

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 30, 1975

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY presented a petition signed by 486 persons alleging that succession duties levied on the surviving spouse had become burdensome through inflation and praying that succession duties be abolished on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS**FIRE SERVICE INQUIRY**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have noticed from a press release issued by the Minister that he intends to appoint another committee of inquiry into fire services in South Australia. As a full report on this subject has already been made by a working party, I think in 1972, will the Minister say why another inquiry is deemed necessary?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: There have been two inquiries into fire services in South Australia, including one by a working party involving the Emergency Fire Services. There was also another report prepared by Mr. Dunsford, a former Director of Lands, dealing with fire brigades in South Australia. Unfortunately, neither of these inquiries examined the whole scene, as the present inquiry will do. The terms of reference are such that the committee of inquiry will not cover the ground that has already been covered by previous inquiries, although it will take into account the two reports on fire services that have already been made, and it will look at fire services generally.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Is the Minister aware that the original working party had terms of reference covering the question just raised, and has the new inquiry been requested by the Secretary of the fire fighters union (Mr. Overall)?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I think it was made quite clear in the press release that there was an item moved at the Labor Party's annual convention to have this type of general inquiry. That was the basis for the setting up of this inquiry, to look at all the fire services throughout South Australia, not merely the E.F.S. and the fire brigades. That was the purpose of it, as clearly stated in the press release.

FISHING

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Before the recent election the Government in its stated policy on fisheries indicated that it recognised the many problems facing the fishing industry in South Australia and would take immediate steps to help the industry solve them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Appoint a Director!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Minister has already indicated the Government would double its present budget for the Fisheries Department. At the time, he also indicated that staff and accommodation would be provided to enable the department to service this important industry. I noted with interest an article, attributed to the Minister, in the weekend press concerning the reorganisation of the Fisheries Department under the overall control of the Agriculture Department. Can the Minister provide the Council with more details of this reorganisation and say how the changes are likely to affect the fishing industry?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The honourable member is quite right: there was an article in the *Sunday Mail* pointing out that part of the plan to reorganise the Fisheries Department, to make it more effective and better able to service the industry, was to include it within the Agriculture Department and rename the department the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries. I emphasise that there is no intention to downgrade the Fisheries Department in any way: it will remain a separate division within what was the Agriculture Department (and now will be the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries), still having access to me as Minister. I think the reorganisation will benefit the industry. The Fisheries Department was a very small department, and in many areas administration was extremely difficult because of its small size. It will now be able to call on the back-up services within the Agriculture Department, including the services of economists in the department and people concerned with information, magazine layout, and design. It will be able to call on the department's administrative services, some of which have already been called on in terms of drawing up pay packets, and so forth. The reorganisation will streamline administration and make it more effective, producing, we believe, a better service for the industry.

SPRAY PACKS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Is the Minister of Health aware that devices containing spray that blinds people are being marketed through Adelaide service stations at present as a self-defence spray? Further, is he aware that the distributors claim that the spray blinds people for 15 minutes, with no after-effects on a person's sight after that time? To operate the pack a small plunger is depressed, releasing view of these devices, and has his department analysed the contents from the viewpoint of any possible long-term damage to human sight? Is the Minister satisfied that the spray packs will not fall into children's hands? Do the possible disadvantages to the community caused by these devices outweigh their possible advantages?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We are aware of these packs. Actually, there are two packs—the Kristee pack and the Sheriff pack. Kristee is a pressure pack measuring about 200 mm in length by 15 mm in diameter. The pack contains capsicum oleoresin suspended in a solution and mixed with a brown dye. When punctured the pack cannot be resealed. The Sheriff pack is similar in size to the Kristee and contains capsicum oleoresin in solution. To operate the pack a small plunger is depressed, releasing the irritant: when released, the pack reseals. Both packs are manufactured in America. Capsicum oleoresin is a hot oily substance extracted from capsicums (chillies). If sprayed on the skin it would generate heat similar to ointment known as "Deep Heat". If sprayed in the eyes, it would cause temporary loss of vision. Inhalation of the irritant will induce coughing. The Kristee pack is being distributed by firms selling security equipment, locksmiths, etc., and the Sheriff pack by service stations; both packs retail for about

\$3.60 each. Depending upon the circumstances in which Kristee and Sheriff packs are used, the user could be charged with carrying an offensive weapon contrary to section 15 (1) of the Police Offences Act. To date, there have been no reported incidents where these sprays have been used in the commission of offences. It could be argued that numerous pressure sprays are available from supermarkets such as oven cleaners, hair sprays, deodorants, etc., but, whereas the Kristee and Sheriff packs are small and easily concealed about the person, the other pressure sprays are manufactured in much larger containers. I suggest that the publicity afforded the Kristee and Sheriff packs for personal protection could motivate the criminal element to use these packs for the commission of offences. I therefore want to warn people that they could be charged with an offence if they carry these packs as weapons.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am concerned that this offensive weapon could be an attacking weapon, and I am also concerned that it could get into children's hands. As the sale of such a pack is prohibited in New York, New Jersey, and California, will the Minister take whatever steps are necessary to have the sale of the Sheriff .50 pack stopped until his department is satisfied that the use and sale of the pack is not against the public interest?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: At present the department is unable to prohibit the sale of these sprays. If necessary, the import of sprays for personal protection should be prohibited by the Commonwealth Department of Customs and Excise, and we will be taking up the matter with that department.

CYCLONE DAMAGE

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about cyclone damage?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Following the cyclone in January, 1975, which caused considerable damage to vines and crops in the New Residence area, the then Minister of Lands (Hon. A. F. Kneebone) received a deputation consisting of growers' representatives, Mr. Nankivell, and a representative from the United Farmers and Graziers Association of South Australia Inc. Their purpose was to find out what assistance could be given to the people of New Residence. They were advised that the only assistance available through the Lands Department was under the provisions of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967, which covered loans for carry-on expenses; any persons who experienced difficulty in obtaining funds through normal channels should apply to the department. The Rural Industry Assistance Authority, which is responsible for the administration of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, has received only three applications for assistance. Two of the applications were received during the last week in May, some five months after the event, and the last in August.

All three applications were approved; two received grants of \$3 000 each for living expenses together with repayable loans of \$2 500 and \$11 340 respectively for carry-on expenses, and the third a grant of \$1 500 for living expenses and a loan of \$1 920 for carry-on expenses. The Community Welfare Department also made assistance available to persons almost immediately to enable essential items, such as food, to be purchased. I believe four families applied for this assistance and received up to \$100, but no further response by them was forthcoming for additional aid.

COMMUNAL SETTLEMENTS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister for Planning and Development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have received a portfolio from a Mr. Wayne Merchant, of Mount Pleasant, setting out a detailed plan for a self-contained communal settlement where about 2 000 people, adults and children, could live together. A great deal of thought has been given to making the settlement ecologically sound, as well as a pleasant place in which to live. Use is made of the principles of solar heating and the generation of electricity from silicon solar cells and from wind, and also of methane gas from sewage. Traffic flows within the settlement are carefully controlled, and most facilities are readily reached on foot. Will the Minister refer this plan to the Minister for Planning and Development for comment and professional evaluation? If it is found to be a practical suggestion, will the Government consider methods of incorporating such a settlement in future developments in this State?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall refer the question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

FIRE-FIGHTING ACCIDENT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding a fire-fighting accident?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: As I informed the honourable member in my reply to his recent letter to me on this subject, claims for compensation from the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund are dealt with by the trustees of that fund, who, under the provisions of the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund Act, have complete jurisdiction to hear and decide claims, and neither I nor my department has any authority in the matter. I am informed that Mr. Smits' case will be further considered by the trustees at a meeting to be held on October 2, and that, following that meeting, the claimant and the District Council of Lincoln will be advised of the outcome.

WHYALLA TRAFFIC

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: My question is directed to the Chief Secretary, representing the Treasurer. Because of the increase in traffic accidents at major road intersections in Whyalla, the city council has applied for Government finance to assist in the installation of traffic lights at four of these major traffic intersections. Last week an Australian Broadcasting Commission television news item stated that sufficient finance was available from Government sources for the installation of only three sets of traffic lights. However, in the same news service there was a report of an announcement by the Minister for the Environment of a grant of \$6 000 for the extension of an amateur fishing jetty at Whyalla. As I believe that road safety and the saving of lives should have a high priority (and I am sure amateur fishermen would concur), will the Treasurer consider reallocating the \$6 000 grant for the fishing jetty extensions so that the urgent installation of traffic lights at the fourth major road intersection at Whyalla can be implemented?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

MEDICAL OFFICERS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Health, and seek leave to make a brief explanation before doing so.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Members of the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association are gravely concerned that their claims for reasonable salary increases are not being met. I understand that a deputation from the association saw the Minister on July 29 last and that correspondence has passed between the Minister and the association since then. The association fears a loss of key personnel unless action is immediately taken. Such a loss would result in a threat to the lives and health of South Australians. Consultants at major public hospitals are especially involved. Their case has been under consideration over a long period, but they do not seem to be getting anywhere with the Public Service Arbitrator. I give the following random example of grade 11 consultants:

State	Annual Salary \$
South Australia.....	18 641
Queensland.....	24 138
Tasmania.....	24 005
Western Australia.....	23 617
New South Wales.....	26 450
Victoria.....	26 749

Can the Minister assist in any way to see that justice is done in the case of these medical officers, so that they are paid fair and reasonable salaries commensurate with their situation and professional skills?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have much sympathy for these officers, and I appreciate that they are being paid at a lower rate than the rate paid in other States. This is a matter for the courts to decide, but I will do everything I can to assist these officers. I will consult with my colleague the Minister of Labour and Industry to see whether we can expedite the matter through the courts.

PIG SWILL

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Replying to a question on this matter two weeks ago about the use and disposal of pig swill, the Minister indicated that, in line with a decision taken by the Australian Agricultural Council, a ban would apply to the feeding of swill to pigs in South Australia from October 1 (tomorrow). Can the Minister say whether he has had occasion to reconsider that decision?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yes. The intention was to bring the ban into operation on October 1, but following certain representations to the Government it appears that people involved with this problem are facing difficulty in meeting the requirements laid down for the disposal of swill. Therefore, we have decided to postpone implementing the ban until January 1, 1976. However, there will be no further postponement of the ban beyond that date. We believe that we have already given adequate warning to everyone involved. Officers in my department have contacted and written to all the people concerned in this operation, and we believe we have given everyone adequate warning. However, in spite of that warning, it seems that there are still problems concerning this matter, and that is why we decided to delay the implementation of the ban on pig swill until January 1.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked on September 16 concerning workmen's compensation?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Minister of Labour and Industry has informed me that the interpretation enunciated by the honourable member in his question to me of September 16, 1975, is correct. Subsections (1) and (5) of section 51 are quite clear in meaning and intent, in that an injured workman must be paid as compensation his average weekly earnings with the same employer over the preceding 12 months, or lesser period if employed for less than 12 months preceding the incapacity, but such weekly earnings cannot be less than the workman's award rate at the time of the incapacity. If the honourable member is willing to give me details of instances where workmen are not being paid in accordance with section 51 of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1971-1973, I shall be pleased to have such instances investigated.

MILK

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on September 10 regarding protein levels in milk?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: A similar question having been asked recently in another place, I quote the reply given, as follows:

The Metropolitan Milk Board has studied iodine levels in South Australian milk. Between January, 1974, and May, 1975, 63 samples of pasteurised milk from the Metropolitan milk treatment plants were analysed for iodine. The average level was 340 micrograms/litre. Twenty-two samples of pasteurised milk from country treatment plants were also analysed giving an average result of 410 micrograms/litre. There is a normal background level of iodine in milk due to the presence of iodine in soil, water, fertiliser and animal foodstuffs. Iodine can also be added to milk by the use of iodophors as sanitising agents in dairy industry complexes. In an attempt to quantify results samples were also taken to establish these background levels. In the period September, 1972, to December, 1973, 10 metropolitan milk producers who claimed to be non-users of iodophor sanitisers were sampled. The average iodine content for this group was 130 micrograms/litre with a range of 30 to 440 micrograms/litre. Four hand-milked samples were also included; these were non-users of iodophor sanitisers. The average was 130 micrograms/litre with a range of 10 to 440 micrograms/litre.

There is presently no evidence to suggest that any adverse effect on health has resulted due to the level of iodine in milk. The World Health Organisation recommends that a daily intake of iodine is about 200 micrograms for an adult, based on 3 micrograms a kilogram of body weight.

The Metropolitan Milk Board is continuing to monitor Adelaide's milk supply. It has issued instructions to milk producers and milk treatments plants concerning the use of iodophors.

MEDIBANK

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question regarding Medibank?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It will be recalled that I suggested that the honourable member may have been able to obtain this information for himself. However, having had second thoughts and taken pity on the honourable member, I have obtained for him the following reply. True, some Medibank claimants were experiencing delays of several weeks before they received their benefit cheques. The delays were experienced because, as has already been publicised, Medibank has been receiving a larger than expected volume of claims. Appropriate steps have been taken, and it is expected that the delay which, of course, was not experienced by all claimants, will soon be shortened.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about Medibank?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I regret that I am unable to give specific information on the extent to which doctors in the Elizabeth area are bulk-billing patients attending their private surgeries. With regard to the question of vacant beds in the Lyell McEwin Hospital, it is true that the occupation rate has decreased in recent weeks. This is partly owing to doctors referring some private patients to private hospitals removed geographically from this area but it also has some relationship to the Congress of Surgeons in New Zealand, which has recently terminated. The present position is that we are continuing to admit private patients from practitioners in the area, and some hospital service patients presenting in casualty are being treated by the salaried casualty staff, if it is within their competence to manage the particular condition presenting.

VINEYARD RECONSTRUCTION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand that the Minister, or his department, has a scheme for vineyard reconstruction in South Australia. The idea has been, I believe, that new varieties of root stocks are to be planted in privately-owned vineyards and that new source areas will thus be established. Will the Minister explain the plan further and say whether it has commenced and, if it has, where the initial source areas are or will be?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: For some time, the Agriculture Department has been doing valuable work in clonal selection of grape varieties in South Australia. The purpose of this clonal selection is to separate out from the existing varieties those individual vines that have a higher yield potential than has the average vine. Having done this clonal selection, the viticultural research centres at Loxton and Nuriootpa have a number of mother vines

that are inherently superior in their yield ability to the average vine of that variety. The problem that has occurred is that the number of cuttings produced from the mother vine is necessarily limited, and the industry has not so far benefited to any great extent from this clonal selection work. About 400 to 600 vines are needed to plant .4 hectares. It is obvious that the few mother vines at the research centres are not capable of producing enough cuttings to plant even a single hectare. The department has taken the extra step, as the honourable member has pointed out, of establishing on private growers' blocks source areas that will provide a large supply of these improved cuttings. The source areas have been established this year in every major grapegrowing area. It is hoped that within two or three years, when these vines have become fully established, sufficient cuttings will be available to the industry to meet all the requirements for the replanting and new planting in vineyards of this superior genetic material.

MEAT PRICES

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on September 9 regarding meat prices?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The best figures available for the comparisons requested by the honourable member are those based on the yearling beef prices of March, 1973, and April, 1975. Although the two are not strictly comparable, they do give some indication of the changes that have occurred during that period. A consumer's \$1 spent on beef last April gave 45c to the producer, 3c to killing charges, 7c to the wholesaler, and 45c to the retailer. Compared to March, 1973, these figures represent a fall of 33 per cent for the producer, and rises of 50 per cent, 250 per cent and 50 per cent for killing charges, wholesaler and retailer respectively. There follows a table setting out those charges, and I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SHARE OF BEEF CONSUMER'S \$1 (IN CENTS)

	Producer	Killing Charge	Wholesaler	Retailer
March, 1973	66	2	2	30
April, 1975	45	3	7	45
Percentage change.....	—33 per cent	+ 50 per cent	+ 250 per cent	+ 50 per cent

ROAD DEATHS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question regarding road deaths?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Post-mortems are performed on the direction of a coroner, and the reason for requiring post-mortems on road deaths is whether the accident caused the death, or the death caused the accident. The accepted practice in the metropolitan area is to hold post-mortems into all road deaths, but this is not fully accepted in some country areas. Post-mortems in the South-East region are, in the main, performed at Mount Gambier, while those in the West Coast region are performed at Whyalla. Road accident victims in the remaining areas are usually brought to Adelaide if a post-mortem is deemed necessary by the coroner. Post-mortems are performed at the Government's cost.

LEVELS TRAFFIC LIGHTS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question regarding the need for traffic lights at the exit from the Levels on to Main North Road?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The access road (Warrendi Road) to the Levels campus of the South Australian Institute of Technology carries fairly large volumes of traffic during two short periods (at 4 p.m. and 5 p.m.) each afternoon, with the greatest volumes on Mondays. Vehicles turning left at Main North Road are not delayed, but there are considerable delays (up to seven minutes total) recorded recently to vehicles turning right. Gaps in the main road traffic are sufficient to allow traffic emerging from Warrendi Road to disperse within about 15 minutes at each peak, and manoeuvres undertaken with a reasonable

amount of patience are made with minimal hazard. This is evidenced by the comparatively small number of accidents that occur and the fact that the great majority of these are rear-end collisions in Warrendi Road, not involving main road traffic.

The installation of traffic signals is very low on the priority listing, because of the comparatively small (total) amount of traffic on the side road and the apparent low accident risk. The most appropriate solution to the problem of access to the Levels appears to be the provision of an alternative route via Cross Keys Road, and the means by which this could be achieved are being investigated.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LAND COMMISSION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to the activities of the South Australian Land Commission as they apply to open-space purchases and the allocation of reserve areas within subdivisions. Recent announcements have indicated that the commission, as well as purchasing large tracts of land for subdivision, is also purchasing large parcels of land as open-space areas. First, does the commission set aside the same proportion of land within each subdivision for reserve areas as is required to be set aside by private subdividers? Secondly, in instances where tracts of land are purchased solely for the purpose of open spaces and Commonwealth money is used to purchase them, has this arrangement been approved by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Land Commission buys land as it becomes available under the Planning and Development Act. Admittedly, the commission receives a sizable amount of money from the Commonwealth, but all purchases of land made by the commission are forwarded to the Commonwealth for ratification. Only last week, I sent a statement from the Land Commission to the Commonwealth authorities in Canberra doing just that. I assure the honourable member that whatever is set down under the Planning and Development Act is carried out to the letter by the commission. I will certainly get a more precise answer to the question whether the commission is bound by the same terms as private developers are.

MEMBERS' INSURANCE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to my question about insurance for members of Parliament?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague informs me that the State Government Insurance Commission has reported that the exemption mentioned in the personal accident cover for members of Parliament is applicable to injuries resulting from the rising of a group of members of a political Party, not by an individual member: that is, an uprising to overthrow. Any injury suffered as a result of a personal attack on members whilst engaged in their Parliamentary duties would be covered under the policy.

STRIKES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand the Chief Secretary has a reply to my recent question about strikes.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As this strike was settled the day after the question was asked by the honourable member, no further action was taken on the matter.

SWEETHEART AGREEMENTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I understand the Chief Secretary has a reply to the question I asked recently about sweetheart agreements.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague has supplied me with the following answer:

The Government's policy was outlined by the Premier in his statement to the House of Assembly on August 27, 1975. Since the statement was made, the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission has delivered its judgment in the wage indexation case and the Government is examining the decision to decide what further action needs to be taken.

TROTTING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport a reply to a question I asked about trotting?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Secretary of the South Australian Trotting Control Board has stated that the words "or any other information" will be deleted from the board's application forms for licences, subject to the confirmation of the Trotting Control Board at its meeting to be held on October 6, 1975.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I address my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, following the answer the Minister has just given. Would he also ask the Trotting Control Board whether it intends extending the requirement for information from trainers and drivers to include other people involved in trotting, such as members of the board, and the chairmen and the secretaries of clubs?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will attempt to get an answer for the honourable member from the Trotting Control Board.

AMALGAMATION OF COUNCILS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the recent question I asked him, representing the Minister of Local Government, concerning the amalgamation of councils?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague states that the Royal Commission, rather than the local government office, has received some submissions from councils desiring to discuss amalgamations along lines other than those recommended by the commission. The District Councils of Freeling and Mudla Wirra desire to discuss, with the commission, amalgamation. The commission will pursue the proposal. The District Council of Crystal Brook desires to amalgamate with the City of Port Pirie and District Council of Pirie. However, there is no evidence of similar desires from the District Council of Pirie. The commission has received one or two other suggestions for departures from what the Royal Commission recommended, but only in minor ways.

CATTLE DISEASES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand the Minister of Agriculture has a reply to my question of September 9, concerning cattle diseases.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Reports from Portugal and Indonesia to the Office International Des Epizooties indicate that the whole island of Timor is free from foot and mouth disease. Nevertheless, full quarantine precautions are taken to prevent the entry of any exotic disease. Two such diseases known to be present in Portuguese Timor are Newcastle disease and surra. My department has been informed by the Animal Quarantine Service in Darwin that all normal precautions were taken with the recent influx of refugees from Portuguese Timor,

and refugees' baggage was checked thoroughly by Customs and the Animal Quarantine Service. Most of this checking was performed at the Larrakeyah Army Barracks, where the refugees were removed after the initial health and immigration checks.

All animal products found were seized and destroyed, the most common items of this nature being milk powder and other foodstuffs. The Red Cross replaced any food items so removed. A few live birds were found on the refugee ships. The ships' captains entered into the usual bonds for these and they were re-exported when the ships left Darwin. Soiled clothing or footwear were disinfected on arrival and general quarantine disinfected any aircraft on arrival in Darwin. It is evident that all precautions have been taken to prevent the introduction of any exotic disease from Timor and that the Animal Quarantine Service is maintaining full surveillance in Darwin, as it is in other ports of entry in Australia.

MALAYSIAN INVESTMENTS

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about Australasia International Developments?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Australasia International Developments (in which South Australia has a 20 per cent equity) has entered into negotiations for the construction of housing panels in Malaysia. Export of the panels to South Australia is not contemplated. The object is to assist the Malaysian Government to provide urgently needed housing for its people, and is in no way related to a project employing cheap Malaysian labour. The benefits to South Australia relate directly to the input of componentry.

RECLAIMED WATER

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On behalf of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who is absent on Parliamentary business, I ask the Minister of Lands for a reply to the honourable member's question about reclaimed water.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The activity in Heaslip Road is work on a normal extension of the water reticulation system to improve the water supply in the Angle Vale area. It is not associated with the utilisation of Bolivar effluent waters. Alternative schemes for the utilisation of Bolivar effluent are being investigated but, as indicated in the Council on March 26, it will be some time before these investigations are complete. The development of the alternative schemes is proceeding on schedule.

AIR TRAVEL

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about economy air travel?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The number of members of Parliament and judges travelling by air is not great, and it is not proposed to alter existing policy. The policy in relation to public servants is that Ministers authorise travel to other States and deal with cases on their merits. Economy travel is encouraged. There are exceptions to the above, as departments are encouraged to make the best use of funds and, in consequence, policy varies somewhat from department to department. For example, in some departments, all officers (including the permanent head) travel economy to enable the maximum number of visits to other States to be made. In other departments, usually where few visits to other States are made, first-class travel is the norm. In general, each visit is judged on its merits, meal availabilities, and the pressures on the officer concerned. It should not be overlooked that most interstate visits eat into officers' private time, which is

appreciated by the Government. I do not propose to ask the Minister for Civil Aviation to introduce one-class air travel throughout Australia. That is a decision which he is quite competent to make.

HOUSING TRUST INVESTMENTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL (on notice):

1. How much money has been invested by the South Australian Housing Trust in factories and commercial buildings which have been purchased or built by the trust and which are now leased to the present occupiers?

2. What is the total of the clear rents being received by the trust for such investment?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The replies are as follows:

1. At June 30, 1975, the South Australian Housing Trust had outstanding the total sum of \$27 929 220 on factory and commercial properties which were, at that date, the subject of various forms of lease. Some of these leases contain a right to purchase, others do not. The expenditure on commercial properties includes buildings and improvements provided for particular communities on which no financial return is obtained. Part of this investment has been made with social rather than direct financial goals. For example, in a number of shopping centres space is let to such bodies as Mothers' and Babies' Health Association, libraries, counselling centres and others for which only a nominal charge is made. It is not possible, therefore, to make a direct comparison on this investment with what might be achieved from a purely commercial point of view.

2. The total rents received for these properties in the 1947-75 financial year were \$2 698 421.

RETURNED SERVICEMEN'S BADGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill is in the nature of corrective legislation prior to consolidation under the Acts Reproduction Act and is designed to up-date and correct inaccuracies in the principal Act. Clause 1 (1) and clause 1 (2) are formal provisions. Clause 1 (3) alters the citation of the principal Act, as amended by the Bill when it becomes law, to the Returned Services Badges Act, 1952-1975, by substituting the word "Services" for the word "Servicemen's" in the citation of the Act. Clause 2 adds to the long title words which explain that the league has been referred to by its former name.

Clause 3 makes three amendments to section 2 of the principal Act. Paragraphs (a) and (b) make amendments which are consequential on the changes of the league's name to the Returned Services' League (South Australian Branch) Incorporated, while paragraph (c) replaces the definition of "returned servicemen's badge" with the definition of "returned services badge". Clause 4 makes necessary consequential amendments to section 3 of the principal Act.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (R.S.L.) BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is in the nature of corrective legislation designed to correct and bring up to date certain provisions relating to the Returned Services League which are inaccurate and/or out of date, and to facilitate the consolidation of the Act under the Acts Republication Act. The Bill deals only with the provisions of the Act that contain inaccurate references to the league. Clause 1 is a formal provision. Clause 2 amends section 27 (4), which refers to "a club that is a sub-branch of the Returned Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia (South Australian Branch) Club". All sub-branches are, and always have been, sub-branches of the league whose former name was the "Returned Sailors', Soldiers', and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia (South Australian Branch), Incorporated", and paragraphs (a) and (b) of clause 2 make the necessary amendments to correct the reference to the league in that subsection. Paragraph (c) is consequential on paragraphs (a) and (b), while paragraph (d) brings the subsection into line with the principles endorsed by the Act itself.

Clause 3 amends section 67 (4) (d) in the same manner as clause 2 amends section 27 (4). Clause 4 (a), (b) and (c) consequentially amends section 87 (5) (b), but clause 4 (d) corrects an erroneous reference in that subsection. Clause 5 (a) consequentially amends section 104 of the principal Act but clause 5 (b) has been inserted because the licence is held by the league, and the words "or to that league" have been added by way of precaution. Clause 5 (c) is intended to nullify the restriction placed by section 2 of the private Act called the Returned Sailors' and Soldiers' Imperial League Club (Licensing) Act, 1934, on membership of the league while it is registered as a club and situated at its present location. That restriction, which has been a dead letter for many years, would have excluded from membership members of the services unless they served in a theatre of war before the passing of that private Act.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is in the nature of corrective legislation for facilitating the consolidation of the principal Act and its amendments under the Acts Republication Act, 1967-1972. The Bill updates the provisions of the Act, repeals or clarifies obsolete provisions, corrects anomalies, and generally renders more meaningful provisions which had been enacted to deal with situations which existed many decades ago but which are now no longer relevant.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 substitutes for section 3 of the Act a new section, the differences between the two sections being consequential on amendments proposed by clauses 4 to 19 of the Bill. Clause 3 (a) amends section 8 (1) of the principal Act by substituting for the reference in paragraph (b) to the "present State Bank" (which, by definition in section 4, as it was enacted in 1925, meant the

State Bank as it was constituted pursuant to the State Advances Act, 1895) a reference to "the bank" (which, by definition in section 4 means the State Bank, as it was established by the State Bank Act, 1925). The amendment will make the section more meaningful in relation to the bank's present capital and operations. Clause 3 (b) strikes out from section 8 (2) a reference to Part VIa of the Act which is now meaningless, as Part VIa had been repealed by Act No. 13 of 1968, section 8.

Clause 4 amends the heading to Part VI of the principal Act to render it more meaningful in view of the proposed repeal of the references to Acts which have since been repealed and in view of the proposed repeal by clauses 5, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17 and 19 of the divisional headings which are no longer relevant or necessary. Clause 5 repeals the heading to Division I which made specific reference to Acts which have since been repealed. Clause 6 repeals section 48, which has now been superseded by section 6 of the Advances for Homes Act, 1928, as amended. Clause 7 repeals section 53, which is now out of date, but all rights that might have accrued under that section and are still in existence are kept alive by new section 53a, which is enacted by clause 8. Clause 9 repeals the heading to Division II, which is no longer necessary. Clause 10 repeals sections 55, 56 and 57, as they are now obsolete, and no money is outstanding under the Acts in question. Clause 11 repeals the heading to Division III, which is no longer necessary. Clause 12 repeals section 59, which is now obsolete.

Clause 13 repeals the heading to Division IV, which is no longer necessary. Clause 14 repeals sections 64 and 65, as they are now obsolete and no money is outstanding under the Acts in question. Clause 15 repeals the heading to Division V, which is no longer necessary. Clause 16 repeals sections 67 and 68, as they are now obsolete and no money is outstanding under the Act in question. Clause 17 repeals the heading to Division VI, which is no longer necessary. Clause 18 repeals sections 70 and 71, as they are now obsolete and no moneys are outstanding under the Acts in question. Clause 19 repeals the heading to Division VII, as it is not necessary and its repeal is consistent with the repeal of the other divisional headings. Clause 20 amends section 77 of the principal Act by the deletion of superfluous and unnecessary words, with the object of clarifying the provisions of the section. Clause 21 amends section 81 by updating the references to the Acts referred to in that section.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 872.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): When I sought leave to conclude my remarks, I was dealing with the impact of Medibank on the State Budget. Before discussing that further, I should like to read the press release issued by the Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden), and a statement made conjointly by the South Australian Minister of Health. The statement is as follows:

The Australian and South Australian Governments are to enter into a formal agreement for the financing and provision of public hospital services under the Medibank programme. This was revealed today in a joint statement from the Minister for Social Security (Mr. Bill Hayden) and the South Australian Minister of Health (Mr. Don Banfield). The agreement is to operate from July 1, the starting date of Medibank. Under the agreement the Australian Government will provide an additional \$20 000 000 in 1975-76

for expenditure on hospitals by the South Australian Government. Mr. Banfield pointed out that these additional funds would also release State Government finances for the improvement of other community-based health services. The agreement with the South Australian Government means that agreements have now been reached with two State Governments for the introduction of Medibank hospital arrangements.

The Tasmanian Minister of Health (Mr. Farquhar) has already announced that Tasmania will enter into a hospital agreement. Mr. Hayden said that negotiations towards a hospital agreement are also well advanced with the Queensland Government. He expected that the details of the agreement would be announced shortly. The medical benefits segment of this Medibank programme will, from July 1, protect every person in Australia against expenses for private medical treatment in or out of hospital and without the need for medical insurance contributions. However, the Medibank hospital arrangements, including free standard ward public hospital accommodation and treatment, can be introduced only in States whose Governments enter into agreements with the Australian Government.

Under the Medibank agreement the net cost of operating South Australian public hospitals will be shared on a 50/50 basis between the Australian and South Australian Governments. The main benefits flowing from the agreement to the South Australian Government will be:

- free standard ward public hospital accommodation and treatment;
- free public hospital outpatients services;
- much reduced public hospital charges for intermediate and private wards because of the financial assistance to be provided to South Australian public hospitals under the agreement;
- \$18 a day in Australian Government payments to private hospitals for their patients; and
- much lower contribution rates to private insurance for people seeking private treatment in hospitals.

Mr. Hayden said it now appeared certain that the Medibank programme would begin with the public in the three States receiving the benefits of the Medibank hospital arrangements and the public in three other States (New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia) being deprived by the non-agreement of their Governments of these benefits. "It will quickly become apparent to residents of the non-co-operating States that, by not entering into agreements, their State Governments have placed them in a very disadvantaged position compared with the people in the States which are co-operating," Mr. Hayden said. Mr. Banfield said that the South Australian Government would provide free accommodation and treatment in all Government public hospitals. Discussions were still proceeding regarding the situation which will apply in other hospitals, both in Adelaide and the country areas.

Mr. Hayden said the agreement between the two Governments would mean that South Australia would, from July 1, 1975, be able to receive a high standard of hospital treatment without incurring any direct personal costs. People who wished to be treated as private patients either in public or private hospitals would be able to purchase private insurance against the accommodation expenses involved, and the agreement would mean that the contribution they paid for such insurance would be considerably less than at present, and certainly much less than in those States where no agreements exist. Contributions to private hospital insurance would continue to be tax deductible. The medical expenses incurred by private patients will, of course, attract Medibank medical benefits. Mr. Banfield said that the immediate advantages of the hospital agreement to the people of South Australia were obvious but that very significant benefits would also flow to other State Government services as well. "The significance of the agreement to the Government is that the very heavy budgetary burden of running this State's public hospital system will now be more equitably shared with the Australian Government," Mr. Banfield said.

"The running costs of the South Australian public and subsidised hospitals for the next financial year are estimated at some \$150 000 000. Under the agreement these costs will be shared and we will be able to apply the \$20 000 000 we save not only to improve our hospitals but to upgrade other community services as well. Apart from the financial advantages, the agreement will also mean that planning for future hospital services in South Australia can now

proceed on a more rational basis, in the knowledge that more adequate funding than has been available in the past can be applied." Mr. Hayden said that care would be taken in the public information campaign on Medibank to point out that people in South Australia and other States who might wish to have private treatment in hospitals rather than free standard-ward treatment should continue their private hospital insurance. There would also be a need to point out to people in the non-co-operating States that they would need to continue to insure for all hospital treatment.

The hospital lines in the Budget provide for expenditure of about \$144 000 000. Under the heading "Miscellaneous" the sum of \$45 000 000 is to be spent by the Hospitals Department. The total hospital budget in South Australia will approximate \$190 000 000. In the total health budget about \$6 000 000 or \$7 000 000 is to be expended on public health. The hospital component of the health budget comprises about \$190 000 000 compared with the \$125 000 000 allocated in the past financial year.

On the revenue side of the hospital operation, the Commonwealth Government's share of the net operating costs is estimated to be \$46 000 000. Under "Medibank bed day receipts" the sum of \$13 000 000 is allocated. There is to be a total contribution of \$190 000 000 in this financial year, with a contribution by the Commonwealth Government for the running of those hospitals of about \$59 000 000. Under the line "Miscellaneous", provision is made for the expenditure of \$33 000 000 on current maintenance. I have tried to analyse all these figures, but the whole presentation of the hospital lines appears to be vague. I assume that the vagueness is the result of difficulties between the Commonwealth Government and State Government in relation to Medibank moneys. I do not refer to difficulties involving moneys coming to the State, but I refer to difficulties involved in arranging the various lines of the Budget.

The provision of hospital services in South Australia will cost the South Australian taxpayer not less than \$130 000 000. By referring to the original press release made by the Ministers, one can see that the total cost of health services in South Australia was to be \$150 000 000. That was the case when the Medibank agreement was presented. There was also going to be the sum of \$20 000 000, which could be directed to other community health operations in South Australia. In examining the figures, the actual cost of the State Budget will be much higher than was expected, especially in view of the continuing pressure that will be exerted by the Commonwealth Treasurer, because his actual commitment will be much greater than was expected. The financial pressure will be returned to the State Treasury.

About all that can be achieved in South Australia will be an increasing commitment by the State Treasury to hospital services in South Australia and, in my opinion, there will be no increase in standard. Indeed, I am willing to say that we will see a decline in hospital standards in South Australia as the Commonwealth Government assumes a greater responsibility in State policies through the Medibank scheme. I have no doubt that, once the Commonwealth Government feels the cold hand of Treasury on its emotional ideas about the provision of hospital services in Australia, we will see a decline in services, and an increasing financial burden on State Treasury to meet that commitment. We are becoming more and more tied to the Commonwealth Government in every way. I have no doubt that we will be entitled to Commonwealth—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Did you go to the Constitution Convention? Why didn't you not jump up and say that

we should secede from the Commonwealth? It's a foreign country from the way you speak.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If the Hon. Mr. Foster will be a little patient I will comment on that.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You're already on record as saying that you have no interest in it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Malcolm Fraser is going to cut us right off.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If honourable members continue their interjections I may have more to say about the convention than they have bargained for.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You do that; we'll be glad to hear it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the Budget speech the Minister of Health indicated that the Government's estimates concerning hospitals, because of the inability to accurately forecast, were subject to variation. This is fair comment, because I have found it extremely difficult to understand the health lines in this Budget. However, I believe that my analysis is correct, in that the Commonwealth Government's contribution will be about \$59 000 000 to the actual running costs of hospitals. The cost to this State, from the Government's estimates, will be about \$130 000 000 a year. I make the point again that I believe that this is a rough "guesstimate" that the Government has made. I predict that its impact on the State Budget will be much higher than the Government has forecast. The last point on this Budget which I wish to make (there are many matters one could speak on in a Budget, but other honourable members will speak on those matters because the debate was not concluded fully in another place), may require your indulgence, Mr. President, and I am sure that I will have the indulgence of the Hon. Mr. Foster. This debate is as good a time as any to refer to this matter.

One could say certain things if one could weave some thoughts regarding the line "Attorney-General—Miscellaneous". Two years ago, a Constitution Convention was established, South Australia having played a not insignificant part in its establishment. With other members of State delegations, South Australia's members went to Sydney to attend the first plenary session. I remember the words of the Governor-General at that time: he said something along the lines that the concept of a Constitution Convention could be either an outstanding success or a monumental flop. At the first plenary session, areas of the Constitution that needed examination were identified. These matters were then referred to the four standing committees, A, B, C and D committees, for report to the next plenary session.

Many State and Commonwealth members of Parliament have since then been working on Constitution Convention standing committees, by which much work has been done. I refer not only to the tremendous amount of work that has been done but also to the success of most of the standing committees (as you, Sir, know, some have not fulfilled their allotted functions). It is a credit to the people who worked together with goodwill to reach a consensus of opinion on many controversial matters. In that context, they have made much headway in making recommendations to the plenary session.

In June, the concept of the Constitution Convention seemed to be in jeopardy because of the expressed attitude of the Commonwealth delegations. The executive of the Constitution Convention (including Eric Willis from New

South Wales, Doug Lowe from Tasmania, and Mr. Hodges from Queensland) waited on the Prime Minister and, although I did not agree with the Prime Minister's approach at that time, we accepted his terms so that the convention could proceed. In the meantime, unfortunately, other States, beginning with Queensland, indicated that they would not be attending the most recent plenary session. Because of that attitude, beginning with that in Queensland—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You'd have much more than that to say about that if it had been a Labor State that adopted that altitude.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The viewpoint expressed to me from this State at one time was that South Australia should also withdraw. However, I put the view that South Australia should not withdraw from the convention. It was my view that, even if other people withdrew, South Australia should take every step possible to keep the convention and the standing committees alive and operating. I congratulate this Parliament on continuing with the appointment of an official delegation to the Constitution Convention, even though it was a limited delegation (we did not appoint a full delegation from this Parliament). I was pleased, however, that at least a delegation from this Parliament attended the convention. I should like particularly to congratulate Bruce Eastick on the work he did. I know that the Chief Secretary will not mind my doing this, even though the Chief Secretary was the leader of the delegation. Indeed, he has been on the executive for some time, and before and during the recent plenary session he was the executive member from the State delegation. I am sure the Chief Secretary would agree with me that Bruce Eastick's work was of a high standard.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: We agree: you shouldn't have sacked him.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I had no say in that.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Yes, you did.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That has little to do with what I am saying.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: They are blaming you, anyway.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am saying that Bruce Eastick's work deserves commendation, and I am certain that the Chief Secretary would support me in this respect. In passing, I state that the press has in other States recognised the constructive work of the whole South Australian delegation and has referred particularly to Bruce Eastick's work. I wholeheartedly support that view.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You'll want Bruce back soon, the way Tonkin is going.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I believe that, if we are to achieve rational changes in our Constitution, there is a pressing need for this convention to continue in existence and to succeed. Recently, the Hon. Mr. Foster referred in the Council to the 1958 report of a Commonwealth committee dealing with the Constitution. I have read that report, and the standing committee of which I have been a member has been right through it with a fine tooth comb. The 1958 committee's document is a valuable one which is not concurred in completely by most people at the State level because it takes the view of the centralist Administration.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: No, it doesn't.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It does.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Not entirely.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Regarding many matters, there is a difference between this convention and the recommendations of the 1958 Commonwealth committee that examined this matter and made recommendations. In many areas there is a difference of opinion. However, on the standing committee we are reaching a consensus of opinion, because the States and the Commonwealth people are working together. This is important if we are to see rational constitutional change in Australia.

In any discussions on changes to the Commonwealth Constitution, it is important that the States' viewpoint be heard and debated alongside the Commonwealth one. If the only means of changing the Commonwealth Constitution is occasionally the Commonwealth Parliament's determining to go to referendum, there will be little chance of success, as the Commonwealth viewpoint is not necessarily that of the rest of the units of Federation.

The recent plenary session was successful because of the efforts of the Northern Territory, Tasmanian and South Australian delegations. I sincerely hope that those people who have for some time been working on the Constitution Convention, and the standing committees, will continue to work and that further consensus can be achieved at the next plenary session in Hobart in 1976. I hope also that the South Australian delegation, which was appointed recently to attend the plenary session, will be appointed permanently and that it will in future meet to discuss all matters coming before the convention and all matters being handled by the standing committees. In that way, the delegation will be able to go to the Constitution Convention having discussed matters amongst all members of this Parliament.

Tasmania has been doing this. Those people who went to the convention, including those who worked on the standing committees, could not but be impressed by the manner in which Tasmania approached this whole matter with its delegation. I hope that the position in the Northern Territory and Tasmania can be repeated here, where the appointed delegation can constantly meet and examine the work of the standing committees so that, when they go to the plenary session in Hobart, they will be armed and informed in relation to discussions on these standing committees. I hope that it is an on-going convention, meeting regularly, and reaching a consensus of opinion. I believe in that way it can do a tremendous amount for the concept of federation in Australia.

I take it a shade further. I know I am probably straying from a Budget speech, but this is related to it. I suggest that delegates to the convention should be given official and permanent recognition, and should be in the same position as other Parliamentary committees. I go so far as to say that a chairman of that delegation should be appointed and the delegation should meet regularly; also, that it should be a paid committee of this Parliament, because there is a tremendous amount of work to be done on the Commonwealth Constitution in sifting through the information available.

I suggest to the Government that this matter be examined by the Government in the context both of appointing this as a permanent delegation properly elected annually and of making it a paid Parliamentary committee. This may appear to be a radical approach but such a paid committee would, I believe, produce a delegation from this Parliament that could take a continuing and leading role in Constitution Conventions of the future and assist to overcome the tendency for such conventions to descend purely to Party politics or a direct Federal-State confrontation, which is

not in the best interests of constitutional reform in Australia.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Neither were the absences of last week.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have already mentioned that I did not support the views of Queensland or of the other States; nor did I support the original viewpoint expressed to me in this Parliament, that this State should not attend because the other States were not attending. I took a totally different view. The convention began in a position where it was under threat the whole time. I have no hesitation in saying it was the delegations from South Australia and Tasmania that rescued the Constitution Convention from the brink of self-destruction. I believe that point is now past; the Constitution Convention from now on can continue, and the South Australian and Tasmanian delegations can take most of the credit for rescuing the convention from dying a natural death.

With those few remarks, I support the Bill. I press the convention delegation to meet regularly, even though it is not a paid committee. If this Government examines this matter, it will see there may be some benefits from my approach to this. I believe this will be a committee with important work to do of understanding not only the viewpoint of the various Parties but also the viewpoint that varies from State to State on many matters.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Much of what you are saying was connected with that previous review to which you referred.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree with what the honourable member is saying, but I make the point to him that the viewpoint expressed in the 1958 document he quoted is a Canberra viewpoint only.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Oh, no!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is not necessarily the viewpoint of the rest of the States. This is still a federation. The Commonwealth Constitution is not the child of the Commonwealth Parliament alone: it belongs to every person in this country and, equally, to every person who calls himself a South Australian. In that way it is necessary that, if there is to be constitutional change, it must be done on the basis of co-operation and reaching a consensus of opinion among Commonwealth and State delegates, irrespective of which Party they happen to represent in Parliament. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The importance of this measure can be gauged by the fact that both the receipts and expenditure in the Budget are estimated to exceed \$1 000 000 000 in this current financial year. If we pause and reflect upon sums of that size, we can appreciate fully the vast expenditure in the document before us: the vast expenditure involved in the Bill and the importance of this Budget debate in Parliament. The Bill must be approved by Parliament. That means, of course, it must be approved by both Houses. It was passed, if we can recall seeing reports in the press, in rather stormy circumstances in another place, and it is now before us for approval.

First, I express my appreciation to the senior officers involved in preparing the Budget. I think the senior officers in the Treasury Department and other departments involved deserve high commendation for the splendid service which they provided in preparing this document and, of course, which they provide in their dedicated work in the interests of South Australia. Also, I compliment the Auditor-General on his report and the officers who co-operated with him in its preparation. The Auditor-General's Report is, of course, closely related to this debate.

I deal with the responsibilities of this Council towards the Budget. I believe this Council has a clear duty to do everything possible to ensure that adequate and responsible debate on this Budget takes place within Parliament. The principal place for debate on this Bill, which is a money Bill, is another place. We in this Council cannot amend a Bill of this kind: we can only suggest amendments. Therefore, I believe that a full and adequate debate should take place in the other place on a measure of this kind.

I believe, too, that, if this Council is satisfied that such an adequate and responsible debate has not taken place, it should act to do what it can to remedy that serious failing. Honourable members will have read of what happened in another place regarding the debate on this Bill. During the debate, the Government prevented detailed questioning by applying the gag. The guillotine was used for the first time in the history of the South Australian Parliament. I stress as forcibly as possible that the Budget debate is the most important debate in the whole annual Parliamentary calendar.

We have read in the press that the Treasurer, the Leader of the Opposition, and some other members were attending an official dinner elsewhere at the time that the guillotine was applied. When the message was flashed to the dinner as to what was occurring in Parliament House, the Leader of the Opposition in another place returned to the House immediately, and later in the evening the Treasurer also returned. The Treasurer has subsequently announced in the press that he would be willing to apply the guillotine again in the future.

Returning to this Council's responsibility in this situation, I canvass the suggestion, for honourable members to consider, that this Bill should be returned to the other place with a message that full and detailed questioning of its provisions line by line should be completed in the other place; such full debate should commence at the point at which the guillotine was applied, and the debate should continue until each line has come under the scrutiny of the people's representatives in another place in the Committee stage. The Government cannot claim that the question of urgency arises in regard to this Council's dealing with this measure: that question does not arise at all, because honourable members will recall that this Council did not sit last week.

Also, we can recall the Government's announcement about the long recess that it is planning for Parliament. If the Bill was returned to another place in the manner that I have suggested, the Government would have two alternatives. First, it could abide by this Council's wishes and complete the debate. That action will be acclaimed by South Australians, many of whom, judging by representations that have been made to me, have been upset by the application of the guillotine in the other place. The request for the other place to consider the measure fully would come from this Council, and let us remember that the majority of members of this Council are now elected by full franchise; after the next election, all members of this Council will be elected under that system. Because of the change to full franchise, this Council's responsibilities are in some ways changed, too. So, an action of this kind in seeking a full debate in another place on this Bill would be fully justified.

The second alternative that the Government would have would be to take no action at all and to take no notice whatever of a return of this Bill. In that case, the Bill would come back to this place, which could then deal with it as honourable members thought best. This Council could pass the Bill or reject it. Of course, the rejection

of the Bill would mean that Parliament rejected Supply, and the inevitable consequence to the Government would follow.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You are not in Canberra now.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No; I am talking about the serious situation with which this Parliament is confronted, because of the Government's action in another place.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris would not agree to that course of action. He committed himself in Question Time two weeks ago.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Each member on this side makes his own review and makes up his own mind.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What took place at the Party meeting this morning?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the Party meeting this morning, no agreements were made as to how groups of members on this side would vote on this Bill. Rejection of the Bill in the circumstances that I have described would have majority support among the public at large. I believe that the public is upset by the action of the Government in applying the guillotine in another place in regard to this most important Bill. Therefore, honourable members should consider a proposal of this kind, so that the Government's error in applying the guillotine can be rectified and so that full and proper debate can transpire in another place on this Bill.

Alternatively, if the Government has become so dictatorial that it is unwilling to allow the people's representatives to debate fully a Bill of this kind, the Government must face the inevitable consequences. The Government ought to be given the opportunity to rectify its error and to allow in future the debate which I believe should have continued on the night that the guillotine was applied.

I am particularly concerned about increases in expenditure in the Premier's Department. For example, Parliamentary Paper No. 9 shows that, whereas \$721 748 was actually spent in the last financial year in connection with salaries, wages and related payments associated with "Policy Division, administrative, Committee Secretariat, Economic Intelligence Unit, publicity and clerical staff", \$831 200 is provided for this financial year. The actual payment in the previous financial year was considerably more than the \$654 057 voted, so we can expect that this year again the expenditure will exceed the amount appropriated. The amount will be getting near \$1 000 000, if last year's situation is used as a guide to guess the final figure actually to be spent in the coming year. Apart from that amount of almost \$1 000 000, what is involved in the words I have just read out? What do we mean by the Policy Division of the Premier's Department? Policy for what? '

The Hon. N. K. Foster: The State.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Policy for whose benefit?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: The State, the people.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am told that it is the State's policy and the people's policy. Let us take those points separately. What is the policy of the State? The policy referred to is the Government's policy; the Government's policy is the Government Party's policy; the Government Party's policy is laid down in the Australian Labor Party's conferences, meetings, and so on. I have no quibble with that.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The public supported us.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: But not by very much, if we look at the percentages.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You didn't get much support.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Take those elected in this Chamber as compared with the combined total of Liberal members elected—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But you have two policies.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Never mind. What work is done by the Policy Division? By our voting for this Bill, the people's money is being spent on this work, and I should like to know more of the work done and of the true meaning of the phrase "Policy Division". Then we come to "Administrative, Committee Secretariat, Economic Intelligence Unit, publicity, and clerical staff". Let us look at the matter of publicity. For whose benefit is the people's money being spent in this connection? I think, quite frankly, that it is to publicise the Premier and the Government, if we get down to the bare bones of it.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Tourism. Didn't you see T.D.T. last night, with the Murray River and the paddle steamer?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I did not see the programme, but I shall take up the interjection. People are asking whether the appearance of the Premier in films publicising tourism in South Australia will be an advantage or a disadvantage to the State. Those films are shown in other States.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Business men say that Don Dunstan is the most popular Premier in Australia.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: It is the best-run State.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Do not make me laugh.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Your own people have said that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Personally, I am opposed to the Premier of this State (irrespective of whom the Premier might be) taking part in departmental films produced and circulated to benefit tourism and the revenue of the State. That is what the Tourist Bureau film is about. It is circulating in other States to attract tourists to South Australia. Once a Premier gets involved in such film making—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He was asked to.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He did it for nothing.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not dealing with the question of remuneration, but of whether tourism in South Australia will benefit as a result of such films. My personal view is that it will not. I think that, when they see these films, people in other States will not be attracted to South Australia.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: People are ringing on the telephone congratulating him.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They are all his supporters. I think that this is highly improper, and I think it could be disadvantageous to the Tourist Bureau and to the tourist industry in this State. I turn now to the reference to "publicity", for which, by my vote in this debate, I am being asked to appropriate the people's money. For what purpose is this publicity intended?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: He was not paid for it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister is still on the other matter. He has not been back in the Chamber very long, so I must refer him to page 13 of Parliamentary Paper 9 and the \$831 000 being appropriated under this general heading. If we are to appropriate money for the Premier's publicity, or for publicity within his department, we should have more details of expenditure.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Part of it is to provide for telling ailing businesses how they can rip money off the Government.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not follow the point. An item of this kind should be set out in great detail and, before we approve expenditure, we should be given a full explanation of what is spent on publicity within the Premier's Department, how such money is being spent altogether, and what benefits are to accrue, in the estimation of this Government.

I turn now to the question of overseas trips. On page 14 is an item in relation to overseas visits of the Premier and officers, with an appropriation of \$50 000 being sought in the current year, expenditure during the last year being \$19 582. Further down, in the Development Division, still within the Premier's Department, we see another item to cater for overseas visits of Minister, Minister's wife (where approved), and officers, with an appropriation sought of \$20 000. The expenditure last year on this item was \$25 101. In aggregate, therefore, Parliament is being asked to appropriate \$70 000 for overseas visits of the Premier and officers of his department in the current year. One has no objection to an occasional overseas trip by a Minister where some obvious benefit is to be gained, and it is quite proper for Ministers, once they have learnt their job, to gain experience of this kind. However, \$70 000 is a bit over the fence.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Does that include the Leader of the Opposition?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Bruce Eastick didn't pay his own fare or that of his wife.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is not involved here. I cannot see any provision for the Leader of the Opposition in the current year. I am talking about the sum of \$70 000 of the people's money which the Government is asking Parliament to approve for trips in this current year. I do not know of any trips that have already been taken, and a quarter of the year has already passed; there are only nine months to go before the year ends. Just where in the world will the Minister be flying to?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you remember seeing eight Liberals in London?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There have never been eight Liberals in London.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Perhaps it was nine—one more went every time another went away.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Who is expected to undertake overseas visits and spend this sort of money? What overseas trips does the Treasurer expect to undertake in this financial year? What is the purpose of such visits?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: He has to go to Penang, doesn't he?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am coming to Penang in a moment, and the Minister had better get well armed to defend himself in relation to Penang. Leaving Penang for a moment, I believe that this is an unnecessary sum to be spent at a time when restraint is necessary, and when many people are having to tighten their belts. We want to see some leadership and an example of restraint being set by the Treasurer and his officers in regard to such expenditure.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: What do the people see? They see the Premier and the Government asking Parliament to approve the expenditure of \$70 000. That is the

highest figure we have ever been asked to approve for this department for oversea trips in any one year. We are breaking all records, and this is contrary to good management and to what people expect.

Regarding Penang, but still dealing with the Premier's Department, I point out that an appropriation of \$177 000 is being sought this financial year for a return visit to Penang and expenses in connection therewith. As I have said previously, the whole association that the Government has developed with Penang has got completely out of hand. It started with a most acceptable sister city relationship between Adelaide and Penang through the historic association in both cities of Colonel William Light. That was a commendable project; certainly the city of Adelaide deserves commendation for developing it.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: We are now making ourselves a laughing stock.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: How?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Unbeknown to the Government, when the Penang people were invited here last time, a Government official was sent out to make his own confidential observations about how South Australia undertook the celebrations and spent funds associated with them. The official had to make a confidential report to the Penang Government about how things went, and his report was not favourable. I understand that he reported back that the people were not much involved in the celebrations.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Have you a copy of the report?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Never mind about that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You are talking a lot of nonsense. You are a stirrer.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: What I am saying is that under Labor Government leadership a privileged few were given the opportunity to participate in those celebrations, but the South Australian Government did not spend funds on that promotion in such a way that many people were able to know much about what was going on.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It's all right to spend millions when you kill people in that area, but when people want to be friends, the honourable member has some objections. I do not remember complaints about the slaughter in that area. For God's sake, get your priorities right.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr. Foster is completely off beam.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You are going crook about a relationship between two cities.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am referring to the line in the Budget asking Parliament to approve the expenditure of \$177 000. On what will this money be spent? What will be the advantages of this expenditure?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What are the disadvantages?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: What is going on between this Government and Penang is amounting to a scandal and, if anyone should be interested in this subject, it is the Hon. Mr. Foster, because he has heard in this Council, as a result of questions raised by the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw (and I congratulate him for raising them), how the organisation with which the South Australian Government has combined in a business operation employs labour in that country at just over \$1 a day.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is the wage structure of the country.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have not got to the core of the argument. The Minister should keep calm for a moment. What will happen to the products manufactured

by the partners of the South Australian Government in Penang using cheap labour? We heard the Government say today that none of these goods will come to South Australia, but that is a lot of rubbish. What will happen is that the labour will be used (and the South Australian Government is a partner in the project) to manufacture goods for export, and those goods will come on to the South Australian market at a time when unemployment is high in this State. When this occurs, what will happen to the people whom honourable members opposite are supposed to represent? Will they go and slap the Treasurer on the back and tell him what a great fellow he is for what he has done in Penang? Will members opposite vote for the allocation of \$177 000 to weld this kind of operation together and to ensure that manufactured goods ultimately do come to this State against the interests of the working people of South Australia? Is that what honourable members opposite want?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What sort of manufactured goods are you talking about?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Goods used by the building industry: all kinds of panels, and similar goods.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: They are not coming into South Australia.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They have not come yet, and the Government believes that they will not come. What will happen if there is stock left over in Penang that cannot be sold and pressure is put on the South Australian Government by its partner in the Penang company?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Your merchants in this city have been importing prefabricated goods for years, and you should know that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Does the honourable member favour that?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I am not saying whether I favour it or not, but I am saying that your captains of industry have exploited people for years.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Didn't they—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order, especially interjections in reply to interjections. I ask honourable members to be a little more patient, and the Hon. Mr. Hill to resume his speech.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am dealing with the line in which Parliament is asked to appropriate \$177 000 in this financial year for a return visit to Penang. One of the main features in this relationship, which is being cemented with Penang, is the fact that the South Australian Government has formed a company in partnership with Malaysian interests to develop industry in Malaysia. I am making the point that the principal trading partner that the South Australian Government has accepted pays its labour especially low rates, and the combined project will produce manufactured goods in Malaysia at low cost. There is no doubt in my mind what this will mean. Ultimately, these cheap goods will come on the South Australian market, which could have a disastrous effect on this State's industry and, more important, on its labour force.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I haven't heard you protesting about John Martin's importing gear from Taiwan.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This is the point that I am trying to make, particularly to the Hon. Mr. Foster. I want to know what he is going to do about making a thorough check within his own Party regarding what is happening. If the honourable member wants to be as influential as he can be in this matter, now is the time for him to show his good faith and tell his Premier and

the Government of which he is a member that they are going too far. As the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw said, we are becoming a laughing stock in this whole matter. Here is the place and now is the time—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: How do you know that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: One honourable member has been there in only the last few weeks.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: How does he know?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Because he has had discussions. I am amazed that I have not had more response from members opposite regarding the prospect of unemployment being drastically affected by this Government's actions. Let us get right down to the bare facts: what do Government members think—

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Just send a non-unionist up there with Ted Chapman.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This is a serious matter, not a joking matter. It is amazing, to me, that Parliament is prepared to allocate a sum of this proportion simply to cement an arrangement with a country in which the prospect to which I have referred is real indeed.

Finally, regarding the Premier's Department line, I refer to grants and provisions for the arts. It is indeed difficult for honourable members to gain much information simply from this line. Although honourable members want to know who are the principal recipients of these grants, we are not given that information in this document.

We are being asked to approve expenditure of \$1 727 400, compared to actual payments last year of \$1 363 340. I do not have any objections to that increase. I want to make that clear. However, I should like to know to whom this money is being granted. If there is a long list of recipients who are receiving only small amounts, I am not concerned with that detail. However, it seems to me to be cockeyed when one must go to this year's Auditor-General's Report to ascertain who were the principal recipients of grants last year. That is what one must do in the present circumstances. One should not have to wait a year to ascertain who were the principal recipients of grants.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why don't you just ask the Treasurer?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is what I am doing, and I hope that at the conclusion of the debate I receive replies to my questions from the Chief Secretary, as Leader of the Government in the Council. I notice from the Auditor-General's Report a list of the main recipients of grants last year. There are some interesting people amongst them. I refer, for instance, to Theatre 62, whose grant increased 100 per cent from \$50 000 to \$100 000 last year. I take only that one example. I believe that Parliament should know who are the principal recipients of these grants, and I ask whether that information could be made available.

Also regarding the Auditor-General's Report, I am concerned about the criticisms he has been making (and these criticisms have been made for years in relation to some departments) of the accounting procedures and other office accounting work within the Public Service. When raising this matter, I am not reflecting on the Public Service, as I believe the Ministers themselves must accept this responsibility. One such criticism concerns the Hospitals Department. I ask the Minister of Health whether he is willing to have this matter closely investigated and to assure the Council that the matter will be corrected before the year is out.

We are dealing with a department regarding which much expenditure is involved, as honourable members can see from the schedule attached to the Bill. In his most recent report, under the heading "Budgetary control", the Auditor-General said, regarding the Hospitals Department:

In my 1974 report I drew attention to the need for stricter control of staff establishments, improved reporting and cost comparisons between hospitals. In April, 1975, a further report was made to the department in which was emphasised the need for staff establishments to be properly formulated so that more meaningful estimates could be prepared against which actual performance could be measured. The department has accepted the need for such establishments and proposes to appoint a manpower committee to uniformly assess and recommend establishments, rosters, etc., for each hospital. On June 5, 1975, another report was forwarded to the department on budgetary control over services and supplies pointing out the need for written reporting giving reasons or causes of variations from budget and for cost comparisons between hospitals.

Then, under the heading "Internal Audit and Control", the Auditor-General gives a further explanation, and concludes:

It is essential that action be taken to review departmental procedures and implement effective internal audit.

These are serious matters, and I ask the Minister in charge of that department whether he can assure me that the problems raised by the Auditor-General (who, I remind honourable members, is the watch-dog of the State's accounts) can be dealt with to his satisfaction.

The only other department to which I refer (and I do so because this is not the first time that I have raised the matter in the Council) is the Lands Department. I raised this matter with the Hon. Mr. Kneebone when he was Minister and I recall that that gentleman sought a report and brought it down to the Council. I am sure he did his best to put the position right. The Lands Department now has a new Minister.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And a good one, too.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is so, a very good one. I am pleased to acknowledge that. Regarding the Lands Department, under the heading "Weaknesses in Accounting Activities", the Auditor-General said:

It was necessary again during the year to draw the department's attention to unsatisfactory aspects of its accounting work. Internal checking procedures which continued to be inadequate included control of cash receipts and sundry debtors (raisings and review of outstandings). Leave records were still unsatisfactory. Payment of accounts was again criticised for failure to follow approved procedures resulting in incorrect payments.

I ask the Minister of Lands to have a close look at this matter. If he looks back to the Auditor-General's reports in the last few years, he will find that this sort of criticism has been continuing. I really think that the people who send us here expect honourable members to ensure that faults that are outlined by the Auditor-General are put right. I should like to know of any plans the Minister has to see that the shortcomings that have been pointed out in his department are corrected soon.

The next matter I raise deals with the railways takeover by the Commonwealth. I was surprised to read in the Auditor-General's Report on page 9, a matter relative to the \$10 000 000, which was the amount payable by the Commonwealth to the State as part of this deal for the purpose of assisting the State's budgetary position generally. Honourable members will recall that it was the only really new money the State received in the transaction to hand over its assets within the railways, which were conservatively valued at \$150 000 000. However, the \$10 000 000 was part of the transaction and it was received by the State.

I am sure most honourable members thought that was the end of that, that the \$10 000 000 could be put safely away in the Treasury as revenue and that it assisted in the figures brought forward for this debate by the Treasurer. But, on page 9, the Auditor-General says under the heading "Consolidated Revenue Account":

The amount referred to (1) above—the \$10 000 000—

shall be repaid by the State to Australia at the request of the Australian Treasurer if he is satisfied that there is good reason to believe that the transfer of the State's non-metropolitan railways system to the Australian Government will not take place before December 31, 1975.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He thinks it's definite.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have good reason to believe it will not take place before December 31, 1975. In fact, from the information I have, although it is hoped it will take place mid-year, some estimates are that it will not take place until December 31, 1976. This State unbeknown to me (and, I venture to say, unbeknown to most honourable members in this place) can be called on to repay that \$10 000 000.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Labor won't do that but the Liberals would; I assure you of that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They say they will not do that sort of thing. I point out to the Hon. Mr. Dunford that Australian Treasurers are not always of that ilk. They approach their business in keeping with agreements.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: A sum of \$10 000 000 wouldn't help them much, anyway.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It certainly would affect the financial situation of this State if it had to be taken out of our Revenue Account. Not only is the \$10 000 000 involved, but later the Auditor-General's Report states that "interest shall be payable by the State". I am not suggesting that this can come about, but I am suggesting that that kind of information certainly was not known at the time of the debate on the agreement. It was not disclosed, I am quite sure, by the Government, and here in this Council we have to wait until we get the Auditor-General's Report to find out these important matters.

Can the Government say when it expects this transfer to take place, on present estimates? If that estimate is after December 31, 1975, can the Government say whether it has had any negotiations with Canberra for an extension (a very important extension, I suggest) of this agreement? This State does not want to be confronted with the situation of having to repay \$10 000 000, being, as I pointed out a moment ago, the only new money received for the whole transfer of the non-metropolitan railways service.

The last point I make concerns the motor vessel *Troubridge*, which comes under the line dealing with the Highways Department. The Auditor-General pointed out last year that the *Troubridge* operations ended with a deficit of \$546 000 and that no depreciation or general administrative costs had been taken into account. The Hon. Mr. Blevins would know that depreciation on sea-going vessels of this kind can be considerable, and obsolescence can come into calculations, too.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What about the sum of \$6 000 000 that you gave to the Adelaide Steamship Company when you were Minister? Be honest about it!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We had to provide transport for the Kangaroo Island people, for whom we on this side of the Council have a high respect. The only means

by which we could provide those people with transport was to subsidise the private enterprise venture.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: The company threatened to take the vessel off the run.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No; it did not do that.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Yes, it did.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The company pointed out its financial difficulties, which must have been obvious to the Minister. Even now, we are running the operation at a deficit of more than \$500 000, without taking into account items that private enterprise must take into account, such as depreciation and administrative costs. The question I want to pose is this: what is the Government doing about the inquiry that was conducted for several years in connection with the possibility of implementing a ferry service across Backstairs Passage from a point near Cape Jervis to a point near Penneshaw?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The *Troubridge* is all right.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member can say that, but the people must find \$500 000 every year. They might not have to find that sum if a ferry service was implemented along the lines suggested by the committee that inquired into the matter.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Wouldn't the Adelaide Steamship Company do it, if it was profitable?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Honourable members opposite are so touchy that they are not adopting a responsible attitude. I am trying to canvass the possibility of saving the State much money and providing an improved public transport system. Will the Government tell me whether it is continuing with the plans that have been considered by the committee and by departmental officers for implementing a new ferry service, which I believe would be of even greater advantage to the tourist industry than are the present transport arrangements? With a rapid turn-around across Backstairs Passage, the deficit could be reduced. In all good faith I ask the Government whether it will investigate this matter again.

In conclusion, I point out that this Council ought to try to do something about the scandalous state of affairs that arose through the Government's use of the guillotine during the Budget debate in another place. This Council ought to try to put that position right. I repeat that the Estimates do not provide sufficient details for honourable members, particularly in connection with allocations of \$1 000 000 or more.

Further, I am very concerned about the manner in which the Government is spending money in connection with the Return to Penang Week, because I do not think this State can afford expenditure of that kind at this time. I trust that the Government will take account of the Auditor-General's criticism of Government accounts. Further, the Government should investigate the possibility of this State's having to give back the only \$10 000 000 it has received in connection with the railways. I again ask that the question of sea transport to Kangaroo Island be further investigated.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I hope the Hon. Mr. Hill does not leave the Chamber, because, although I have heard some speeches in my short Parliamentary career that have bordered on the ridiculous, I do not think I have ever heard a speech given by anyone, apart from the honourable member, in any legislative body that makes such criticisms in 1975; no doubt such criticisms were made at the turn of the century. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has referred to the Constitution Convention. He said that

there was too much centralism in the 1958 report of the then Constitution Committee, which had been set up before that year.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has a turn of mind toward such matters which in some ways grudgingly (I use the term "grudgingly" advisedly) deserves some credit. We must take into consideration that his attitude generally is that we cannot have Constitution reform within the terms of the Constitution unless there is no ground given whatever by the States; that is just not possible. One would have expected the Leader to have deduced from the 1958 report, which he said he had gone through with a fine tooth comb, that some of its most important recommendations resulted from much inquiry and spadework by members of all political complexions who were then in the national and State Parliaments.

Sir Alexander Downer and Senator Wright, two members of his own political persuasion, brought down minority reports on some matters raised during that convention, and those matters were the subject of recommendations. The recommendations relating to industrial matters are a classic example. The Leader should refer to the section of the report dealing with the minority report brought down by Sir Alexander Downer, who was a Minister in a Federal Liberal and Country Party Government. The other matter I wish to deal with briefly relates to one of the speeches made here this afternoon. One cannot give chapter and verse, because if one wanted to go through and answer each point more precisely and more correctly one would need to wait until the *Hansard* proofs became available. That advantage is not open to us on the day.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You could seek leave to conclude, and look at *Hansard* tomorrow.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I do not want to do that, because I might find myself on my feet for four hours telling the honourable member how stupid and how ridiculous he was. I do not want to labour the point to that extent, and I shall be content to explode the myth of his argument that the whole of the 1958 recommendations were centralist in their attitude and did not suggest any change along the lines he mentioned. Chapter 19, on page 133, deals with economic powers. The honourable member was talking on economics, talking about the State Budget and the expenditure for the coming 12 months. I thought that, as he was dealing with that section, I should thumb through the report to convince him that he was wrong. This is one of the recommendations of the committee:

980. One of the Parliament's powers, the banking power (Constitution, section 51 (xiii.)), itself was a far less useful power than at Federation because of the growth of specialised financial institutions outside the banking structure.

While that is sinking in a little, the honourable member should remind himself of the history of his Party regarding the Chifley banking legislation in the late 1940's, and the objection of his Party—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What was the name of that Party?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It was under Menzies then. It was a new, up-and-coming, revitalised version of the old U.A.P. after the drag-you-down, knock-you-out sort of argument within its political sphere. It was the Liberal Party of Australia. It was the god-child of Menzies, who was hawked around the Liberal Party branches in Melbourne by a fellow named Holyman, who introduced him during the war years as a man of destiny. The same Holyman was said to have been dragging Malcolm Fraser

around Melbourne, saying, "Twenty years ago I introduced to you a man of destiny. Now I have another, Malcolm Fraser." That was well before he knocked off Billie Snedden. Do not get me wrong on how pure and simple members opposite have been regarding their own political Party.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You must be frightened of Fraser.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am not frightened of Fraser; he has been boundary riding for years. I am not frightened of such a man. Anyone who lives on less than a quarter of a hectare of land in an Australian city or suburb and who would cast a vote for a man owning 10 000 hectares is out of his mind. That is where his interests lie; make no error about that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I think perhaps the Hon. Mr. Hill meant Joe Frazier!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Let me remind the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, whatever else he may be reading, that he should read also the committee's recommendation of the constitutional report in paragraph 981, which states:

The committee further commented, in paragraph 150, that, when the Constitution was drafted, no government in Australia was responsible for the general state of the economy, including the level of employment, stability of the value of the currency and the rate and balance of economic development. It was not until many years after Federation that the achievement of economic understanding had made the factors determining these matters sufficiently clear for governments to take action.

I am making a point, if I can get through to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. If I cannot, the existing Constitution Convention should not be given an indefinite life, as was suggested by him this afternoon. Rather, we should insist that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is incompetent and should come off the convention, because he has not read the previous document that he claims to have gone through with a fine tooth comb to know basically what it was about. Further, the recommendations state:

It was not surprising, in these circumstances, that the Constitution was not concerned with the allocation between the Commonwealth and the States of the powers needed to implement a general economic policy. The committee considered that the Commonwealth now had to discharge a responsibility of government which did not exist when the Constitution was originally framed, namely, to safeguard and promote the economic welfare of the community of Australia.

I could go on and on about the recommendations of that committee, saying that, if this was the attitude displayed by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris at the current convention, I do not think he should be a member of it. I turn briefly now to another matter. Where has the Hon. Mr. Hill gone? He has shot through. In his absence, I shall comment on his bitter criticisms about the expenditure of money, on the passage of this Bill, towards the promotion of relations between South Australia and Penang. Now that he has just returned to the Chamber, I make the point to the honourable gentleman that, so far as I am aware, he has never raised any objection to the many millions of dollars in money and resources squandered by Australia in the South-East Asian area to carry on a diabolical war, to use one of the expressions relating to that war of the late Arthur Calwell. He was proved correct although the Labor Party took a drubbing in 1966 as a result of its insistence that its policies were correct.

The Hon. Mr. Hill raised no objection, and I have not seen him in any rally in this connection, but he is prepared to give voice to all the powers of opposition he can command, saying that we are wrong with this paltry sum of about \$180 000, saying what a terrible thing

it is to spend that much money. He challenged members on this side to justify that expenditure and asked what could be done about the people who will be unemployed and who will go to the wall because we will get building struts and prefabricated timber products coming here, thus denying work for our workers. He does not give a damn about the workers: he could not care less about them. He is merely, primarily, and only concerned with the business sector. His heart should not bleed for them, because if any import industry should be the subject of a real and close investigation it is the timber import industry in Australia.

Douglas Fir timber, commonly known in the timber trade as Oregon, sells out of timber ports in America for a given figure. I do not know the current figure; it is some years since I knew it. During the course of its journey across the Pacific, that timber can change hands five or more times with a mark-up of 10 per cent to benefit business interests in Australia which do not saw, cut, or drive a nail in it, prepare it in any way, shape or form. The honourable member is concerned about the system and about those people, but if he were fair dinkum about what was going to happen to the workers in Australia, why was not his voice raised in protest against the importation of fully made up or knocked down furniture, flogged through the system in this city in the last 10 years or more?

It is all right for Lloyds to make tremendous profits. That company's profit was set out recently in the columns of the *Advertiser*, and members opposite should turn it up. I will not waste my time doing so. However, the profit of that company was increased by much more than 100 per cent. Much of their profit resulted from imported timber and other imported furniture items in which that company specialised. I never heard members opposite raising any objection to that in this Council. Do honourable members opposite and the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw object to the superphosphate bounty on the basis that men such as Malcolm Fraser should not continue to rip off \$50 000 over five years and then say in the Commonwealth Parliament that the bounty should continue?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Did the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw say that?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No, he did not say that. I am saying that to the likes of the honourable member on the front bench. He did not say that any more than the Hon. Mr. Burdett will tell the Council and the people of South Australia that in the area of compulsory insurance in Australia, that is, third party insurance, and in workmen's compensation insurance, men of his profession rip off approximately \$50 000 000 a year, and that the total rip off by businesses amounts to \$200 000 000 a year. Honourable members opposite should not start complaining in this Council about workmen's compensation being too high today because workers are now entitled, if they are injured at work, to receive at least the same as what they would have received if they were at work.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: What is the total rip-off by the employees in Australia?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is the equivalent of their weekly earnings. The burial has just occurred of the man who introduced workmen's compensation to Australia, yet this system was introduced in European countries such as Germany and Great Britain almost 100 years ago. When it was introduced the calamity howlers went abroad saying they would never be able to trade in Great Britain again. That was the type of comment made. That was what was said when Jack. Lang introduced workmen's

compensation in New South Wales. The nation was told that those provisions of widows pensions would turn every woman into a prostitute. Honourable members opposite can think along those lines, and shame on them. I did not hear the Hon. Mr. Hill, or any other honourable member, before I entered this Council or since I came here, condemn John Martin's and other adherents of the Adelaide Club (whether they be members or not) in the golden mile, just back a little from this building.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Not business in the "mall".

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It rhymes with something starting with B, and that is your creation. The fact is that members opposite have not raised their voices in protest against John Martin's, Myer's, and David Jones', who have for years sent abroad people from this State and from Australia to negotiate manufacturing deals on clothing and apparel in Taiwan and other eastern countries for a paltry amount in comparison with the cost of similar items made in Australia. I presume that representatives of those companies then sit around a table and cunningly devise a system of coding and pricing to be withheld from the general public. If one cannot crack those codes one will not know of the 600 per cent rip-off that is made on those articles, yet honourable members opposite do not object to that. The Hon. Mr. Hill, the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris do not object to that.

However, because there is in office a State Labor Government, which seeks to appropriate \$180 000 to be spent in relation to business in Penang, members opposite infer that Government members are starting to go back almost to the days of black birding against those who are not born in this country. Honourable members opposite have said nothing to the contrary and, taking what has been said as their principle, I expect that they believe that it is wrong for one single bale of Australian wool to be exported to Japan or to the spinning mills of the United Kingdom. That is what members opposite obviously mean. They are obviously going back to the old stupidity of the free-trader philosophy.

Honourable members opposite would obviously believe that newsprint pulp should not be imported into Australia. Certainly, that is what they are saying. Refrigerators were pouring into Australia from Spain. They were manufactured in Spain, a cheap labour country, under licence from the captains of industry in America with whom members opposite are tied up. Not one word of protest do I hear. Obviously, that is what honourable members opposite think should take place. What did they do when one organisation was active in South Australia a few years ago? I think that organisation was called Community Aid Abroad, and it was involved with the principle of how we could assist our Asian neighbours.

True, parochialism is a bad disease, and most honourable members suffer from political parochialism in a similar way to the way we suffer from State parochialism and parochialism based on our favourite football team or the school we went to. I can remember students asking questions of members of Parliament about what industries could Australia abandon for the benefit of our near Asian neighbours? The sugar industry immediately comes to mind. However, one cannot uproot all the cane growers and forget the importance of the sugar industry to Queensland. Of course, my heart would bleed for the Colonial Sugar Refinery if that situation were to obtain. I put it to members opposite that Community Aid Abroad was concerned about the way in which it could assist our Asian neighbours.

I now refer to the comments of the Hon. Mr. Hill about that great jewel located south of the two South Australian gulfs. I refer to Kangaroo Island. The Hon. Mr. Hill wants to know why the Government is running *m.v. Troubridge* at a loss. I thought that as a thinking person and as a previous Minister in control of this matter that the honourable member would have inquired into it and into why the State Government has provided a vessel after the private company (Adelaide Steamship Company) was unable to do so. I have much admiration for Jim Felgate, the Chairman of that company. He is one of the few managers for whom I have respect, but he is not always able to convince his board about what is the right thing and what is the wrong thing to do.

I should now like to trace the history of this matter. The *m.v. Karatta* and *m.v. Kopoola* traded with Kangaroo Island for years. Companies which traded in South Australia included Coast Steamship Company and Le Messuriers, and I think that one honourable member opposite is connected with that latter company, although I will not identify him by name. He is associated with the timber industry to which I earlier referred. The fact is that the Adelaide Steamship Company had this vessel laid down as one of the first roll-on ships. It entered the trade about 1960. Before entering the trade the Adelaide Steamship Company bought up road transport and private operators on Kangaroo Island, and it also bought them up on the West Coast of Eyre Peninsula.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Not all of them.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It did eventually. It then introduced the *Troubridge* and had a monopoly. One could trace the whole history of this matter if one wanted to, but time would not suffice. One of the reasons why the *Troubridge* shows a loss is the simple fact that the Government has a responsibility (although this is not appreciated by the Islanders) to provide a service, which it does. However, it does not have a monopoly in this respect.

Honourable members should interest themselves in the percentage of trade that is still carried on with ketches, and weigh that against the loss incurred by the *Troubridge*. They would see that, if the Government was to have, by way of an Act of Parliament, an absolute right to all trade, it would not incur a loss. However, this should not happen in a democratic society.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Would you like to see that?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The honourable member knows damn well that I would not like to see it. We all have a place in this world and a place in the sun. Nowhere else in the community is that right denied more than it is when one business organisation is operating against another. They must either toe the line or get out. If one does not join an association or chamber, one must look out: one will not get one's place in the sun. People are told, "You sell at the mark-up on which we, as suppliers, insist, or you will not get the products to sell." One should not mind much what Stewart Cockburn said in the *Advertiser* recently about small businesses in the community; he told only half the story. Having dealt with that matter, I should like now to conclude on the basis that it is not good enough for Opposition members to come into this Council, as it is so easy for them to do when in Opposition, pick up the various Budget documents, and say, for instance, "The arts are getting this and that."

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I am glad you've got back to the lines.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Leader cannot criticise me. I have not gone off the line to which he referred. Members opposite were demanding answers regarding what was to be done about Malaysia. The Hon. Mr. Laidlaw has been in this Chamber for only a few short weeks and has already taken up the cudgels (as is his right, and I would defend that right, as much as I disagree with his comments) on behalf of big business. He was moaning and crying poverty, yet when one picks up that radical rag, the *Advertiser*, and turns to its more conservative pages, one sees in the business section a good photograph of the honourable member. He posed quite well for that photograph, smiling as he is in it. The honourable member has that look on his face as though he is thinking, "Well, we've got this much profit this year. There's more to come next year." The *Advertiser* report to which I have referred carried the headline, "Johns-Perry pays peak dividend". They are entitled to do that and fiddle the books: they can manipulate the way in which their taxes and dividends are paid and the balance sheet is presented, and so on.

I raise this matter only because of what the Hon. Mr. Hill said regarding what Government members were going to do in relation to putting people out of work. Our minds are a little above the idea that Malaysians ought to be nothing but hewers of wood and carriers of water. I did not hear the honourable member tell the Council who are the faceless companies and men that control our destinies from time to time. I hope that, when the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw participates in this debate, he will tell us more about Bernard-Smith P.D.M. Proprietary Limited and others who are referred to in this morning's *Advertiser* report. Undoubtedly, he will tell me that I did not look far enough and that, if I had looked further on, I would have seen that Lifesavers had made a lower profit. Surely, he will see the hole in that!

Surely, too, we should not be subjected to the type of speeches that have been made in the Council by the two Leaders of the Opposition Party. They, and particularly the Hon. Mr. Hill, have got up on a course of ridicule. Let us hope that the other honourable members will not proceed on that basis but will make much more constructive contributions to the debate.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW secured the adjournment of the debate.

SALARIES ADJUSTMENT (PUBLIC SERVICE AND TEACHERS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill proposes certain amendments (by way of corrective legislation) to the Salaries Adjustment (Public Service and Teachers) Act, 1960. Although that Act has never been amended, this corrective legislation has become necessary, because sections 3 and 4 of the Act depended for their operation on certain provisions of the Public Service Act, 1936-1958 (which has since been repealed by the Public Service Act, 1967), and the Education Act, 1915-1958 (which has since been repealed by the Education Act, 1972). Those sections deal with classification

returns made by the Public Service Board under the repealed Public Service Act, 1936-1958, and with awards made by the Teachers Salaries Board under the repealed Education Act, 1915-1958. They provide authority whereby salaries of officers of the Public Service and teachers can be increased retrospectively and deal with cases where such returns or awards affected officers and teachers who have retired or died between the dates to which the returns or awards have been made retrospective and the dates on which they have come into operation. However, those sections can no longer apply with any degree of certainty to similar cases under the Public Service Act, 1967, and the Education Act, 1972, unless consequential amendments are made to the Salaries Adjustment (Public Service and Teachers) Act, 1960. The Bill accordingly makes those consequential amendments.

The adjustments of amounts referred to in paragraphs (b) and (c) of section 3 (1) of the Salaries Adjustment (Public Service and Teachers) Act, 1960, depend upon directions given under specific provisions of the repealed Acts, but no directions as such are referred to in the new Acts. Moreover, section 3 of that Act would have applied only to cases to which classification returns under the old Public Service Act and awards under the old Education Act were applicable. For instance, under the old Public Service Act, classification returns could have applied to permanent heads who were not in the first division of the Public Service, as it was then constituted, whereas under the present Public Service Act classification returns would not apply to any permanent heads. Clauses 2 and 3 of the Bill eliminate the difficulties that might arise if the Act was republished in its present form. They make the Act more meaningful and bring it into line with the present Public Service Act and Education Act. The amendments proposed by this Bill, if approved by Parliament, will facilitate the consolidation of the Act under the Acts Replication Act, 1967.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (OPTIONAL PREFERENCES)

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REGULATIONS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 872.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There are two very unsatisfactory aspects about this Bill. The first is that it is retrospective legislation which, as honourable members would agree, is something which honourable members always try to avoid introducing and which must, therefore, be reviewed with great caution and care. In this place, where we review legislation in great detail, we must look further than the point of retrospectivity. We must ascertain the reasons for the introduction of the Bill, and I have endeavoured to do that. The other bad feature of the Bill is that it reawakens the whole sorry story of the Myer case at Queenstown.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: If they had been more honest, it would not have happened.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Honourable members who were here at the time will recall that the treatment of the Myer company meted out by the Government was dealt with in Parliament. The Government seemed hell bent

on winning its case against the company, and it used whatever means it had at its disposal to achieve that victory. In the end, the Government won, although it lost the court action. The Government won because it managed to delay the whole issue for so long that rising costs and the establishment of premises by the company's principal competitor, which I believe has been favoured by the Government at every turn, resulted in the Myer organisation being unable to proceed with its project.

Mr. Justice Wells referred to some of the tactics employed by the Government at that time; for example, His Honour pointed out how the Government decided early one afternoon that regulations had to be passed by a meeting of the Executive Council to further the Government's cause. An emergency meeting of the Executive Council was held at 3.45 that afternoon; at that meeting only two Ministers attended with His Excellency, and neither of those Ministers was the Minister involved in planning and development. However, that is history now.

This Council has an obligation to see whether the introduction of this Bill is justified. In his judgment on April 15, 1975, Mr. Justice Wells held that regulations which were finally gazetted and which differed in some respects from the proposed regulations that were exhibited for public examination by councils might not, in effect, be valid. It would appear that the State Planning Authority made recommendations to councils in an endeavour to have building and zoning regulations conform to models and, in the course of negotiations between the State Planning Authority and councils, after those regulations had been publicly exhibited, some alterations were made.

So, in many instances slight differences occurred in the final regulations that were used by councils and on which decisions were made by councils. Some variations occurred in the final regulations, compared with the initial regulations that were exhibited for public examination by the councils. Where such differences occurred, a serious question has arisen that those final regulations might not now be valid; honourable members can easily see the consequences of that.

Challenges can be made in relation to decisions based on such regulations. Of course, the original decisions were made in good faith by councils and were accepted in good faith by ratepayers. However, as a result of the judgment, the whole area has been thrown into doubt.

The second matter on which serious doubt has been raised relates to the situation where some councils have retained their interim development control and at the same time have had regulations gazetted. His Honour in this situation held that decisions made under regulations in those circumstances were not valid. He held that those regulations could not subsist at the same time as interim development control was exercised by councils. Honourable members can therefore see that decisions made by local government based upon such regulations are not now valid.

This means that decisions made by local government in good faith and accepted by ratepayers might now be upset, as a result of this finding. A most serious situation could occur in connection with building operations, if an original decision was upset. In connection with those two situations, the Government has endeavoured to put the position right by introducing this retrospective legislation.

Clause 2, the principal operative clause, provides that the period from the initial time of making the regulations until the passing of this Bill (if it passes) is the period involved in the Bill. The Bill provides that during that period regulations which have been gazetted and which

are different from or in which there is some discrepancy from a recommendation of the authority or a council will not be regarded as invalid. That matter is dealt with in clause 2 (a). The Bill then tackles the second problem, where concurrently interim development control has been running with gazetted regulations. The Bill provides that, in that situation, no suspension of the operation of the regulations shall be held to have taken place by virtue of the fact of interim development control existing.

In relation to paragraph (d), the Government is endeavouring to put right the situation in which His Honour held that such regulations were in suspense while a council operated under interim development control. A serious situation has arisen under those two headings: there is a situation in which decisions have been made in good faith and in which property owners may be affected most adversely if the present situation is allowed to continue. I am pleased to see that the Government has the interests of property owners in mind. From the remarks of a speaker on the other side a few moments ago, one would wonder whether it ever had them in mind at all. Certainly, with this Bill the Government has concerned itself with the interests of property owners who have accepted consent from local government in good faith, and it has concerned itself with the interests of local government which, in turn, has been acting also in good faith.

I have endeavoured to canvass some councils where I believe interim development control might still apply, and I have endeavoured to canvass councils about the whole of the Bill, because I believe they should be informed of this matter. The general feeling from the clerks of such councils is that the councils need the protection the Bill gives them. The interests of the Myer organisation are protected by the latter part of clause 2, in which the Bill states that the interests of the plaintiff in the actions involved (and the plaintiff in those actions was the Myer organisation or the various companies associated with it) are protected within the measure.

Considering all aspects of the Bill, and despite my grave dislike of the whole principle of retrospectivity, I believe the measure should be supported at least to the second reading stage. One council has made representations to me on a problem arising in relation to the measure, and I am endeavouring to shape that problem into an amendment to give the council the protection I think it deserves. That amendment has not yet been completed, because of pressure upon the Parliamentary Counsel.

From my dealings with the various councils, I recognise that it is a great pity that local government does not have an association to which all councils belong, an efficient association circularising council membership with information regarding Bills of this kind introduced in Parliament. To my mind, that is the only satisfactory method by which local government can be informed of such situations when vital legislation is before Parliament. I have been greatly surprised by the lack of knowledge about this Bill in local government, and I sheet the problem home to the fact that local government is not united in its support of the present association and that I have some doubts (and I do not want to be over-critical) as to whether that association, even in its present form, circulates legislation of this kind to its membership.

It might well be that the Local Government Department does not advise the Local Government Association of its intention to introduce legislation of this kind, but I have always firmly believed that all legislation affecting local government should be circulated to the Local Government

Association by the Government of the day so that local government authorities can be informed before the legislation comes to Parliament. I make those remarks as an aside, but the problem has been highlighted by my research and by the contacts I have made with local government regarding the problems this Bill is endeavouring to solve. I suggest that, while the Bill involves retrospective legislation, very serious circumstances can follow, in my view, if the existing situation is not put right. I want to listen to the views of other honourable members on the Bill as the debate proceeds, but I intend to support it at least up to and through the second reading stage.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTRY)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 872.)

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I support this Bill, for the reasons I shall outline. In considering the problem, I took note of how the size and cost of the public sector have increased during the past 10 years, since the end of the Playford Administration. We, as taxpayers, must look to Ministers of the Crown to impose restraints upon any excesses in the public sector, in the same way that shareholders look to boards of directors to do likewise in the private sector.

According to the latest report of the Auditor-General, 78 400 people were employed by South Australian Government departments in June, 1975, an increase of 30 000, or 62 per cent, in 10 years. In money terms, the budgeted expenditure of the South Australian public sector for 1975-76 is \$1 051 000 000, compared to \$258 000 000 10 years previously, an increase of 307 per cent. Furthermore, 46 administrative entities are recognised as departments in the public sector, each department having a permanent head. This incidentally, is more than there is in Canberra or in any of the other Australian States.

Whilst I do not accept that these increases are justified we are faced with the problem of controlling a huge organisation. If the Labor Government believes that it needs a twelfth Minister to carry out the duty of policing the public sector, I am willing to support it. Mr. Millhouse, when opposing this Bill in another place, claimed that it would cost \$100 000 a year to maintain an extra Minister and his entourage. I believe that this figure is somewhat inflated but, even if it does cost that much, it could be worth while if it would lead to firmer control over the Public Service.

It is interesting to compare the South Australian public sector with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, which is the only Australian company of comparable size. At May 31, 1975, B.H.P. had 63 000 employees compared to 78 400 in South Australian Government departments. Its operating costs amounted to \$1 400 000 000 compared to budgeted expenses of \$1 051 000 000 by the South Australian Administration in this financial year. And, to conclude the comparison, B.H.P. has recently increased the number of its board from 11 to 12 directors. I am willing to support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.42 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 1, at 2.15 p.m.