area designated by that elector; in other words, if a person lived in a certain ward and had a business interest or occupied an office in another ward, and perhaps had a beach house at one of the beaches, that person, according to that Bill, would have the right to vote in only one place. I am glad to see that this measure has a more sane and realistic approach; it provides for an elector to vote in each ward or area where he has an interest, and the right to be on the roll in that ward or area.

It is obvious that the policy of this Government places a strong emphasis just on the elector and disregards any interest that one could have in a property. It must be accepted that, if a person pays his rates and is responsible for contributing to the revenue of a corporation or council area, he should have certain consideration.

I should like to think that, if people, because their name is on the Assembly roll, will have the right to participate in council elections and in council business, some form of revenue should be received from them. I should like to see this method introduced in some form so that there can be an equality of contribution to the revenue of that area from those people involved in the community. If I had had the time, I would have tried to have an amendment prepared. Until I have that opportunity, I will support the measure at the second reading stage. I want to prepare something that will meet what I consider reasonable requirements in raising revenue from those who are not ratepayers in an area. It is possible that the present Federal Government will give money to local government from a percentage of personal income tax. I consider that, if that happens, everyone will be contributing directly to the financing of their local government area.

At present the Act provides that, if a ratepayer has not paid rates six weeks before an election or a poll is held or a question of the nomination for an official position in a council arises, that person is not permitted to vote or seek nomination. The Bill repeals these provisions, and a person will not be obliged to be financial regarding rates to be able to vote in an election or poll or to be able to be nominated as a councillor, aiderman, or mayor. Perhaps the Minister can confirm my thinking, but I think that this has been done so that there will be equality for all electors, because, if the Bill is passed, everyone will have the opportunity to vote and it would be an imposition on a ratepayer, even though he had not paid his account, if he was deprived of a vote when everyone else was free to vote.

I agree that many people in the community today of about 18 years of age take a keen interest in local affairs. They participate actively in sport and are office bearers in sporting clubs. Many belong to service clubs and they take their place on committees, and we must consider them in relation to having a say in local affairs and in local government. The only thing I am concerned about is that this

measure could be a stepping stone to more restrictive action or perhaps to opening the basis of elections in local government to a greater degree.

I hope that it is not a stepping stone for the Government to take it step by step and then try to bring in compulsory voting. I have explained that there has been insufficient time to collate all the information that I would have liked to gather so as to examine the Bill in the depth in which I would like to examine it. So that I will have opportunity to do this, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 12. Page 1891.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): This Party considers that this Bill should be opposed, and I will give my reasons for presenting that case. The reason for opposing the Bill in its present form is that this Party has accepted, as a matter of policy, the recommendations of the Bright committee, which saw the governing body with overriding control over the Government departments in question as being an authority outside the Public Service, comprising people who were experts in their field and who were operating as voluntary agents. We have instances of similar sorts of authorities operating in this State in the Electricity Trust and the Housing Trust.

We do not disagree that there needs to be organisation, co-ordination and rationalisation of medical services, but we do not agree with a monolithic Government department being set up to exercise the authority to put the Bill as presented to this House into effect. I say that advisedly, because this Bill is very powerful and persuasive. It is not as simple as it seems on the surface. I am mindful of what the Minister said when introducing this Bill, and I think I have the right explanation. He stated:

> Following detailed study of the recommendations contained in the Bright report, the Government accepted the broad principles of the recommendations and has, since that time, attempted to implement some of the recommendations.

I do not believe that anything contained in the Bright report, other than the concept of rationalisation, is significantly contained in this Bill. I say this because the Bright report conceived the concept of a single external authority, and I emphasise "external". The report states:

> We believe that the most efficient method of providing the governmental component of health services is by means of a single authority external to the Public Service. We reach this conclusion for the following reasons:

I will read the reasons, because they are also the reasons why this Party supports the concept of the Bright report. The first reason is:

> We refer elsewhere in this report to the existing fragmentation of health services in this State. Much of that fragmentation is within the Government component, and no existing Government department is suitable to act in place of all existing departments.

We agree with that. The reasons continue:

> We believe that greater simplicity and a more unified approach can be achieved by a body which is not bound by the necessarily strict rules governing the Public Service as a whole. Flexibility is easier to achieve within a particular area of service if that flexibility is restricted to that particular area.
>
> *(c)* We refer later to a part-time authority. We advocate this partly so as to gain access to a variety of skills, to achieve a turnover of personnel at the top and to use skilled persons who would not be willing to become full-time servants of the State.

That is a very important reason. The report continues:

> These objects can only be achieved in a structure outside the Public Service.
>
> *(d)* We believe that many voluntary bodies will find it easier to co-operate with an independent authority than with a Government department.
>
> *(e)* The concept of part-time boards in the administration of semi-governmental authorities is well established in this State.
>
> *(f)* Whilst we think that no employee of an external authority should be disadvantaged by reason of the fact that he or she is not in the direct employ of the Government we point to the fact that there will be many posts to be filled in the authority which will not correspond to any positions in Government. It will be easier to set establishments and scales if they relate solely to persons in the service of the authority. Nevertheless, we hope that so far as possible the Public Service Board will actively participate in the setting of establishments and salaries so as to ensure favourable working conditions for persons in the service of the authority. We refer elsewhere to our desire that there should be a ready means of interchange of staff between the Public Service and the authority.

I think the importance of this Bill is that this commission we are setting up is a Public Service department, and right through the Bill we find reference to the Public Service Board relating to salaries, staffing conditions, and other areas of employment and remuneration. The second reading explanation dealt largely with history, and it would be appropriate to say something of the history of hospital service, especially in South Australia. So far as I know the position in Australia, the system of local hospitals as provided under the subsidised hospital system in South Australia would have provided, and would still be providing, one of the best nursing and hospital services available anywhere in Australia. I do not know of any place in another State in which I could go into country areas and find the same standard of hospitalisation available in the community. I refer to many hospitals in my district, in reply to the member for Ross Smith who seems to disagree with me: the Keith Hospital, the new Meningie Hospital, the Karoonda Hospital, and the facilities provided at Loxton and Pinnaroo, and to a lesser extent at Lameroo, all hospitals in a local area that are well equipped and well staffed, and provide an efficient local service that has been under the control of local boards.

This Bill intends to take the remaining autonomy away from those boards. Local boards of these hospitals have been manned by people who have voluntarily given of their time and the community has voluntarily supported these hospitals, providing substantial finance in order to obtain subsidies to build the hospitals they have required. Councils have been forced to contribute under the Local Government and Hospitals Acts 3 per cent of their rate income, and they have had effective representation on these boards. What is intended by this Bill is to take away what little autonomy is left after the Medibank proposals were introduced on July 1, 1975, which destroyed the voluntary interest of the community in hospital activities, because it took away the incentives to raise money and for efficient administration. I say that advisedly, knowing that many hospitals have placed items on debit orders that they would never have approved if they had had the finance themselves. I believe the Bill destroys what is left of the autonomy of these hospitals.

Mr. Jennings: You don't suggest they could provide the same service?

Mr. NANKIVELL: That has nothing to do with this Bill. The commission is being set up with extraordinarily wide powers, and those powers it does not obtain voluntarily by the so-called voluntary incorporation it will obtain by the application of pressure in the same way that

pressure was applied to hospitals when Medibank was introduced, because the whole system of hospital financing depends on some form of subsidy or assistance. We have not forgotten the threats to withhold subsidies to hospitals unless they conformed in connection with Medibank. We have not forgotten that the same pressures can be brought to bear on existing hospitals to incorporate, even though the Bill provides that they can do it voluntarily subject to the consent of the board and to the constitution of the hospital being acceptable to the commission.

Mr. Coumbe: What if they don't?

Mr. NANK1VELL: They will be starved out so they will conform. Although the Bill looks nice and provides that a hospital can incorporate voluntarily, or a health service can incorporate voluntarily—

Dr. Tonkin: Or an ambulance service.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, but what happens if they do not incorporate? There is no guarantee that they will receive the subsidies and support that they are now receiving. I believe that one of the most undesirable aspects of this Bill is the veiled threat that exists in it that, "If you don't conform we can pressure you into conforming." The evidence is there that this technique can be used, and it has been used in the past. I believe that the system of hospitalisation we have had, and still have, in country areas is one of the best nursing hospital services anywhere in Australia, and it has been accomplished on a voluntary basis. No other State has had this facility, because all of them have had some form of Government hospital arrangement, or even a commission, as has existed in New South Wales since 1929. Victoria has had a system whereby it has had a semi-independent authority in the form of a Hospitals and Charities Commission, and I am well aware that recently the Symes and Townsend report was presented to the Minister in Victoria, setting out recommendations for a new hospitals commission to be set up.

However, none of this action justifies South Australia's adopting the same pattern, because these States had never had a system of hospitalisation that we have enjoyed. I believe this is extremely important to local communities, and I repeat that when Medibank was introduced the voluntary concept of assisting hospitals by fund-raising and other means in order to extend, develop, and maintain hospitals lost its motivating force. Under this Bill there will be none at all, despite the brave words contained in the Bill that one of the functions of the commission will be to promote and encourage voluntary participation in the provision of services. Who wants to provide this sort of service when there is no incentive? People will say, "Why should we work for it? Let the taxpayer pay." That is the sort of social welfare system we are seeing too much of in Australia today. There is no initiative on the part of the individual; he thinks it should be left to the Government to provide all the necessary services and amenities.

Dealing now more specifically with the Bill, I refer, first, to clause 13, which relates to the disclosure of interest. Having examined other Acts, I believe the penalty provided for in the Bill in relation to the disclosure of interest is far from adequate. New South Wales provides a $1 000 penalty or six months imprisonment. I have no hesitation in saying that any person who is a member of a hospital board and in a position to promote his interests but who does not declare those interests should be dismissed from the board. I do not believe the penalty of imprisonment is too harsh in the circumstances, as such a person would be taking a deceitful advantage of the community. I do not wish to talk about the general terms of the commission because, as I have said, it is not my Party's policy to support the commission in its present form.

Mr. Coumbe: In its proposed form.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I thank the member for Torrens: in its proposed form, or as provided for in the Bill. I have already referred to Part III, which deals with hospitals. Clause 25 (2) provides:

A proclamation shall not be made incorporating a hospital under this section—

(a) unless the commission has approved the constitution under which the hospital is to be incorporated—

and that, in itself, is an overriding authority—

(b) unless (except in the case of a Government hospital) the governing body of the hospital has consented to incorporation of the hospital under this Act.

I do not believe they will have any choice. At present, as I understand it, only two hospitals (Kapunda and Keith) have not incorporated under the present Act. Whether they can continue to function as private subsidised hospitals, I do not know.

Mr. Gunn: They'll be squeezed out.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It has been suggested (and I believe it to be correct) that there is every power in this Bill to squeeze them out, just as there is the power of the commission to displace an existing board if it is not satisfied with it. What is meant by "satisfied"? It may mean that the board is not doing what it is told; or that it may be told that the hospital is redundant and should be closed but it will not move for the closure, and it can be discharged and replaced. What happens to the assets when it is dissolved? Whence do these come? In most instances, at least one-third of them come from local contributions, because most subsidies have been on a $2 for $1 basis. Clause 25 (7) provides:

Upon dissolution of a hospital under this section, the assets of the hospital shall be disposed of in accordance with the directions of the Governor.

Unless I have an assurance otherwise, I take it that the hospital's assets would become the property of the commission. That would, I believe, be a misappropriation of funds which belong to the community but which would be denied to it as a result of such action being taken. In referring to the community, I wish to be more precise: I mean not the community generally but the community of the local area that has contributed towards the hospital's assets.

The situation regarding staffing is another point of contention concerning existing hospital boards. They ask, "Are we to be forced to staff at the same level as public hospitals? Will a schedule be set out for so many staff members for each hospital bed? Under what system are we to be staffed, and what will this cost us? Will we be more efficient as a result of the additional staff that we may be willing to employ?" I suggest that, if these country hospitals were staffed at the level of public hospitals, they would not have any resources at all; they would be bankrupt.

Another squeeze comes in this area, in that the Bill provides precisely that, unless one belongs to one of the Government hospitals or an incorporated health centre, or is employed by the State Public Service or the commission, none of the superannuation, recreation leave, sick leave or long service leave benefits shall be portable. In other words, if one works for a private hospital and wants to transfer to a public or an incorporated hospital, one does

not receive any benefits, unless someone else is big-hearted, because the Bill provides that there shall be no portability. I know that it can go the other way, but that is usually a matter for negotiation between the prospective employee and the employing authority.

Mr. Chapman: You can if those private hospitals give up their assets and become incorporated, though.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It involves not only the pressure that is exerted as a result of withholding subsidies but also that which can be exerted by staff members who can say that, as far as they are concerned, they will not work for the hospital unless it is incorporated. I do not know whether the blackmail that is implied in the Bill is intended, although I suggest that the powers are there and could well be used. We know at present that hospital fees are fixed by arrangement, particularly in relation to Medibank beds. However, there are other fees which are also fixed by the hospital and which concern many people involved in providing medical services. There is the power to fix the fee provided for a service. This means that a medical officer gets a fee for a service, but what happens in the case of general practitioners who are using hospitals? Under the Medibank arrangements, they may also be medical officers for the hospital in question.

Under this Bill, how much pressure will be brought to bear on them in relation to fees and access of patients to the hospital? This is another area of concern to the Australian Medical Association, which has been fighting this conscription. There is power under this Bill further to force medical practitioners into being public servants. It is all very well for Government members to laugh, but I have been a member of this House for 17 years and have seen much legislation passed. I know what has been the intention of Parliament and how various legislation has been interpreted by those who apply it. The interpretation placed on our action by the courts has in no way, in some cases, conformed to the will, intent or expressed opinion of members when they passed the legislation.

I have become more and more concerned to look at the letter of the law and see how it can be interpreted and, indeed, to put the worst construction on it, because that is the construction that one must learn to expect under some Administrations. My Party is also concerned about another aspect of implementing the Bill in this way. No-one at this stage knows what is the present Commonwealth Government's policy on Medibank. We know we have an assurance that it is to be carried on, although we do not know in what form. There may well be a change in policy that could substantially influence the commission's activities in relation to the financing of hospitals.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you saying that your Party has not made clear what it is going to do about Medibank?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not aware that the honourable member's Party has made clear what it is going to do about Medibank, either, so I think the member for Mitcham can keep himself out of this argument. We are not worried about what his Party thinks about it: it does not matter.

Mr. Millhouse: No, but I am asking you what your Party, which is now in Government in Canberra, is going to do, and you are saying that you do not know. So, apparently we cannot accept the assurances that were given before the election.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I wish to express concern about one or two other matters.

Mr. Millhouse: There was a firm undertaking.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mallee has the floor.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It almost appeared that the member for Mitcham had the floor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mallee to return to the question under debate.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I said that I would not canvass the personnel of the commission, but I must refer to the personnel, because of representations made by local government, which has wished to be involved in health services. Local government is closely involved financially and administratively on hospital boards at present. Indeed, in his second reading explanation the Minister said that health services needed to be related closely and realistically to health problems. He also said that health services should be as close as possible to the people. We have always accepted that local government is as close as possible to the people; it is certainly closer than is a commission operating from a centralist Government department, as opposed to arrangements that have existed in the past whereby local government has taken an active part in these areas, and I believe that it wishes to take a more active part. At this juncture local government has representation; it can be answerable to ratepayers for money rated from them for a local hospital, but under this Bill there is no way in which local government can be responsible for that money.

If one looks at this Bill objectively, one sees that it applies a surcharge on land tax through local government to provide money for hospitals. The councils are still obliged to be collectors. Perhaps someone can give more details about the five part-time commissioners. Perhaps someone can say whether it is intended to give representation on the commission to local government through the part-time commissioners; if not, whereas at present local government can be responsible to ratepayers for the money it collects, under this Bill it has the responsibility to collect money but it has no authority over the administration of those funds; that is an imposition on local government, and it is an error of judgment. Indeed, if this Bill is passed, serious consideration should be given to taking the same action as has been taken in other States, where local government does not contribute. If it is still required that local government should contribute to health, the money could be put into other services rather than hospital services. At this stage local government has limited powers to increase its revenue and it has limited rating powers, yet under this Bill it is obliged to accept that an unqualified sum be collected from ratepayers from prescribed areas to service hospitals over which it will no longer have control.

Mr. Keneally: Would your suggestion be more effective if the Federal Government was to provide more money for hospitals, rather than less?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The problem is one of responsibility for the collection of money. We have often heard that Governments should be answerable for the money they spend. It has always been a principle that local government is answerable for the money it spends, but here it is asked to collect money without being answerable, because it has no representation. It is no good referring to the question of representation on hospital boards, because the hospital boards that will exist under this Bill are only management committees. They will have no authority and no autonomy. They will have to do as they are told; otherwise, they will be kicked out. The constitution of the hospitals must be approved by the commission. Health centres that were set

up by the previous Australian Government will be carried on, and at present they are not directly under the State's administration; this needs to be corrected.

Other organisations that provide health services are covered by the Bill. For example, the Bill covers the Mothers and Babies Health Association, which draws most of its funds from Government subsidy. Any service that provides paramedical or ambulance services is included. I believe Meals on Wheels is not covered, because it does not provide paramedical, services. Ambulance services are included at present. We have at present a very happy arrangement with the St. John ambulance service, which has been built up to provide ambulance needs. This may continue, but I am anxious for the Minister to tell me where the money to subsidise ambulance services will come from under this Bill, unless they are incorporated under it and have to provide a budget and have funds allocated to them. Are we suggesting we will incorporate the St. John ambulance service, which is being provided at a fraction of the cost that applies in other States? In the Eyre District, ambulances at remote points service the Eyre Peninsula people; the ambulances operate from a central base in Whyalla. If those ambulances had to be serviced by paid personnel, the cost would be exorbitant. If anything is done to reduce that service, the Eyre Peninsula people will be further denied medical treatment. Many things concern us relating to outside bodies that could be encompassed by this Bill.

There is power in the Bill to close existing hospitals, and in this connection I point out that we already have trouble in getting general practitioners to go to country areas; we will not get them to go to places where there is no hospital. If the hospital is taken away, the medical service is taken away. If the St. John ambulance service is interfered with, the ambulance service may be taken away. Then, instead of having a better health service in South Australia, we will have a worse one. This is why we are concerned. Within this Bill we have the inevitability of an enlarged, monolithic, over-riding health authority that will not necessarily improve the health services of this State.

I have other colleagues who have points of view they wish to raise in this debate. The Bill in its present form is unacceptable to this Party and, consequently, we have asked for it to be referred contingently on its second reading to a Select Committee so that some of the bodies and organisations concerned (some organisations have known nothing about the Bill when I have spoken to them on the telephone) can have a chance to find out where they stand, ask questions, and make recommendations or representations to the committee that may change the Bill in some way to make it acceptable to this Party. For the reasons I have given, because I fear the consequences of this Bill if it is administered as it could be, I take this stand.

I know the people who are going to administer the Bill if it passes, andI am not climbing down or soft pedalling on this matter. I am not concerned about the people who will initiate this legislation into practical terms, but I know how these things can be interpreted and what constructions can be placed on such legislation. I know what form this Bill could take as an Act if it were interpreted from the present draft by people who wanted to be completely and utterly ruthless, seeking to form not only a monolithic structure but also bringing all medical services completely under the control of the Government. For those reasons and because of those fears,I oppose the Bill in its present form.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this Bill, which is connected with one of the most blatant pieces of misrepresentation that has ever emanated from the Health Department. I say that advisedly. It has possibly resulted from the instigation of the Minister, who is showing an extreme amount of interest in its passage through this House. In the second reading explanation the following reference was made to the Bright committee report:

> Following a detailed study of the recommendations contained in that report, the Government accepted the broad principles of the recommendations and has since that time attempted to implement some of the recommendations relating to community health and the expansion of mental health services.

That is the biggest piece of con work I have seen for a long time. That statement implies that this legislation now before the House is in some way implementing the recommendations of the Bright committee report. That is a sham and a fraud, because this Bill does not in any way implement the main recommendations of that report, and the Minister knows it.

I remind honourable members that there was a stage after the committee's report was brought down on January 31, 1973, when numerous small items in the report were implemented. I was then obliged to put a notice of motion condemning the Government for not implementing the major part of that report. I refer to that part of the report providing in conclusion that unless the major new authority is created and if that concept is not accepted much of the report becomes incapable of implementing.

Here we have the health authority. I suspect that we are all considered to be so foolish and naive to believe that now we have a health authority it must surely be the one recommended by the report, but it is not. It is far from that, and it is different in a most significant way. The member for Mallee has outlined many of the objections we have to this Bill.

I agree with the honourable member that the health services and country hospital services in South Australia are equal to, if not better than, similar services and facilities anywhere else in the world. We have managed to achieve that situation under a system that we are told is no longer efficient. If no longer being efficient means that we do not have a vast department to control it, I agree that we are not efficient. I believe we can do the job much better without such a department. Chapter 3 of the report states:

> The purposes we have in mind are . . . *(a)* to bring within a unified control all health services provided by government.

That is what is intended. It is not intended that this legislation should be used to force other health services within the grasp of Government. That is a fundamental point. I refer to the following point:

> *(b)* To administer and control every service provided by government agency at a point as close as possible to the place where that service is provided.

How can one administer and control every service within the State's health services at a point as close as possible to the place where the service is provided if the headquarters and the control is to be vested in one monolithic Government department? That proposition is absolutely absurd. It is totally against the principles of the delivery of both health care and community welfare service, principles that have been recognised by this Government, by the former Commonwealth Labor Government under the Australian Assistance Plan and by the present Commonwealth Liberal Government. It is a fundamental fact that one controls services as near to the point of delivery as is possible. The final purpose is as follows:

> *(c)* To encourage existing and new voluntary health services and ... to bring the activities of voluntary bodies in the health field into a unified pattern of health care delivery.

In other words, function a co-ordinating body, a body which will not discourage voluntary enrolment but which will encourage it and direct it through co-ordination into areas where, if it so chooses, each body concerned can do the best it can for the community. What have we got? Instead of that situation, we have another Government department. It can be called an authority, a commission, or any name one cares to choose. It can be described as a corporate body, but it still exists within the Public Service: it is still nothing more than an enlarged Government department.

Mr. Becker: There are various classifications.

Dr. TONKIN: True, and I understand that there are perhaps psychological reasons why one might feel much better if one were employed by an organisation that was taken over by a commission rather than merely becoming part of a Government department. One would not be taken over but merely incorporated. How nice that would be. Those involved could say, "We could become an incorporated body." That sounds so much better. Nevertheless, the effect is exactly the same: it is a take-over by one monolithic Government department. The health authority recommended by the Bright committee is detailed in paragraph 3.4 as follows:

> We believe that the most efficient method of providing the governmental component of health services is by means of a single authority external to the Public Service.

The committee then explains through points *(a)* to *(f)* why it is important that the body should be external to the Public Service. At paragraph 3.5 the report states:

> The formal structure which we recommend we have called a health authority. We have discarded the word "department", because the organisation will not be within the Public Service. We have also discarded the word "commission"—

at least the Government has been honest in this respect—

> because that word has been used in many contexts and has many meanings. The concept of placing control of a service near the point of supply of the service will manifest itself in various contexts in this chapter . . .

So it does. The chapter goes on to deal with corporations created by Statute external to the Public Service. That was the aim and the ideal, but now let us see what we have in this miserable Bill that will create another Government department larger than any other Government department that exists here—virtually an empire. The Bill will take the heads of the three departments and superimpose on them a pyramid of further control, but whence will those officers come? I notice that, in the Bright committee report, the authority was to be composed totally of part-time experts, whereas I notice that, under the Bill, we will have three full-time experts in the commission. I wonder who will get the job and who made the recommendations. T may sound cynical, and I am. In the Bill, we have nothing that looks like an independent authority: the Bill refers to the Public Service Board throughout.

Indeed, when I went to see what amendments I could make to improve the Bill I found it well nigh impossible; it could be done only by deleting reference to the board. We have come up with something that I obviously will not canvass now, and I hope that it does not become necessary for me to do so. I hope that the Bill will be thrown out at the second reading and, if it is not, I hope that it will be referred to a Select Committee. However, if it is not referred to a Select Committee, we will try to improve it. I suspect that, if we are unsuccessful in our first two aims, we will not be successful in improving it either. The proposed commission will take over the control of every possible governmental agency, whether it be a community health centre, hospital or subsidised hospital. You name it, and this commission is in for it! It is significant,I think, that the Bill has been introduced and was so long delayed until the Medibank scheme was introduced and operating. I think it is also significant that it is proceeding with all haste now that there has been a change of Government in Canberra.

I am sorry that the member for Mitcham has left the Chamber again, because I would have been pleased to tell him what is the Liberal and Country Party attitude to the Medibank programme. Medibank will persist and remain, but it will be made to work efficiently. I think it most unwise and improper to introduce a Bill in the House at this stage that takes over the control in one State authority—a Bill that provides the most blatant opportunities for blackmail and for pressure (and I make no apology for saying that). We have seen with what fervour those financial pressures have been used against country subsidised hospitals during the past six months and against hospitals that are nearer home. The activities of the Hospitals Department in furthering the cause of Medibank have been nothing short of disgraceful. If the department was to persuade, talk and negotiate, I would say that it was trying to do its job, but to use financial pressure and pressure on members of the medical profession and members of hospital boards is disgraceful (and I make no apology for saying that, either).

Let us look at the local hospital boards. What rights have they against the Health Commission? Their membership may, at the commission's whim, be terminated. Whole hospital boards, under the terms of the Bill, can be replaced. The commission will decide on what terms and conditions people may be employed, what the establishment of the individual body may be, and how many people may be employed there. The commission will decide how many nurses ought to be allotted to a certain ward, if necessary. If the local board does not go along with the commission (and it will not have many rights, anyway, because the commission will have the overriding power), it will be out! If this is what the Government wants, why is it not honest about it? Why does it not say, "We are taking over all the hospitals and health services we can lay our hands on"? That would be honest of the Government, and it would be a change. Local government is disturbed about the Bill to the extent that, having made contributions towards various hospitals, it has expected some representation (the member for Mallee has referred to this matter), but it will no longer have effective representation. Some people say that it will not be possible to give adequate representation to the various spheres of health care, whether mental health, public health or hospital care.

Generally speaking, I find the whole concept distasteful. I refer once again to the points I made in relation to the local delivery of health care and, therefore, the local control. I repeat that it is a principle that, wherever possible, community welfare, health and health care must be controlled as close as possible to the point of delivery. I think that all members will recall the consultative councils about which we talked in the House some years ago; the Minister certainly should, because this matter now comes within his province.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Which Government introduced them?

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister ought to know that it was his own Government; he should remember that that was a worthwhile policy that I supported strongly at the time. The reason we supported that was that all members agreed (and I am pleased that the Minister still agrees) that the

control should be as close as possible to the point of delivery. That was the whole point about setting up regional consultative councils, whereas now the Minister is going to the other extreme and concentrating all control in one central authority. The hospital boards will become nothing but rubber stamps. It is just not on!

Another matter that concerns me particularly, apart from the fact that the boards will no longer have control over the hiring and firing of their own staff, is that they will be subject to the Public Service Board. It has been put to me that if we are to do the job properly and create what will be a semi-governmental authority the Public Service Board should not come into this matter. The hospital should have the right to hire and determine wages and conditions according to the various awards, because this is the prerogative of the hospital boards. It has also been put to me (and I totally agree with it) that the Public Service Board should not come into this matter at all. I instance (as did the member for Mallee) the Electricity Trust, a body that is virtually independent. The trust is a semi-government authority that is not subject to the same kind of red tape and controls as those to which the average Government department is subject. The reason for this is that the trust's members can be hired without reference to the Public Service Board: indeed, in some cases their terms and conditions are better than those applying under the Public Service Board. The point is that the trust has the right to act autonomously.

Now we are to have this new health department, because that is all it is. One may call it a commission, an authority, or anything one likes, but it is nothing more than a health department that will be directly responsible to the Minister. It is a corporate body within the Public Service, and it is nothing more than another Government department. With deficit monthly budgeting, which is now being introduced into so many of our hospitals, we see a degree of inefficiency creeping in that is unbelievable. We do not have to be efficient if someone will pick up the tab; we do not have to be enthusiastic and attend board meetings if we know that it does not really matter what we decide—someone will pick up the tab at the end.

I am talking about all those people who have given many years of solid voluntary community service on the boards of country subsidised hospitals, all those people who until now have had the desire and the enthusiasm to help their community, but who now have had their incentive completely destroyed. Many people will know from personal experience that the voluntary efforts of auxiliary people, who in the past have raised sums of money for the capital development of their hospitals, and their enthusiasm have gone. People are not interested any more because we are developing the old socialist attitude of "Why bother? The Government will look after us all. Why bother about getting new curtains or a new cot for the children's ward? The Government will provide it, so why should we work out our guts to get it?" That is a feature that will have a significant and deleterious effect on community life and spirit, which has been very much a part of country community life and city community life. We have only to look at the remarkable record that South Australia has (and the Minister should know this), our fine record of community hospitals and country hospitals, which have been organised, built and worked for by members of the local community, to know how important this is.

Mr. Keneally: They have been subsidised by the Government.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and that is the Government's role, to subsidise individual voluntary effort. This Bill will destroy it, as surely as night follows day. This body should be a co-ordinating body; it should help and direct voluntary organisations where they can best help. I remember spending some little time during the last session of the last Parliament debating the repeal of the State Health Advisory Committee, a committee that had been largely defunct for a number of years. I think the Director-General of Health, by virtue of his office, and the Director of Tuberculosis were members of the committee; many other such people occupied positions on that committee, and it was that committee that by its voluntary actions and non-compulsion set the pattern for tuberculosis services, which was taken up throughout Australia. This committee was allowed to die out. We repealed the enabling legislation for that committee in the last Parliament and, instead of that committee, instead of a committee such as the Bright committee reported on and recommended, a committee of part-time experts who should constantly change so that their abilities and skills would be varied, we are to be lumbered with not a body outside the Public Service but another Government department—as I say, a large monolithic Government department. I see nothing good about this legislation. I would be the first person in this House to support it if, indeed, it had followed the recommendations of the Bright committee report. I am on record as having said so in this House. I would be happy to do so.

Mr. Keneally: You wouldn't support anything we do.

Dr. TONKIN: Unfortunately, the member for Stuart is quite correct, because his Government has done nothing in the best interests of South Australia for some time. Therefore, I have been obliged to oppose it. I would support this Bill if it was a different matter, differently constituted. I may have been a little too severe in my comments on the department. But, when I see legislation such as this coming forward, which in my view is nothing more than empire-building in order to promote what is the nationalisation of health services in South Australia, I retract nothing of what I said.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: For some reason or other, the Minister seems to be ashamed of the words "nationalisation" and "socialism". So he should be.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: No, in no way.

Dr. TONKIN: Nevertheless, the Premier, in answering a letter from a constituent of the member for Fisher just before the last Federal election containing the question, "Why does the Labor Party want to nationalise everything?", said something like this: "I cannot understand why you say that the Labor Party federally wants to nationalise everything, because under the Federal Constitution it cannot do so. However, such moves would have to be made at the State level." Indeed, the Premier is absolutely correct: the sovereign Constitution of this State provides the means whereby any Government can totally nationalise any body, any industry, anything at all within this State, and that is something that we should never forget. I oppose the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I, too, oppose the Bill. I do not want to canvass the various areas that have already been covered, although it is possible that I shall meander through one or two aspects of the Bill already covered. In it, we find in clause 14 that in the exercise of its functions the commission shall be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister. That is not an unusual type of clause in many pieces of legislation, but it is certainly

not the type of clause one would expect to see in legislation creating an authority that was going to be—in the concept of the Bright report—an authority outside the direct direction of Government. What we have here in this measure is a masquerade of an authority hiding or sheltering behind the good name of the Bright committee and the people who put so much effort into a report that is of considerable benefit and advantage to the people of this State.

I do not intend to read out the names of the members of that committee, as the report is available for any person to see. However, as a result of promotion by various parties, the statements have been made that the recommendations of the Bright committee to the advantage of the State of South Australia would be implemented. This measure does not do that; it is a hollow sham. I repeat: it is hiding behind the good name of Mr. Justice Bright and the various people who served on that committee.

The reason why I take exception to the fact that we are giving the Minister an opportunity to have such control is the shabby, low-down blackmail that has been perpetrated against various hospitals in this State under the present Minister. It is action that is preventing communities from receiving their just dues. I refer to Keith and more particularly to Kapunda, which is in my electoral district, where a hospital offers exactly the same services as the hospitals at Angaston, at Keith, at Blyth, at Gawler, and in so many other centres. I have tried not to deal with those hospitals that are recognised as Government-subsidised hospitals. I am not referring to the situation at Wallaroo or Mount Gambier, or necessarily to the situation at Whyalla. I am coming back to those hospitals that completed a form, at the time of the introduction of the Medibank scheme, indicating that they would try to provide certain activities, knowing full well (and this statement has been made in this House previously) that the medical profession would not provide the service required within the commitment that the hospitals were making. That is not a criticism of the medical profession, because I believe that that profession did the right thing in standing up to the dictatorial attitude of the Whitlam Government, which tried to make them prostitute their profession in the name of the Medibank scheme.

These hospitals are not providing any service different from that provided at Keith and Kapunda, yet in February, 1976, after representations had been made as long ago as July, 1975, these two hospitals have been denied by the present Minister the opportunity to receive the benefits that accrue to other hospitals. They have been denied the right to receive assistance from local government. It is all very well if the councils provide an *ex gratia* payment, but there is no requirement on them to provide assistance to these two hospitals, because they have been denied recognition by the present Administration. I am referring here to the Minister and to the direction he and his Cabinet are giving to those below them.

This type of activity by a Government is certainly not the action of a Government concerned with the health and well-being of the people of the State particularly around the area concerned. I detest that sort of action from a Government of the complexion of this one. Let us go further: we are not contained only to the situation in respect of Keith and Kapunda.

What about the situation of the Gawler Hospital Board members who attended offices of the department within the past four weeks (I think I would be correct in saying within the past two weeks, but I will say four weeks so there will be no doubt) to seek money for an urgent project at the hospital? The project had been discussed with the authorities over a period and had been delayed for a long time because of the demands on a surveyor in the system who at one stage did not know whether he was to continue in employment, because his employment was from year to year. This tended to upset the normal flow of assistance to the hospital system.

The delays extended over nearly three years. Naturally, the cost of the work has increased and it has been necessary for the board to fulfil its obligation (by way of direction) in the type of detail it provided to the administration when applying for funds. The members of the board were told that it was most unlikely that any funds would be available. They were given the story, which was factual enough, that funds were difficult to obtain, that the Federal Government had not provided as much as had been expected, and that overall inflation had had an effect, but the matter did not rest there.

They were then told, "Let us look at your Medibank history and then we will decide whether you will qualify for assistance." Because their Medibank history was poor, they were told that they would not in any circumstances be considered for assistance. I have made tentative arrangements (I cannot give the date or time now) to take members of the board to see the Minister, because if this blackmail and application of pressure on members of the community who are providing an essential service to their community have not been at the specific direction of the Minister, someone further down the line responsible for making the statement and using that technique in the overall plan needs to be pulled into line.

Mr. Keneally: Do you make this speech under provocation?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, definitely. I hold the Minister responsible for the actions that take place within his department, and a Minister who is worth his salt, whether he is involved in this or any other field, must accept the whole of the responsibility for action taken by his subordinates.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you agree, then, that the commission should be responsible to the Minister?

Dr. EASTICK: No. I am making the point strongly that the type of direction that has come from the Minister and Cabinet and from the Party opposite shows how shabby and how low action can be, how much pressure can be put upon people providing an essential service in a community, and how much these people opposite will hide behind the facade that they care for the people and will not deny them education or medical and hospital treatment. By their action, members of the Party opposite are denying that care.

We believe that, within the terms of the Bright report, the authority should be completely independent of the Government and responsible as a body with the purpose of providing total medical cover in the community. I do not believe that that can be provided by this Bill. The failure of local government to receive any direct consideration in this measure has been mentioned. I do not want to quote at length from representations that councils have made to me, but I think I should refer to a letter from the West Torrens council, dated December 11, 1975. I understand that the letter was also sent to all other members. The letter states in part:

Whilst it is recognised that there may be some room for improvement in the standard of health services provided by individual councils, we would suggest that this is primarily attributable to lack of finance and not as a result of antipathy on the part of local government.

Local government constantly is being referred to by members of the Party opposite, and not only at the State level. It was certainly referred to enough by the colleagues in Canberra of members opposite when that Party was in Government there, it being stated that local government must have more autonomy and greater involvement with its community. However, here is an instance where this same Party is denying local government the opportunity to serve in its community. The letter continues:

The Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. R. G. Payne) in his second reading speech has said, "The aim here is to ensure that the administration and control of health services is located as close to the delivery point as possible." We believe that a council, being the responsible authority within an area, is best suited to meet the Minister's criteria as to administration being located close to the delivery point. It has an intimate local knowledge of the characteristics and problems of the community; it has already a functional administrative organisation which could readily be augmented to meet any expansion in services; and, given recourse to funds from central sources, would be best able to effectively and efficiently deliver a wide range of health services, which in the past it has not been possible to equitably finance from a property tax.

Another more recent document to which I refer is a letter that was forwarded to the Minister from the Northern Metropolitan Regional Organisation (No. 1) with a post box at Elizabeth. The letter has also been sent to other members, namely, the members for Tea Tree Gully, Goyder, Elizabeth, Light, Salisbury, and Playford, and to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the Hon. Mr. Creedon, the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, and the Hon. Mr. Chatterton. It was also sent to D. O. Tonkin, Leader of the Opposition. This document contains several worthwhile points, the last of which states:

This region urges you to introduce appropriate measures, either by legislation or by Ministerial statements, to ensure that there is an effective role for local government in community health administration through the proposed Health Commission, and consequentially that there are funds made available to enable it to assist in this most important aspect of community service.

I make clear that I do not accept (and this is by no means a reflection on the Minister involved) a Ministerial assurance in this House on a measure as important as is this Bill. What I would accept is something written into the Bill which cannot be misinterpreted and which clearly defines the part councils will play in an overall authority. It is important to realise that this is one of the major aspects which we have to consider and which should be considered in depth by a Select Committee.

Without reflecting on the person involved, I am interested in a report that appeared on January 21, 1976, in the *Salisbury-Elizabeth News Review* concerning Mr. John Joel. Under the heading "Joel leaves", the report states:

Lyell McEwin Hospital Administrator Mr. John Joel has been seconded to the State Hospitals Department. Mr. Joel, who has been administrator at the hospital since its inception 17 years ago, will be the department's new director of management services. He will continue to serve as Domiciliary Care Service and Para District Health Services Advisory Committee chairman. Mr. Joel will also remain chairman of the planning team for the future Para District Hospital. Arrangements for his release as administrator were confirmed at a hospital management board meeting on January 8.

Is this another case similar to that which applied in education when we found an officer being employed in research in advance of there being authority for him to be so employed? There may be a simple answer, but it all seems to dovetail together. What I have said indicates that I believe the department has become bigger than the Minister, and, if this Bill were to become law, it would be totally bigger than the Minister, working under the Minister's apron because of the type of activities to which I referred earlier. On April 21 last year I was privileged to sit in the House of Lords to listen to a debate on a Government motion concerning England's entry into the European Economic Community. At that stage there was to be a referendum in respect to this matter, and I had the good fortune to listen to the maiden speeches of several members. I listened to the fourth maiden speech of Lord Home. He made the original speech in the Lower House, was elevated to the House of Lords and made another; he went back to the House of Commons and became Prime Minister, and was then elevated again to the House of Lords. Another interesting gentleman to make a maiden speech was Lord Shinwell, who is well known to members opposite. With one small piece of paper from which to read a quote, for 30 minutes he enthralled all those who were able to listen to him. Speaking on the vital issue being debated, he said:

It is said of Napoleon that, after he had defeated the Spaniards, the Italians and the rest of them he tried to vanquish the Russians, but the weather was bad and he had to return. It is said that he had one great, last ambition, and that was to make of England an offshore island of France. But he failed. It has been left to Mr. Heath and Mr. Wilson to achieve that task, to make of our country an offshore island of France, because if that comes about you will have to accept their eggs and their wine and all the rest of it, whether you like it or not!

In a recent announcement the Premier said that one of the reasons why he would not go to the Commonwealth scene was that he wanted to make South Australia the true democratically social State of the world. We have said for a long time that unfortunately we have been the guinea pig social State in Australia. My colleague has said that the State Government is trying to achieve something that could not be achieved by the Commonwealth Labor Government, and I believe that this measure is completely contrary to the best interests of the people of South Australia. Using Shinwell's terms, I do not wish to see a situation in which the Dunstan-Banfield organisation is able to achieve what the Whitlam authority failed to achieve.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I make clear at the outset that I oppose the Bill. Before dealing with its clauses, I should like to ask members whether they have ever cared to obtain the views of patients on the attention they have received from totally Government institutions compared to that which they have received from institutions that have a personal and local element of involvement. I have done this. In fact, I have been unfortunate enough to have needed to receive attention from a totally Government institution (the Royal Adelaide Hospital) as well as from a private hospital and a community hospital recently. So, as a patient I am at least reasonably well equipped to make an assessment, and I declare that I received the most sympathetic and personal attention from the hospital in which there was local and public involvement. I do not for a moment suggest that the attention I received at the private hospital was much behind that which I received in the country subsidised hospital, the sort of hospital that country people regard as their hospital and as a vital part of their community.

I point out that the basic aims in the constitutions of our various subsidised hospitals are not to build staff or funds but to provide the best attention to those who are sick and need care and to serve and heal the sick at the lowest rates that can possibly be arranged by the careful and dedicated management of the respective board members. It is this concept of board management and local involvement in medical and health care that I should like to see preserved.

and it is this area that I believe is being destroyed by the introduction of this Bill to establish a South Australian Health Commission. It has been stated at length by many members that the Bill, while hiding under the shroud of the Bright report, does not implement the recommendations contained in that report. I have taken the trouble to read that report, and I bring to the attention of members a short paragraph thereof which does not apply in the proposal put forward by the Minister. I refer to paragraph 3.4, under the heading "Single external authority".

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear what the honourable member for Alexandra is saying, and I should like the honourable member for Davenport to be a little quieter.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The paragraph of the report to which I have referred states:

> We believe that the most efficient method of providing the governmental component of health services is by means of a single authority external to the Public Service.

That paragraph and the intent incorporated in it is not included in the Bill, which is so set up as to provide a Public Service element and public department. It is quite the opposite of the autonomous authority suggested by the Bright committee. Although I do not intend to quote extracts from that report, I place on record that I recognise the significant difference between what was recommended in the report and what is contained in the Bill. I return briefly to the type of health service that we receive in country subsidised and local hospitals, and refer to a comment made by Mr. Ren DeGaris, then Minister of Health, in 1969. In a speech made when opening the Murray Bridge nurses home, he referred, among other things, to the provision of our health services, saying:

> The South Australian system is unique in Australia, and I hope that in the future, before any changes are made in the structure of our health care system, the basis of our success in South Australia is not permanently damaged or irrevocably lost. It is the acceptance of this responsibility by ordinary people that has enabled South Australia to reach the standard that we have achieved, the auxiliaries, the fund-raising groups, the medical officer interest, the local government interest, that has cultivated to the highest degree, because the hospital is recognised as our hospital.

I believe that is a real feeling that exists in the community centres that have a board of management elected from the public and/or local government. These function on a totally voluntary basis and work side by side with hospital staff and the district medical officer, and with all other employees that offer their services either on a voluntary or an employed basis. They work collectively as a family, they are a vital part of the community, and they have at heart the success of the organisation to provide care for their own people. I will oppose anything that suggests a breakdown of that managerial and dedicated structure.

I turn briefly to the clauses of the Bill, Division 1 of which refers to the establishment of the commission. Although in a later clause reference is made to the contribution that may be made or called upon to be made by local government, there is no provision, in the setting up of the commission, for local government representation; nor is there any provision for the South Australian Hospitals Association or the Australian Medical Association to be represented. One can only assume, from the exclusion of those people who are closest to the scene of hospital and medical care, that this will be simply another Government department. The Bill appears not to be designed to co-ordinate our health services through an autonomous authority, but rather to build an empire of public servants. We are all aware of comments made about Queensland's hospital services. We are all aware of the mass attention that is applied at the Royal Adelaide Hospital; as much as the staff members may try, it is a machine. The personal element does not exist in a hospital of that size. If we must have the commission, it is reasonable that we should know what its powers and functions will be. Clause 15 (1) provides:

> The functions of the commission include the following:
>
> *(a)* to institute, promote or assist in research in the field of health and health services.

I cannot support the establishment of any organisation at State level that enters the field of research, as is implied by paragraph *(a)*. If there is to be research (and there must be) it ought to be at the national level. If the various States are to establish organisations and enter the research field, as is implied here, there will be gross duplication of expenditure, waste of money, and fragmentation of the expertise available. In a country with only about 13 000 000 people, the only efficient way of providing research into heart disease, cancer, etc., is to have a single research centre. Dissemination of effort at the State level would lead only to a waste of State funds. Clause 15 (1) *(g)* provides:

> To provide, or assist in the provision of, education, instruction or training in such professional or other fields of knowledge or expertise related to the provision of health services as the commission thinks desirable.

I do not know who the commissioners will be. A few suggestions have been made this evening that the jobs for the boys have already been decided. We should appreciate the sort of education programme that we have within our hospital structure at present. There is little room for improvement in the system of staff training from the apprentice nurse stage through to the highly qualified level. From the time a nurse enters employment in a hospital, she commences training under the direct control of a matron or sister. The nurse then goes to a further training centre, where the best possible staff is available. She has experience in hospitals nominated for her, where the best expertise is passed on to her. She then goes back into hospitals of her choice. The system leaves little to be desired, and I cannot support any action that will put the present training system in jeopardy. Paragraph (k) provides:

> To ensure as far as possible that the people of this State live and work in a healthy environment.

Has the Minister for the Environment failed to achieve the best and healthiest environment for the people? Has he given the game away? Is he handing over responsibility for the environment to the Health Commission? Division IV refers to the staff of the commission. I am concerned about those hospitals that may not become part of the proposed system. The attractive element in Division IV relates to the portability of superannuation and other incentives to attract staff, but that element does not apply to other than incorporated hospitals. I am concerned about the staffing of private hospitals, which are excluded. The only way in which the staff of those hospitals can enjoy the benefits is through those hospitals becoming incorporated. Clause 22 (1) provides:

> The commission may, with the approval of the Treasurer, borrow money for the purpose of enabling it to perform and discharge its functions and duties under this or any other Act.

In what circumstances would the commission want to invest funds? If it is to be a Government instrumentality, what authority would it have to invest, anyway? I can only assume that clause 22 provides for the take-over of the personal and real assets attached to subsidised hospitals in this State, amounting to many millions of dollars. I refer to moneys approved at the local level, moneys donated and collected from boards, auxiliaries, and public

groups. I can only assume that the Government can see this great funding and that it wants to get its hands on it; otherwise, there would be no need for the commission to have the power to invest.

I can imagine the reaction of the various local groups who have worked to accrue funds when they see those funds handed over to some administrative authority to spend at its own discretion. Clauses 23 and 24 confirm this view: that it is the Government's intention to run a public department, incorporating not only the hospitals but also their liquid and fixed assets. The incorporation and management of hospitals is described in the Bill as being somewhat voluntary. How voluntary can the incorporation be if the commission is the responsible authority to establish a constitution?

How voluntary can it be if the commission is the authority to administer the funds? How voluntary can it be if the commission, as suggested in the Bill, is the superimposed authority controlling hospital management? The commission is the authority that manages the management committee. In other words, the management committees or boards become tools of the master machines: they become agents to act for the department of the commission. As a member of a subsidised hospital board, I can assure the House that it is demoralising to be part of an organisation which has such limited control. The control of boards has been eroded since the introduction of Medibank.

Before the introduction of Medibank, our board, when called upon to provide facilities for equipment for the local hospital, immediately looked at the need for such facilities and then looked to its resources to purchase. Since the introduction of Medibank and since it has been picking up the tab, I believe that the element of neglect of financial management has crept in, so that on request for equipment the element of need becomes a secondary factor. The first factor that automatically comes to mind under this demoralising system that we now have is whether the item required qualifies under the Medibank payment system. If it does, the tendency, if it is not there now will be to buy the item and to consider the need secondarily. I believe this is destructive to the good management and good operation of any form of business, let alone one so vital as that involving the health care of our people.

Division II of Part III of the Bill deals with the staff of incorporated hospitals. This is a comprehensive provision, suggesting clearly that the commission will be the outright managers. Clause 28 (4) provides:

> A board shall not appoint any person to, or dismiss any person from, an office to which a notice under subsection (3) of this section applies, without the prior approval of the commission.

The Bright committee made the opposite recommendation, paragraph 3.29 stating:

> Voluntary organisations will continue to exercise their rights of hiring and firing their staff.

That paragraph is to be completely ignored and overridden by the architects of the Bill. Division III refers to assets, and I have already adequately dealt with that point. This part of the Bill will have the opposite effect to that of Medibank. Where Medibank moves in at the board level on a monthly basis and meets the deficit, this Bill establishes a commission that will come in and take away the assets. I can think of nothing more destructive to voluntary board management, or to auxiliary activity at the local level, than the provisions in this Bill.

If we take away the contribution made and the personal care given at that level, we are taking away the hub and the valuable basis of our subsidised hospital organisations. I have concentrated in this debate on subsidised hospitals because they form an area with which I have been closely associated. This is an area that every effort should be made to preserve. Certainly, in my district members of the various boards, as well as members of the public, are deeply concerned about the subsidised hospitals. I cannot accept that support should be given to this Bill, which seeks to implement provisions largely opposed to the recommendations of the Bright committee. Although this Party, as the Leader said, is committed to support the basic recommendation involving an independant authority as outlined in the Bright report, we are not committed to and will not support this Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I have many reasons for opposing the Bill. I find that there are two main areas of concern, the first affecting local government, and the second affecting the various medical services that currently exist in South Australia. My colleagues have referred to the concern of local government about its hospital contributions and the fact that, despite the existence of Medibank in South Australia, local government is still required to make its contributions, so that ratepayers have the right to query the necessity for continuing those contributions. There is no guarantee in the Bill that local government contributions will be less than 3 per cent; indeed, they could be more. That local government will no longer be represented is a matter of grave concern to the layman. In his second reading explanation the Minister stated:

> The people of South Australia today enjoy access to and the protection of a wide range of efficient health services provided by Australian, State and local government, private enterprise, and voluntary organisations, many of which receive substantial Government assistance. There are hospitals for the care of the sick, nursing homes and other facilities for the elderly, and centres for the rehabilitation of the sick and the handicapped.

Some may have been concerned when they heard the Leader's remarks, and others will be when they read them, but I think much more could be done to improve this State's health services for the elderly, the handicapped and the mentally ill. From the bitter experience of the past 12 months, I can assure the House that our services are lacking drastically. It is a pity that nothing has been done over the years. However, to see the control come under one organisation without knowing exactly what the effect will be on the services we already have, what guarantee we will have in the future that these services will be continually upgraded and the facilities improved, and without being satisfied that a wider range of the handicapped and the elderly will be adequately protected is a matter that I believe Parliament should first consider. That is why I am inclined to think that, if we cannot have a Select Committee to investigate the ramifications of this legislation, regrettably one should oppose the Bill outright.

We are aware of the Government's promise at the recent State election in 1975. The Labor Party said that legislation was ready to be set up, on the recommendation of the Bright committee, for a health commission in South Australia. The debate advanced on this side of the House destroys that statement, which does not adequately conform to the Bright committee's recommendations. That was merely an election promise. There is the Labor Party platform in relation to health, community welfare, and metropolitan hospitals, and its policy of so-called effective expansion, control and administration of Government and semi-government hospital services; yet I cannot see how this

Bill will achieve that. The various community hospitals are rightly concerned. Members have received a letter from the West Torrens council, for whose comments I asked when the Bill was introduced. The council made plain its view in relation to the Bill, part of the letter stating:

. . . Whilst it is recognised that there may be some room for improvement in the standard of health services provided by individual councils, we would suggest that this is primarily attributable to lack of finance and not as a result of antipathy on the part of local government . . . I am to advise, therefore, that my council desires to express its opposition to any further implementation of the recommendations contained within the Bright report in so far that it would result in a loss of the delivery of health services by local governing authorities, which could result from the Bill at present before the Parliament. In consequence, we would respectfully request that, when this Bill is again brought forward for debate, consideration be given to the initiation of an amendment which would have the effect of preserving the autonomy and authority of local government in this field.

To ensure that that council's views were put forward, a Select Committee would be the best answer. We have in my area and in that of the member for Glenelg a community hospital and another one just east of my area, the Ashford Community Hospital, where we are finding a classic example of interference for political reasons and manipulation of the present board. One person tried to run a campaign to obtain as members people with political associations, in order to ensure that that hospital would conform to Government policy. That was blatant manipulation of a voluntary community service, yet it is the Labor Party's policy that voluntary health services be retained. On the other hand, we have the move to get rid of voluntary services. One is suspicious of the reference in the legislation to the St. John ambulance service, because we know of the trade union movement's objection to voluntary St. John ambulance drivers.

One wonders, when one sees this type of legislation and reads the philosophy of the present Government, whether it is genuine in its desire to improve medical health services in South Australia. Will the Government co-ordinate the services, as we are led to believe it will under the legislation; or is it just another bid to socialise and to bring about complete control. One cannot be blamed for being suspicious when one knows that moves are afoot to destroy what we know as the voluntary section of the St. John ambulance service. I do not know about the Royal Flying Doctor Service, which is not mentioned, but I suspect that it could also be involved. Under clause 25 of the Bill, the Government may compulsorily incorporate a hospital, whose constitution must be approved by the commission; this point has already been dealt with. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): I take this first opportunity I have had since yesterday to voice my concern about and disapproval of the no-confidence motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, because I believe that certain Opposition members must be feeling somewhat guilty about being convinced that they ought to support a proposal such as the one involved in that motion. I also believe that they will have cause to regret the kind of attack that was made on an individual yesterday without justification or proof. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the Liberal Movement, which, I know, was anxious to have an opportunity to show its opposition to the Government but which, nevertheless, could not bring itself to support such a miserable move as the one made yesterday. I know some Opposition members would deeply regret being associated with such an unfortunate move. However, what I really want to discuss this evening is the Fisheries Department and its activities in the State over recent years.

Mr. Gunn: I'll have something to say about that, too, at the first opportunity I get.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: What I mainly want to say has been confirmed by that interjection. Over a considerable time we have had constant attacks by the Opposition on our fisheries management and activities throughout the State.

Mr. Gunn: I'm going to make another one, too.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member makes clear that he is already armed to make further attacks.

Mr. Gunn: And I don't apologise, either.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Fisheries Department's activities and the administration of the policies formulated by the Minister and the Government over recent years have borne considerable fruit, and I think it worth quoting a publication that is available at the Parliamentary Library. I hope the publication is read by those Opposition members who make constant attacks on this State's fisheries activities. It is a report prepared for the department by Professor Copes, and recently published. This report makes one or two comments that bear out what I am saying and destroys the sort of attack that members opposite are constantly making on our fisheries management. The report states:

The author has also concluded, after broad exploratory contacts, that in South Australia the level of understanding of the economic problem in the fishing industry is of a particularly high order. This understanding extends to political leadership, to fisheries management officials and to leading fishermen representatives. The Minister of Fisheries (the Hon. B. A. Chatterton) has an evident keen interest in, and analytical understanding of, the fishing problem. The Chief Fisheries Officer (Mr. A. M. Olsen) has an exceptional grasp of the requirements of rational management and has succeeded in developing a set of compatible fisheries regulations. He has also been able to communicate to many leading members of the industry the advantages of rational fisheries management. The author was much impressed with the constructive attitudes and insights expressed to him by a group of South Australian fishermen representatives. In view of his contrary experiences in many other parts of the world, the author wishes to emphasise this impression of an exceptionally high level of understanding of the requirements of fisheries management in South Australia. The author has made a cursory examination of South Australian fisheries legislation and regulations. In general, their provisions appear very well suited to the needs of a sensible and comprehensive fisheries management regime.

When we consider that the author of those comments was an outsider who came here to examine the South Australian fisheries with an independent outlook and could make comments of that nature, it bears out what I am saying, that the attacks constantly made on our fisheries management in this State are completely unjustified. It is a difficult industry to manage. There are many problems and some inperfections both in our methods of operation and in our legislation. Nevertheless, that report justifies what I have had to say.

The other matter about fisheries to which I wish to refer is that some two years ago, after much consideration, a decision was made to prohibit the netting of fish adjoining the metropolitan foreshore. This was done because it was suggested that several people were dragging small species of fish up on to the beach and leaving them there to rot, at the same time disturbing the sea-bed and having an adverse effect upon the fishing along our metropolitan coast. I am sure the member for Glenelg and other members representing seaside districts will have noticed that, since that decision was made, there has been a dramatic improvement in fishing opportunities for people who use our metropolitan jetties. In fact, before the decision was made, one could visit metropolitan jetties and find very few people ever catching any fish of any type. However, my observations over the last two years, and particularly over the Christmas period, when I visited some metropolitan jetties, showed that competition for places on our jetties for recreational fishing was keen; it is difficult to get a spot. It gives even more pleasure to observe that these people can catch many good size fish. So clearly, with the only alteration that has taken place along the metropolitan coastline being the banning of netting, it seems certain that this good effect has been brought about by that decision.

At the time it was made, it was also decided by the Fisheries Department, not with any particular means of supporting its decision, that other areas of the State should be prohibited from using nets. Many areas in the State were selected, lines were drawn, and netting was prohibited in many places. I should be interested if the Minister of Fisheries could tell me the observations of fisheries and the communities in those other areas so that it can be found out whether the same impact has taken place, as has occurred in our metropolitan area.

Another matter I want to raise concerns motor vehicle insurance. Two constituents with a similar problem have approached me during the past two months, and doubtless other members have had similar approaches. Regrettably, after speaking to the Attorney-General, I am almost certain that nothing can be done to solve the problem. A constituent was driving his vehicle near his house, when another vehicle came out from a side street, on the wrong side of the road and at considerable speed, and cannoned into the constituent's vehicle, causing much damage to both cars.

When my constituent spoke to the other driver, he found that that driver had that day had his car serviced and he suspected that the brakes were not working. He was driving the vehicle around the block to determine whether they were working, and when he came to this intersection he found that they were not. They failed to operate, and he drove into my constituent's vehicle. After approaching the insurance companies, it was clear that the other driver was completely at fault, his vehicle having no brakes. The cost of the damage to my constituent's car was $450 and the cost of the damage to the other person's car was $1 000.

The insurance companies indicated that, because my constituent was driving on the road, he had to share some obligation, and of the total damage cost he was required to pay more than $300. I understand that this happened because of a legal judgment that provides that a person is to blame, despite the fact that he may not have contributed to the accident, merely because he is on the road. I believe that this is bad law and should be examined. I should be pleased if the Attorney-General could offer me any advice about this kind of problem.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): The member for Henley Beach said that he was disappointed with this side of the House in relation to the debate yesterday about the actions of a certain Mr. Liberman. That surprises me. The member for Henley Beach would remember that a former Attorney-General in this House, then Hon. Len King, when pushing for a Bill about land brokers and land salesmen, stated that there should be no conflict of interest. That was the basis of his argument. I suggest that there certainly is a conflict regarding Mr. Liberman in his situation with the Housing Trust, R.D.C. and in the other related matters. I am surprised that the member for Henley Beach supports the bad principle that has been stated here of the Premier's nominating such a person and giving the appointment his blessing.

The other matter that I want to raise is the big financial problem that faces many pensioners, particularly war widows. I understand that the matter arose through complaints received by the then Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) who directed that no information should be given from the Department of Social Security in relation to pensioners becoming ineligible for benefits. Apparently, this "blackout" has bounced back and is causing hardship among the people to whom I have referred. The decision was made in October, 1973, and these pensioners are receiving retrospective accounts back to 1974 and 1975.

The mistake is really threefold, involving the Department of Social Security, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the pensioners. When the Department of Social Security withheld this information from other departments, the Engineering and Waler Supply Department could not get the information, and in 1974 the latter department sent out notices to those who had lost the fringe benefits, stating that they should immediately list and notify the benefits that had been lost. The department added a rider to the notice stating that if the person was receiving a pension as a war widow the notice could be disregarded. No doubt this was a mistake, but it affected these people who received the fringe benefits. Apparently, the Engineering and Water Supply Department assumed it would receive the information from the Department of Social Security, but that department failed to forward that information.

A war widow's pension from the Social Security Department is very small and no doubt people receiving such a pension would think they were not included because of the small amount. They are elderly people who could easily misunderstand things of this nature. It could be said that there is no definite instrumentality that can cover this situation, but I understand that the Act allows for a cancellation of a remission, and that the cancellation can be taken back to 1973. There is also a right under the Act to grant a remission back to 1973. I refer to two cases concerning a Mrs. Ash of Oaklands Park and Miss LeCornu of Warradale. These people approached me, because one has received an account for $76.06 and the other an account for $99.51, which are fairly large amounts for these people. The accounts date from April, 1974, and these people had no inkling that they had to budget for these amounts. I believe great hardship is being caused to them, andI hope the Minister will try to ease their burden.

Elderly people in the community, particularly age pensioners and those receiving superannuation, are not accustomed to owing money, and they become worried and upset. They also have to pay council rates and land tax. It could be argued that these people do not have

to pay immediately, because the debts could become a charge against the estate. What a thing to have over their heads! I ask the Minister to assist in relieving the burden placed on these people.

I should like now briefly to touch on the effect of the loss of rights suffered by Opposition members in this House. When I first entered this place, members were allowed two hours Question Time. That was halved to one hour by this Government, and Opposition members are now lucky to be able to ask two questions a week. Indeed, this week we will be lucky to ask only one question each. One remembers the pantomime that occurred this afternoon, when the Attorney-General took 17 minutes to answer a question in the House—

Mr. Max Brown: Two questions.

Mr. MATHWIN: —aided and abetted by his colleague the Minister of Labour and Industry, who tried to do a similar thing, but eventually ran out of words and could not do it. Nevertheless, the Attorney's action in the House this afternoon was a disgrace to him and his Party. He did it with a certain amount of pleasure for himself and most of his colleagues. Several Ministers on the front bench enjoyed and revelled in the situation. I warn Ministers that, if this happens again, the results will be drastic. During the fiasco and pantomime put on by the Attorney this afternoon, he was twice called to order. Two points of order were taken, and he defied the Chair when you, Mr. Speaker, asked him to get on with his reply to the question, and he got away with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable member for Glenelg to withdraw that remark. At no time has he or any other honourable member of this House, either today or on any other day, got away with anything since I have been Speaker. I make that quite clear. I do not want any member in this House ever to insinuate anything through me, at me, or at someone else, because I will not tolerate it. I demand that the honourable member withdraw that remark.

Mr. MATHWIN: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to withdraw it. However, I say to you that I believe—

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): One trembles at the wrath of the member for Glenelg. Fancy his standing up and criticising anyone for taking any time at all to answer a question or make a contribution to a debate. Since I have been a member of this Chamber, he has occupied the crease more than any other member and made the least contribution to the debates of the House. It is completely hypocritical of him to complain about or criticise any other member for speaking at length on any subject. The Attorney-General, when answering the question, gave a good and complete answer that was appreciated by members, even if the honourable gentleman opposite did not appreciate it.

A most distasteful element is creeping into the contributions to debate made by Opposition members, particularly in the last two days. I refer to the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, which was given wide publicity by the Murdoch press in South Australia and Australia generally. South Australian Parliamentary debates have never been so widely publicised before, and one suspects the motives of the Murdoch press and gentlemen opposite. Could it be because they have been so successful recently in the Federal sphere in their character assassinations and personal attacks on members of Parliament and individuals, using the coward's castle of Parliament House in Canberra? I suspect that we shall be faced with the same sort of activity in South Australia. This evening the member for Alexandra, in dealing with the South Australian Health Commission Bill, went so far as to say that people who use South Australian public hospitals are receiving care and attention of a lower standard than that which they would receive at private hospitals or community hospitals. What absolute rot! What a slur on the dedicated people who work in South Australian Government hospitals!

I do not know whether the member for Alexandra realises exactly what he said. He thought it was funny! He said that, if anyone had had recent experience in a Government hospital and a non-Government hospital, that person would know where the best service was provided—and that people in country communities were close to their hospitals. He thinks that everyone in the country has a community hospital or a private hospital, but people in country centres like Port Augusta have a Government hospital. I am a member of the Port Augusta hospital board. The member for Mount Gambier is a member of the Mount Gambier hospital board. Further, for many years the member for Whyalla was a member of the Whyalla hospital board. So, we are very close to our hospitals, and I say that these Government hospitals provide an excellent service.

For the member for Alexandra to suggest that the service we get from our hospitals is of a lower standard than that which he says he gets from his hospital is disgraceful. It is a continuation of what happened here yesterday—the slur, the innuendo, the use of the coward's castle to criticise, condemn and slander people who have no redress whatever. I was interested in what the member for Glenelg said earlier in this debate. He complained about what he saw to be a raw deal for some South Australian pensioners. I would expect him to be loud in his condemnation of the Federal Government's intention to defer for two months the increase to which Australian pensioners are entitled; this action will save the Federal Government $29 000 000.

Not one word did we hear from members opposite about the distress that will be caused to Australian pensioners by the arrogant, dictatorial Prime Minister with which this country is now cursed—a man who would not know the problems faced by pensioners. Because he has never worked in his life, he would not know the problems faced by workers. This man dictates to his Cabinet and makes the decisions himself. He could not care less about the needs of the Australian people who are most sorely pressed—the pensioners. He will defer an increase in pensions for two months in order to save $29 000 000. He says that he will cut the deficit of $4 500 000 000. How will he do it? It will be at the expense of those people in this country who can least afford to be attacked by the interests he represents. Would he attack the people who could afford $29 000 000 off their incomes? Of course he would not. He will take it off the pensioners and people on low incomes. He will deprive the country of medical and education services. Because he is what he is, an arrogant, dictatorial man, he thinks he will get away with it. It distresses me to see his lackeys on the other side of this House applauding his actions. If the Labor Government had done the same kind of thing, Opposition members would have been loud in their condemnation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not tolerate these interjections; it seems that certain members have come in here for no other purpose. If they continue, I will certainly take action.

Mr. KENEALLY: Of course, we are used to double standards from members opposite. Anything goes in their grab for power. They succeeded in Canberra. They think they will use the same tactics here, but they will fall flat on their collective stupid faces, because the people of South Australia will ensure that they do.

The reason I was going to speak in this debate this evening was to criticise the present Australian Government for what it appears to be going to do to local government. The Port Augusta council found itself compelled recently to write a letter to the previous Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) congratulating him and his Government on the magnificent contribution they had made to the welfare of local government throughout Australia and especially in the cities of the Spencer Gulf area.

You, Mr. Speaker, with your close association with local government would realise the contribution that was made. This contribution was made through many agencies such as the Area Improvement Programme, the Regional Employment Development Scheme, the Department of Urban and Regional Development, and the Cities Commission, which are now threatened by the new Commonwealth Liberal Government. We have heard members opposite this evening saying that local government has limited resources and is unable to pay hospital contributions, because local government is already applying a maximum rating. How much worse off will local government be when the Fraser Administration gets fully into gear?

People in cities such as Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Whyalla feel threatened about the future of programmes that have been implemented with the encouragement and assistance of the progressive Whitlam Administration. Money was spent in those cities, and if members opposite come north to those cities they will see the worthwhile work of the Whitlam Government.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've got a good sense of humour.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am serious about this, as is my local council and the people of Port Augusta. We all feel threatened because of the activities of the present Government. Programmes have been promised to Port Augusta, such as the sewerage programme, and there is now much insecurity about that. That programme, which is essential to the health and well-being of my constituents, is threatened by activities that are supported by members opposite. I ask them to join with us in trying to ensure that the Commonwealth Government does not try to cut back on those programmes that are absolutely essential to the well-being of South Australia. I refer to activities involving hospitals and pensions. These two areas have been the subject of decisions by the new Commonwealth Government and are indicative of what that Government will try to do if it is able to get away with its actions. The Opposition, along with this Government, should be out loudly supporting the case for South Australia.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 5, at 2 p.m.