HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 26, 1969.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

STAMP DUTY

Mr. CLARK: Representations have recently been made to me by a constituent concerning the position of an English pensioner living in South Australia who has to pay stamp duty of $2 a year on the certificate of insurance when registering a motor car. My constituent has pointed out that vehicles owned by persons receiving a Commonwealth pension are exempt from this duty but that those in Australia receiving United Kingdom pensions are not entitled to medical and hospital benefits or other special benefits applying to the Australian pensioner if they are not receiving a part pension from the Commonwealth Government. Will the Treasurer investigate this matter to see whether the $2 stamp duty on third party motor vehicle insurance can be remitted in the case of English pensioners living in South Australia?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think that at least part of this matter was considered when the relevant legislation was being examined. As my memory of the detail is not clear, I will re-examine the matter and let the honourable member have a report.

KINDERGARTENS

Mrs. BYRNE: The following article appeared in the *Leader* on September 3:

Changes in the Local Government Act are being sought to allow the Salisbury council to assist with the establishment of kindergartens.

Representatives of three kindergartens and of the Kindergarten Union sought changes at a special meeting held to discuss problems associated with the establishment of kindergartens. The article continues:

Among suggested changes to the Local Government Act was that kindergartens be permitted to be built on council-owned reserves leased to kindergartens.

The Town Clerk, who was present, explained that councils could not lease reserves to non-sporting organizations. He also quoted a section of the Act that gave councils power to grant leases of park lands for the purpose of sports, games, agricultural shows or public recreations. Although the section of the Act was not referred to, I presume he was referring to section 457. This situation has arisen because kindergartens, being for educational purposes, are not specifically referred to in the Act. For that reason it is thought that the use of lands for kindergarten purposes is not consistent with the nature of such lands and the purpose for which they are set apart or dedicated. As a kindergarten committee in my district may now face a similar situation, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government to furnish me with a report on the matter with a view to assisting kindergarten committees in this predicament?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will see what information is available for the honourable member.

ENGLISH COURSE

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about crash courses in English for migrants?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I believe a small item appeared in the *News* about the intention of the Department of Immigration to initiate a crash course in English for migrants. On calling for a report, I have been informed that that department intends to arrange this course for migrants in special categories during January, 1970, if there are enough applicants. I think the idea was that, through the local branch of the department, it was hoped to have an accelerated course for migrants who had special qualifications in professions or trades and who needed English in their jobs.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. HUDSON: On November 11, when I asked the Premier what reserve had been kept by the advisory committee determining wheat quotas against further appeals, he said that he would bring down information that would satisfy my query. When I asked the same question on November 19, the Premier said that he did not have the information. On the following day, information appeared in the *Chronicle* that about 500,000 bushels would be available for redistribution on appeals throughout the whole State. The Premier has now informed me that he has the information for me. I shall be pleased to see whether the information he gives checks with what the *Chronicle* published, and I should appreciate it if future questions of this type could be dealt with more promptly.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have noted the honourable member's rebuke and comment, but I consider them to be out of order. However, I have the information; this is the first time I have seen it. I have not kept it from the honourable member or given any direction that it be kept from him. I am informed that in its deliberations the advisory committee had allowed a contingency reserve of at least 333,000 bushels for the purposes of the review committee. If, after the review committee has completed its task, there still remains wheat in reserve, the quantity remaining will be combined with declared shortfalls and re-allocated to growers who have over-quota wheat.

MANNUM HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to my recent question about work at the Mannum High School?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The request by the Headmaster of the Mannum High School for a steel and iron double-garage type of building to be erected as a sports store has resulted from the proposal to convert the existing sports store in the main buildings to a canteen. These proposals have been considered, but it is felt that the erection of additions in the form of a standard garage would be detrimental to the appearance of the new solid construction buildings. A submission is, therefore, being made to the Education Department, recommending that consideration be given to retaining the area already provided as a sports store and that a new canteen structure be erected.

COOBER PEDY TAXIS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Recently a taxi service started operations at Coober Pedy and the establishment of two further services followed immediately, resulting in an extremely unsatisfactory position. In areas served by local government the councils determine the conditions under which taxi services may operate. However, as Coober Pedy is not in a council area, this arrangement does not apply. In the Northern Territory a regulation governs the licensing of taxi services, the fixing of fares and the licensing and conduct of drivers, in a similar way to that in which councils control taxi services in South Australia. As I consider that a regulation similar to that operating in the Northern Territory would meet South Australian requirements, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government to consider introducing such a regulation to control taxi services in places such as Coober Pedy?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I should have thought that Coober Pedy was too small to support three taxi services. The Minister of Lands reminds me about wedding cars, and I do not know whether such a service is provided. However, I shall be pleased to discuss the honourable member's suggestion with my colleague.

TAPLEY HILL ROAD

Mr. BROOMHILL: Tapley Hill Road is being widened, and the section within about 100yds. and immediately north of the Henley Beach Road intersection, which is being widened by about 12ft., has been excavated to a depth of about 1ft. As a result of the work, the road has been narrowed and many 44-gallon drums are set up to prevent motorists from driving into the excavations. However, residents living nearby have told me that there have been many accidents, with motor cars entering the excavations and also crashing into walls of houses. As elderly pensioners, living in a nearby group of flats, find it difficult to cross the road because of the way the excavations have been dug, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport why there has been this delay, and when the work is expected to be completed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. LAWN: Motorists travelling towards the city and wishing to make a right turn into Greenhill Road at the Keswick bridge find it difficult to do so, because while motor cars, buses, and commercial vehicles coming from the city are waiting to make a right turn into West Beach Road motorists coming from the direction of Glenelg cannot see what traffic, if any, is travelling towards them from the city. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider installing traffic lights with an arrow shown on them at this intersection, and whether he would consider making all traffic lights uniform, because some show arrows and some do not?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know the intersection to which the honourable member refers, but as a pedestrian when making my way from Central Command to the Keswick railway station, and it is a difficult intersection to negotiate on foot. Although

I will discuss with my colleague the other matters of difficulty mentioned by the honourable member, I point out that it is only a year or so since we provided in the Road Traffic Act for arrows as well as lights so that, if we were to act on the suggestion of the honourable member for uniformity, we would be going back on something Parliament decided comparatively recently. However, because of the difficulties raised I will discuss that matter, too, with Mr. Hill.

EYRE PENINSULA FIRES

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier a further reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning bush fires on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have the following summary of information about the Portana fire on Eyre Peninsula:

Estimated time of origin, 1730 hours, on November 23, 1969.
State fire ban in force.
Initial estimates of damage:
- 10,000 acres of cereal crop and grazing land (500 acres of cereal crop),
- 20 to 30 miles of fencing,
- 1 harvester, value $1,000,
- 1,500 bags of grain,
- Fire damaged three properties (Schlinks, Siviours, McNamara, Point Portana Station),
- No stock losses evident to date,
- Damage estimate, about $25,000.

Fire-fighting equipment:
- Elliston E.F.S., 10 private units, and council grader and bulldozer.

The Elliston police officer, Senior Constable D. Edwards is continuing his investigations. He has a difficult task, and it will be some time before full details are in hand. The country burnt was mainly grazing land with patches of sheoak scrub. The area is being patrolled to prevent a re-kindle.

ELECTRICITY CUT

Mr. VIRGO: My question is supplementary to the question which I asked the Minister of Lands last week as a result of a requirement by the Electricity Trust that forces consumers to pay a security deposit. Since asking my original question I have received numerous telephone calls and letters all supporting wholeheartedly the stand that has been taken. In particular, I refer the Minister to one which I received this morning and in respect of which, for obvious reasons because of this person's political association, the writer desired that his name should not be made known to Ministers of the Government as it might embarrass them. The writer is a hills primary producer whose annual electricity account amounts to between $1,000 and $1,200. Merely because of holdups in milk cheques, some of his accounts were not paid by the date stipulated, so the trust required him to lodge $300 as a security deposit. He describes the action of the trust as nothing short of persecution, and I agree with him. I therefore ask the Minister of Lands (if he has not already taken my earlier question up with the Chairman of the trust board) whether he will, when doing so, ask what sum the trust is holding as a result of its demand for security deposits and how many consumers are concerned.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On behalf of the Minister of Works, I am happy to accept the question because the trust is my responsibility. I have taken up the matter raised by the honourable member last week when he gave me the name of the person concerned, but I have not yet received a reply, although I expect to receive one shortly. It may take a day or two longer to deal with the trust than to deal with a normal Government department. I will take up the matter the honourable member has raised today if he will give me the name of the person concerned.

Mr. Virgo: I told you that I cannot do that because he happens to be a member of the Liberal and Country League.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall be happy to take up with the trust its general policy in this respect, but it does not seem very sensible to take up a personal matter without knowing the name of the person concerned, because when one investigates these matters one wants to know the person's record of his dealings with the trust. At the same time I will get a reply as best I can, working in the dark as I shall be regarding the name of the person concerned. I remind the honourable member again that the Electricity Trust is an organization most enthusiastically supported by the members opposite who hailed the original Act as Socialist legislation.

MACCLESFIELD SCHOOL

Mr. McANANEY: As I understand that there are plans for building a school at Macclesfield, will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, ascertain what progress has been made on this project?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a report.

SEMAPHORE ROAD

Mr. HURST: I have received correspondence from seven Semaphore business men expressing grave concern at the lack of progress being made on the construction of the Semaphore Road extension. These constituents point out that at least four roads have been closed to through traffic since the construction of the Jervois bridge and not even one has been completed. Because of the effect this is having on nearby businesses, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to assist these people by expediting the completion of the Semaphore Road extension?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

PARTY INITIALS

Mr. CASEY: I have been approached on several occasions recently about the Party initials that are attached to members' names when they are mentioned in the press, and I noticed in today's *Advertiser* that all Government members are referred to as members of the L.C.P. I wonder whether this is because of a coalition between the Liberal and Country League and the Country Party or are members of the Government really L.C.L. representatives.

Mr. McAnaney: You should know: you were a member!

Members interjecting:

Mr. CASEY: I have been expecting this—

The SPEAKER: Well, I have not, because it is out of order.

Mr. CASEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to hear that it is out of order. Can the Premier say whether his Party is the Liberal and Country League and, if it is, why are not the letters L.C.L. used after members' names when they are mentioned in the press? Are they referred to as L.C.P. members because there is a coalition between the L.C.L. and the Country Party in this State?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I assure the honourable member that there has been no change in the formation of the Party since he was a member of it. I think he was still a member when he came into Parliament because I know of no resignation being received by the Party from him. I am sure the honourable member would know more about political Parties than I do because I have never been a member of any other political Party, whereas he was evidently a member of both political Parties at the same time. In those circumstances I am sure that his experience has led him to make a comparison which no doubt he keeps to himself. The L.C.L. in South Australia has existed successfully for many years and has governed for most of those years. As the honourable member would know, this Party has brought much prosperity to the State, and it has never worried much about the letters by which it is known. In fact, it exists on performance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one question at a time. This is not an afternoon tea party.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Concerning names in the paper, that is a choice for the paper itself to make. I am sure those concerned see the name as one which has been used for some time and which they possibly want to continue to use. I reiterate that this Party governs on performance.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The prosperity that it has brought to this State, which is sufficient recommendation, is certainly far more important than any play on words or letters concerning the Party.

Mr. CASEY: This is a serious matter, because in this State there are political Parties other than the L.C.L. and the Australian Labor Party, and I think the position must be resolved. However, the Premier's statement does not add anything: he did not reply to the question. Perhaps he may have been under a strain because his Chief Secretary, who is in another place, was, I understand, an A.L.P. official, having held office in that Party at Millicent some years ago, but that is beside the point.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CASEY: This matter is especially serious because people want to know to which political Party members belong. Will the Premier say whether he and all other members opposite are members of the L.C.L. or L.C.P.? If he can reply to that question one way or the other I shall be pleased, because I should appreciate confirmation about just what Party members opposite belong to.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is only one organization that we belong to, and there has been no split in it like the split that there has been in the Labor Party. Doubtless, the honourable member's confusion stems from the famous split of 1954, which created two Labor Parties throughout Australia.

Mr. Casey: Just answer the question, that's all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Frome will restrain himself.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think the honourable member, as I have said, would realize from his previous association that the L.C.L. is known as a league, as a body. It is probably the largest political Party in Australia.

Mr. Lawn: You're joking.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There are more than 50,000 members of the L.C.L. in S.A. That is a tremendous number.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think we had better adjourn this discussion until some time next year.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, I am pleased to discuss the matter, but I remind the honourable member that there is only one Party, as such.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. RYAN: Some time ago I received a letter from the Enfield council, as a result of which, on September 23, I asked a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport. The Enfield council was gravely concerned (and still is) about the number of unoccupied railway houses within its municipality. Its main concern is that it has to supply the necessary civic requirements for which it receives no return if these railway houses are unoccupied. On the other hand, it does receive a return if these properties are occupied. The council, which wrote a similar letter to the Railways Commissioner, was told by him that this matter was the subject of a report that would be given to me as a reply to the question I had asked in the House. I have received a reply on this matter from the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, and also one from the Minister of Housing. The last reply was given on November 6, informing me that the Railways Department was disposing of the surplus houses and that, as houses became redundant, the department would dispose of even more.

The council, which has once again approached me, is greatly concerned about the loss of revenue to it because of the Commissioner's policy in allowing these houses to remain empty for long periods. The request has been made that, if the Commissioner is not going to dispose of these unoccupied houses, the Government should consider providing a financial return to the council on the same basis as that applying to occupied houses. The council's attitude is that ratepayers in the area are carrying the financial burden, because the Government is not facing up to its responsibility: first, in regard to having these houses occupied, and secondly, in regard to rate return to the council.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think this matter is primarily the concern and responsibility of the Railways Commissioner but, as the honourable member has requested in the latter part of his question that the financial return to the Enfield corporation be considered, perhaps I should examine the matter. As the owner of a house, the Railways Commissioner would be liable in the first instance for the payment to the corporation (it is his property). Of course, this would ultimately reflect on the Treasury because, as the honourable member is aware, the Commissioner does not have a surplus from his operations from which to make outgoings. I will have the matter examined, and I will ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to take it up again with the Railways Commissioner. As I think the whole matter is one concerning two departments, I will take the responsibility of seeing whether I can further the honourable member's request.

UNIVERSITY FEES

Mr. NANKIVELL: In correspondence that has taken place between the Premier and the university councils and Institute of Technology, it has been suggested that, in order to make some compensation for the increases in fees that will result if the request for the 20 per cent increase is implemented by the universities and the institute, there will be a liberalization of the fees concession scheme. Can the Premier say what is intended by this "liberalization"? Will there be a liberalized amount in respect of each individual? Will the liberalization involve also assistance to part-time as well as full-time students, particularly those who are married? As the scheme is administered on an adjusted means test, can the Premier say whether this means test will be altered and whether assistance will be provided in respect not only of fees but also of living allowances?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The scheme, as it works under the existing conditions, would cost more because of the rise in fees, but the Government has looked at this matter and considers that it should apply further resources. It has asked the committee to draw up a more helpful fees concession scheme than exists today, and this will mean in broad terms (the details have to be worked out by the committee) that the concession would

apply over a wider field. There would be more discretion in regard to helping individual cases, which although worthy ones, may have been previously debarred by the rules governing the scheme. It will also mean that the means test will be altered to help those affected by the rise in fees and the lowering in the value of money generally.

The subject will soon be dealt with, the fees concession committee having been asked to draw up an amended scheme basically containing those new provisions. It has certainly been the Government's aim to be more helpful, especially in the light of cases brought to my notice during the students' representations made to me. These representations were put well and, in fact, put expertly. I believe that the fees concession committee will now have the resources from which to provide a much wider range of help than has been possible previously.

INDUSTRIAL UNREST

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I refer the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, to an article in today's newspaper headed "Employer foresees 'Unrest'", a brief extract of which states:

The President of the South Australian Employers' Federation (Mr. P. W. Woodroofe) warned yesterday of "a likelihood of pockets of unrest" in industry. That unrest, he said, was related to claims by employees against their employers . . . But he felt that much good could arise from the creation of an advisory committee to assist the Minister in considering matters of common interest to the Governments, employers and unions. Such a committee would provide a convenient measure for mutual discussion and contribution in matters firmly related to industry and its future development in South Australia.

He shared the concern of his council at the reduction in the intake of young people into apprenticeship trades. Employees had to be given greater encouragement to enter upon new and further training, so that they would be readily available to meet the demands for a new level of skills.

Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, comment on that article?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I saw the reference in this morning's *Advertiser* to Mr. Woodroofe's remarks. He has made a prophecy, which is worrying and which has been made on several occasions in the last few weeks, about the likelihood of industrial unrest in 1970. Anything I can do or the Government can do (and this applies particularly to the Minister of Labour and Industry, Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe) to help minimize this or prevent it altogether, we want to do, because industrial unrest is inimical to all interests in the community and to the community itself, whatever the causes may be. I presume that Mr. Woodroofe had in mind the formation in South Australia of a body similar to the National Labour Advisory Council which was set up at the Commonwealth level last year, I think. I understand there is a similar body in New South Wales that allows for consultation between the various interests engaged in business and industrial matters. I can say that the practice of the Minister (Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe) is always to consult with those interests before, for example, there is any legislation on any topic or, if any problem arises in the community, he consults the Trades and Labour Council, the Employers' Federation and the Chamber of Manufactures (which, as honourable members know, are the three main bodies involved) and any other body that may be especially interested. If it is considered by those bodies and by others that the setting up of some standing committee, such as that to which I have referred as being set up in the Commonwealth sphere and in New South Wales, will help. I am certain that the Minister will be only too willing to do this, and that the Government as a whole will be very glad to do it. This would mean that discussions, which now usually take place on an individual basis between the Minister and the bodies to which I have referred, would take place on a tripartite basis, or a wider basis if there were other parties or members of the council or committee (or whatever it might be called) interested. As that would perhaps be a good thing, I will certainly discuss it with the Minister when he returns to office soon, we hope.

FIRE RISK

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the fire risk created by vacant blocks of land owned by the Education Department?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: A fire break has been cleared by the local fire brigade on the Education Department land at Forest Avenue, Black Forest. Burning-off operations will be carried out as soon as the undergrowth is sufficiently dry. The land in Jaffrey Street, Parkside, is now vested in the Minister of Works. The site was recently leased for horse-grazing purposes, and I am informed that, although now vacant, it is considered not to be a fire hazard at this stage.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about Murray Bridge High School buses?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I take it that the honourable member's question is designed to find out whether the three new departmentally-owned school buses provided to transport children between Tailem Bend and Murray Bridge High School can be hired free of charge. One of these buses is being used to convey high school students to the primary school for woodwork classes free of charge, because the necessary facilities are not available at the high school. When these craft facilities are provided the bus service will be cancelled. With regard to school excursions such as geological excursions, departmental buses may be hired at rates fixed by the department, provided that privately-operated buses or a railway service cannot be conveniently utilized.

SMALL BOATS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Treasurer, representing the Minister of Marine, a reply to my recent question about small boats and the use of inboard petrol engines?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: One of the regulations for the survey and equipment of fishing vessels lays down that inboard-type petrol engines are not to be installed in any fishing vessel. However, there is power under these regulations to waive any regulation in respect of any particular vessel where it can be established to the satisfaction of the Minister that compliance is impracticable or unnecessary. It is possible that small, shallow-drafted fishing vessels used for inshore netting could be exempted from the particular regulation mentioned, but each case will be treated on its merits as the vessels are progressively surveyed.

The honourable member will appreciate that one of the most terrifying dangers at sea is a small boat that is on fire. Therefore, I think he will appreciate, as I think all fishermen will appreciate, that a petrol motor in a confined space in any sort of vessel is a grave hazard. For this reason, in drafting the regulations it has been proposed that this should not be allowed. Since I have acted on behalf of the Minister of Marine, I have had representations that outboard petrol motors should be permitted and that some other cases, such as the one to which I referred earlier, should receive special consideration. So far as it is possible to eliminate this hazard, the regulations are designed to do that. In this respect, fishermen concerned have given their support, but there is an opportunity for special consideration to be given to special cases.

MOUNT GAMBIER NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the Mount Gambier North Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Public Buildings Department states that a contract was let on October 2 for the construction of a car park and access paths on the recently acquired additional land at the Mount Gambier North Primary School. The contractor stated a completion time of 10 weeks when submitting his tender.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Among the letters to the Editor in yesterday's *News* there appeared a letter over the *nom de plume* of "Unclassified" that claimed that a few teachers who had completed a year's training remained unclassified under the new salary classifications, whereas a group of teachers who were classified in the A category and who had completed only a week or so in a classroom were receiving $750 a year more than the first group, although these claimed to be more experienced teachers. As the letter asks the Minister of Education what she intends to do about the position, can she say whether the position is as stated and, if it is, what action she intends to take?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Having seen the letter in the newspaper, I called for a report on the matter and I think it would be of interest to most members. Any teacher's salary depends on qualifications and experience. Primary teachers who have B classification are on a higher salary range than those who do not possess B classification. In most instances, teachers not holding B classification lack the required academic subjects. It seems that "Unclassified" is one such teacher. Teachers who enter the service without B classification may achieve this classification and the next higher classification A by taking appropriate subjects during their teaching career. Such "classified" teachers receive higher salaries than "unclassified" teachers. Teachers in the category of the correspondent "Unclassified" can improve their salaries by taking further studies as external students of the teachers colleges

at no expense to themselves. The remedy lies in their own hands. It is possible for a teacher who undertook a one-year course of training to be still "unclassified" (because of lack of the required subjects) and for a teacher who entered the service with less than a year's training to be now "classified" because of subjects passed after entering the service.

ST. AGNES WATER SUPPLY

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to my question of November 19 about the provision of water supply in an area at St. Agnes?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is realized that the new subdivision alongside Whiting Road, St. Agnes, is a developing area which will require additional water to be brought into it. At present there is a 4in. water main in Whiting Road which in the near future will need to be enlarged. The provision of a satisfactory water supply to a new area requires careful investigation and is dependent to some extent upon the patterns in which the developing land is to be subdivided. Close liaison in laying new water mains is also kept with the Highways Department to ensure that the main is laid in its correct position after a road is widened, and that it does not have to be altered when a new pavement is laid. The position at St. Agnes is that the Engineering and Water Supply Department realizes that additional water will have to be brought into this area as development proceeds but, at present, is awaiting further advice from the Highways Department concerning possible road widening in the area and also is dependent upon further subdivisions being submitted before detailed and final plans to augment the water supply in this area can be completed. A close watch is being kept on the situation and every endeavour will be made to maintain an adequate water supply at all times.

ELIZABETH NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. CLARK: Earlier this year I took up with the Minister of Education, I think by way of question, at the request of the mothers' club at Elizabeth North Primary School the matter of asphalting around the outside rooms at the school. I understand that later the Minister told the club that the Public Buildings Department was dealing with this matter. As the welfare club at the school has also told me that it is most anxious that this work be done as soon as possible and as it desires to know when it will be done, will the Minister obtain information on the matter for me?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to do that.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, obtain for me details of the Engineering and Water Supply Department's plans for sewering Loch Lomond Drive and adjoining streets at Modbury, which sections have been omitted from previous sewerage schemes in that area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get the information.

REGISTRATION FEES

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question regarding what he describes as registration fees?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think the question heading is provided by *Hansard* and thereafter adopted, I hope with the honourable member's approval as well as mine. Certainly, I am content to accept whatever heading *Hansard* gives to this question: *Hansard* is usually fairly accurate.

Under the Libraries Subsidies Act, councils are subsidized to the extent of 50 per cent of the administration costs of running a library. The effect is that councils concerned are paying only half the normal registration fee and insurance. They are exempt from stamp duty. In view of this, it is considered that there is no strong argument for extending free registration for these vehicles.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ROLLS)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1965, as amended. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is consequential on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, and is designed to permit the preparation of electoral rolls for the electoral districts under the new boundaries contemplated by that Bill, in addition to the electoral rolls for the electoral districts under the existing boundaries. The new boundaries will operate for the purposes of the next general election and any election thereafter, whereas the existing boundaries will operate for the purpose of any by-election that might take place before the next general election. Clause 2 provides that it is to become law on the day

on which the Constitution Act Amendment Bill becomes law, and clause 3 gives effect to the main objects of the Bill. Members will realize that this is a machinery Bill, consequential on the alteration of the electoral boundaries in this State that we expect to become law shortly. All members will agree that it is desirable, indeed essential, that we have the authority to print and to make public the electoral rolls for the new districts, as this is a matter of great convenience to many people. I hope that this measure will have the support and approval of the Opposition so that it may have a speedy passage.

Mr. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DIRECTORS)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Some time ago the then Government received representations from the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated for the splitting of the bulk handling zone of Eyre Peninsula into two, thus providing two zone directors for that area. The present directors of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited have concurred in the proposal, and the purpose of this Bill is to provide the machinery to give effect to it from the next election of zone directors, that is, on September 6, 1970. This Bill also gives effect to a request by the company that the term of elected directors be four years rather than six years as is the case at present, since the shorter term is more usual in comparable authorities in other States. At the same time opportunity has been taken to generally bring the principal Act up to date.

Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 amends the definition section by bringing up to date references to certain Acts. Clause 3 repeals sections 4, 4a, and 4b, which are now redundant since the advances made under them have now been repaid. Clause 4 makes appropriate provision to continue in operation the guarantee given in respect of the last advance made to the company by the Commonwealth Bank. Clause 5 provides that after September 6, 1970, there shall be eight elected directors of the company of whom five shall be "zone" directors, and by proposed new paragraph (4) power is given to the directors to create an additional zone.

Paragraph (*e*) provides for the term of elected directors to be four years in lieu of the former period of six years, since this period seems more in line with the term of office of directors in comparable organizations in other States. Paragraph (*f*) ensures that the term of office of the State directors next elected will expire midway in the term of the zone directors, thus ensuring a degree of continuity of service of directors. Clause 6 makes a decimal currency amendment and changes a reference to "wheatgrower" to a "grower of grain" to accord with amendments previously made to the principal Act.

Clauses 7 and 8 effect decimal currency amendments, and clause 9 brings up to date an obsolete reference to the metropolitan area, and also effects a decimal currency amendment. Clause 10 substitutes references to the Minister of Marine for references to the South Australian Harbors Board, and clause 11 re-drafts subsection (2) of section 16 to make its meaning clear. Clauses 12, 13 and 14 effect minor Statute law revision and decimal currency amendments.

As a member representing part, at least, of Eyre Peninsula I should add to the official report. For some time it has been obvious that the task of the single zone director on Eyre Peninsula has been beyond the physical capacity of one man. A desire has been expressed for several years that this large geographical area should be split and, therefore, have the right to elect an additional zone director. A large percentage of the grain handled by the co-operative is produced and handled on Eyre Peninsula and a substantial part of the toll that is to be paid to the co-operative has therefore been derived from growers of grain in that area. For these reasons it seems logical and fair that the growers should have better representation on the co-operative than they have at present. This matter has been discussed by grower organizations and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, has been considered for some time. As it is imminently fair, I commend the legislation to the House.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1948-1965. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a significant change in the superannuation scheme applicable to members of Parliament. Under the principal Act at present provision is made for the payment of a fixed contribution for a fixed benefit by way of pension and the change proposed is for the contribution to be determined as a percentage of a member's basic salary as from time to time payable and the pension to be determined by reference to a percentage of the basic salary payable to the member at the time he becomes entitled to a pension. In addition, other amendments of somewhat less significance are proposed by the Bill. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the interpretation section of the principal Act (*a*) by defining "basic salary" with reference to the basic salary payable under the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act; (*b*) by extending the definition of "member" to include persons who are not strictly speaking members but who are still in receipt of Parliamentary salary; and (*c*) by redefining "Parliamentary salary" in the terms of the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act.

Clause 4 sets out two new rates of contribution (*a*) a rate of 9 per cent of basic salary in lieu of the old rate of $456 a year; and (*b*) a rate of 6¾ per cent of basic salary in lieu of the old rate of $342 a year, and further provides that all new entrants to the fund shall contribute at the 9 per cent rate. Clause 5 is intended to permit a contributor at the rate of 6¾ per cent to convert to the higher rate of 9 per cent. This option is open to such a contributor only during the two months next following the coming into force of these provisions and is contingent on the contributor paying to the fund the difference between the amount he has already contributed to the fund and the amount he would have contributed to the fund if he had always contributed at the higher rate. If the contributor elects to pay the difference by instalments, until all the instalments are paid his pension is subject to a reduction which would vary in amount depending on the number of his instalments from time to time unpaid.

Clause 6 makes certain formal amendments to the principal Act to preserve the rights of existing pensioners. Clause 7 deals with rates of pension and re-enacts section 13 of the principal Act and at subsection (1) preserves existing pension, and subsections (2) and (3) adjust pensions payable to pensioners by taking into account any period of contributory service of less than a year. Previously, entitlement was based on complete years of service and no regard could be paid to any period of less than a complete year even though contributions had been paid during that period. Subsection (4) sets out the new rates of pension payable under this Act. The rates commence at 30 per cent of the basic salary on retirement for eight years' contributory service as a member with stepped increases up to a maximum of 68 per cent of basic salary on retirement. Appropriate provision is made for a lower pension to be paid to a contributor who is entitled to contribute at a lower rate. If a member with less than eight years' service is obliged to retire on grounds of invalidity his pension will be 30 per cent of his basic salary on retirement. New section 13a appears to be a complex provision but is intended to ensure that the increased benefits payable from the fund do not affect its future financial development. In substance, they provide that any member who qualifies for a pension, other than a pension on retirement through invalidity within three years next following the commencement of this amending Act, must either pay a sum equal to the difference between the contributions he would have paid under the old system of contributions and the contributions he would have paid under the new system of contributions in each case over three years.

If the retiring member does not desire to pay this sum, a pension somewhat higher than the old rate pension but somewhat lower than the new rate pension will be payable. The reduction principle expressed in this provision will not apply to widow or widower pensions. Clause 8 provides that a member who resigns or fails to seek re-election because he wishes to stand for election to the Commonwealth Parliament or the Parliament of another State shall be deemed to have satisfied a judge that there were good and sufficient reasons for his resignation or failure to stand for his re-election. Clause 9 is a decimal currency amendment. Clause 10 makes certain amendments consequential on the amended definition of "member" and at paragraph (*b*) makes it clear that where a member who has less than eight years' service dies, for the purpose of

calculating a pension to his widow he will be deemed to have had eight years' service. In addition, the widows of former members who would, had they been alive, have benefited from the adjustment of pensions provided for by new sections 13 (1) and (2) will be entitled to three-quarters of the benefit that the members would have been entitled to if they had been alive. Clause 11 allows for the repayment of contributions by persons who are entitled to a pension from another Parliament. Clause 12 effects an amendment consequential on the amended definition of "member". I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COURTS)

In Committee.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3269).

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In the definition of "Judge" to strike out "as defined in section 4 of the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1969" and insert "of the Industrial Court of South Australia".

The amendment will give effect to the matters discussed in the second reading debate to allow the workmen's compensation jurisdiction to be exercised by a judge in the South Australian Industrial Court, not in the local court. The reasons for this change have already been dealt with in the second reading debate, so I will not enlarge on them in Committee.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment. We canvassed this matter as much as was proper last evening. I indicated then that I intended, when the new intermediate jurisdiction of the local court was established, to provide that one judge, to be appointed under the legislation, would specialize in workmen's compensation matters. As I understand it, the reason why the Leader has moved the amendment is that the Opposition considers that workmen's compensation is a specialist jurisdiction, and I agree. That is why I intend to act as I have said: so that we will have a judicial officer who is of considerable senior status dealing with matters of workmen's compensation. Incidentally, it was the Leader (when Attorney-General at the beginning of last year) who directed that workmen's compensation matters should be taken only by judges, and I have seen the direction in the docket that judges should take workmen's compensation matters. This is what has been occurring in the Adelaide Local Court since January, 1968. As a result of that direction, a temporary local court judge, Judge Williams, takes all the cases that he possibly can. So, when he was in office, the Leader gave the same direction as I intend to give when the new intermediate jurisdiction is established. I will be doing precisely what the Leader has moved to do in this amendment: he wants to provide that the jurisdiction should be transferred to the Industrial Commission and that it will be exercised by a magistrate there.

Apparently the Opposition would downgrade the jurisdiction. I point out that this jurisdiction can involve over $20,000, whereas the magistrate's jurisdiction is limited to $2,500. As it is not intended to raise the maximum sum in the magistrate's jurisdiction, we would then have the anomaly of asking a magistrate to deal with matters that in other cases he could not have jurisdiction over because he could be dealing with up to 10 times the amount of $2,500. I agree that the jurisdiction we are conferring on local court judges to be appointed to the jurisdiction will be substantial. I do not believe that all workmen's compensation cases should go to the Supreme Court, but I do believe, as the Leader believed when he was in office, that workmen's compensation should be dealt with by one judicial officer who has a standing above that of a special magistrate and who can specialize in this field, and that is what we are going to do.

Apart from this situation there would be enormous practical difficulties in doing what the amendment suggests. There are three problems if this jurisdiction is to go to the Industrial Commission. First, there is the grave problem that the two judges of the Industrial Commission at present are fully committed and they just could not handle the volume of work that would be involved if they were to deal with workmen's compensation in addition to the industrial matters coming before them in their various capacities. So that makes the position impractical as the commission is at present constituted. Secondly, there is the difficulty (admitted only a temporary one) of accommodation if we have to increase the number of members of the Industrial Commission. This could be resolved in time, but it does cause a severe difficulty at the moment. Thirdly (and this is the most important of the three points I am raising), if we carry this amendment it would require significant changes

to the Industrial Code. The Government does not intend this session to introduce amendments to the Industrial Code so, if this amendment were carried, we would find ourselves in a vacuum because it is physically impossible now to have drafted and passed the amendments to the Industrial Code that would be necessary if this amendment were to be workable. For these three reasons, the amendment is an inappropriate amendment to move. For the reasons I have given I hope that the Committee will not accept this amendment.

Mr. VIRGO: We have heard the Attorney-General at his worst today. He has not convinced anyone. His argument just does not hold water. It is no good talking about upgrading and downgrading when the Attorney-General knows that this amendment is being moved after a discussion which he had with the Leader and myself yesterday afternoon during which it was decided to have one amendment moved as a test case to determine one question: whether cases under the Workmen's Compensation Act should be settled in the Industrial Court or a local court, and that is all we are attempting to resolve here. This amendment merely determines the principle of whether workmen's compensation cases should be decided in the local and district criminal courts (as the Bill suggests) or in the Industrial Court (as the amendment suggests). When we keep the Industrial Court alone in our minds and then consider the Attorney-General's argument, it becomes crystal clear that he has no basis for continuing to claim that this matter is best dealt with in the local and district courts. Compensation is an industrial matter, and the Industrial Court has a far better appreciation and knowledge of the conditions of employment and of the numerous factors associated with employment and workmen than has any other tribunal.

The only premise on which the Attorney-General rejects the amendment is that the Government intends that, if this Bill is carried, one local court judge will be assigned to do all the work and that this will achieve the purpose of the amendment. If this is the case, why cannot he be a judge in the Industrial Court who, by virtue of his being connected with that court, is associated with all other aspects of industry? The real reason behind the Government's objection to the amendment is that it does not want to do what the amendment seeks to do. The Attorney-General has not put forward a case to justify the stand he has taken, and there is no validity in his excuses. I hope he will have second thoughts and support the amendment.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I wish to put two matters in rebuttal of the case presented by the member for Edwardstown. First, he says that this is an industrial matter. In one sense, workmen's compensation is an industrial matter, in that it is concerned by and large, but not exclusively, with those who work in industry. But it is certainly not an industrial matter of the same nature as matters now dealt with by the Industrial Court and the Industrial Commission.

Mr. Virgo: They are closely related.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have yet to know what the relationship between them is and how it is helpful that they should be adjudicated on in the same court. I can see that they are, broadly perhaps, both industrial matters, but they are industrial matters of a different kind. Secondly, there is no reason to think that, simply because the man who sits is a member of the Industrial Court, *ipso facto* thereby he will be any more experienced or better able to handle this jurisdiction than if he sits in a local court. Heaven knows, the courts are close to each other (they are on the same site, within a few yards of each other), and there is nothing whatever to suggest that, simply because he is a member of the Industrial Court, this will help him.

The most important fact is that we are proposing that this jurisdiction should be exercised by an experienced man who is a judge. The machinery is there, and it is being fashioned by Parliament now. If this Bill goes through without the amendment, we can get on with it immediately and have this system operating within the next few months. If, on the other hand, this amendment is carried, it will be at least 12 months before we can physically do anything, even if the Government were prepared to accept that it was necessary to introduce the amendments that would be essential in the Industrial Code, because it would mean a change in the jurisdiction of the Industrial Court. It would also mean making another appointment to that court, which may or may not be desirable. It is rather strange that honourable members are, by implication, trying to insist that we appoint another judge in that jurisdiction, when they oppose the general court scheme on the basis that it will add to expense. Here is another identifiable extra body that will have to be appointed in that jurisdiction, instead of having a man who will specialize in workmen's

compensation matters in a local court but who may have time to do general matters as well, and he will certainly be available to do them if he does have time. On all these grounds, I cannot accept the arguments put forward by the member for Edwardstown which simply do not make out a case for altering and disturbing the Government's scheme.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Riches. No—Mr. Coumbe.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 31) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DEPENDANTS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 18. Page 3071.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill contains some improvements to workmen's compensation but, unfortunately, involved with the improvements is a complete turning back of the clock in the ambit of workmen's compensation in South Australia. The Attorney-General may gasp, but I say this advisedly. No other measure was fought for so much by the trade union movement in South Australia as the measure to widen the ambit of section 4 of the Act. This was a major plank of the Labor Party's platform at the 1965 election. We promised the trade unions and rank and file members in South Australia that we would enlarge the ambit of workmen's compensation so as to put workmen in this State in a position no worse than that of workmen in other States.

Until that time, feelings here were most bitter because, in order to prove that he had the basis of a claim for workmen's compensation, an employee had to prove an injury by accident arising out of or in the course of his employment. In the other States it was not necessary to prove an injury by accident but only that the injury had occurred during the course of employment. It was not necessary to prove an accident, an untoward event, and a workman did not have to prove that the employment was an essential part of the basis of the compenstion, other than that the injury had occurred during employment.

The Legislative Council did not like our bringing South Australia into line with the other States and at a conference on the measure the compromise arrived at was that it would be a defence if the employer discharged an onus of proving to the court that the employment was not a contributing factor, but the onus was on the employer, for the good reason that an onus on the employee to prove that the employment was a contributing factor has been almost impossible for an employee to discharge in most cases of cardiac failure and heart complaint.

The heart complaint cases were the subject of a memorandum to me by the Coroner. That memorandum is in the Attorney-General's file and I suggest that he look at it, because Mr. Cleland made clear to the Government of the day the grave difficulties that arose from the onus being on the employee to discharge some proof that the employment was a contributing factor in a heart case.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You know, though, how the local court interpreted the clause we had put in in 1965, don't you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What does the Attorney-General mean?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: The court interpreted it as meaning that in every case the onus was on the employer. That is not what we intended.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course that is what we intended. What else can the clause mean? I do not know whether the Attorney has read the opinions that I gave when I was Attorney-General, but they said precisely that.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Were they worth reading?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course they were. If the Attorney-General looks back at the submissions made to me on many workmen's compensation cases affecting the Government, particularly in the Railways Department, he will see the directions that I gave about my Government's attitude at the time.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You do know that this clause—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow conversations. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney has said that it is not fair that the onus should be on the employer. Why is that not fair? That means that the onus is on the insurance company. In all this business about the employer, the onus is really on the insurance company, and insurance companies are in a much better position in this matter in South Australia under existing legislation than they are in any other State. In the other States if the employee shows that the injury arose during the course of employment, that is the end of the matter and we have provided a special defence in South Australia if the employer can discharge the onus of showing that the employment was not a contributing factor. That defence was reached by compromise. The employee here is in a worse position than that of an employee in any other State. The Government intends to turn the clock back and tell the employee that he must discharge the onus of showing that the employment was a contributing factor.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: This is the onus normally in any matter.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The employee does not have the onus in workmen's compensation cases in any other part of Australia. As I have said, it is almost impossible in a whole series of cases for an employee to discharge that onus effectively. How does the employee discharge it in heart cases, back injury cases, hernia cases, and cases of degenerative disease? In many instances a medical practitioner will give evidence that the employment may have been a contributing factor and the Attorney-General knows very well that a medical practitioner often cannot go further and say definitely one way or the other.

The Government is saying that, in such circumstances, the employee fails. Workmen's compensation is an insurance against disablement during the course of employment. It has not been in South Australia, as it is on the Continent, an effective compensation for that injury. It has been a payment to the extent that it keeps the body and soul of the employee together, but then not very well. It is an insurance provision: it is not a question of whether blame attaches to the employer or not, because it is an insurance against disablement and as such is a necessary part of the social legislation of this State, and provides a protection and welfare service to employees. Why does the Attorney-General demand that an employee in many cases discharge the onus of proof, which is clearly impossible for him to discharge, even if it may well have been that the employment was a contributing factor? This is not a question of blame: it is a question of insurance.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: All this is concerned with is proving the connection between the employment and—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Why is it necessary to prove a connection between the employment and the employee, other than that the injury arose during employment, because this has been the standard normally adopted in Australia? In 1965, during the election compaign, we pointed to cases where people had been suffering the gravest of hardship because workmen's compensation benefits in this State were not equal to those in other States or in the Commonwealth. People voted for this policy: we put it to the House and it was agreed here, but the other place wanted special protection, although it admitted that we had a mandate. We compromised on the defence that was written into section 4.

Mr. Hudson: I suppose the Attorney-General has a mandate to do this!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was never a mention during the election campaign by the present Government of details of this measure.

Mr. Clark: Or of a good many others.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Even if it were mentioned, the Government would not have a mandate for it, because no-one voted for this at the last election.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Come off it.

Mr. Broomhill: The Government was too busy pushing Chowilla.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Attorney-General proceeds with this clause he makes nonsense of his protestations of not wanting industrial unrest in South Australia, because if there is one thing that will inflame the trade unions in South Australia, it is this.

Mr. Venning: Go on: stir them up.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have to do any stirring. I invite the honourable member to come to a meeting of workmen at which I will not say anything. He can explain this clause, and then see whether I would have to do any stirring on this matter.

Mr. Hudson: Don't invite him down, because they wouldn't look at him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Government members do not like talking to workmen, but I invite any of them to come and hear what the workers have to say. Let the Attorney-General come and hear what they think about this.

Mr. Virgo: He wouldn't have the courage.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader does not need assistance to make his speech.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am always grateful for assistance, Sir.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You're putting on the motley, are you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Attorney-General thinks that I am making a sham of indignation on this, all I can say is that he does not realize what affects the ordinary people of this State. Of course I am indignant about this: it is a disgraceful proposal. I do not think the Attorney-General, or Government members, can sit this out, but if they are hauling a flag down to the insurance companies in South Australia on this, they had better think again. If the Government proceeds with this clause it will reap a whirlwind of industrial unrest, because workmen will not put up with it. They fought bitterly for about 20 years to obtain the change made in 1965, and they are not going to give that up. The remaining clauses require some amendment, because other things need to be done in workmen's compensation, but we will discuss those matters in Committee. This clause will cause much harm in South Australia if it is not amended. On behalf of the trade union movement in South Australia I tell the Attorney-General that Opposition members have been asked to cast the whole Bill out: they would rather lose everything in this measure than lose existing section 4. That is the official view of the trade union movement in this State.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Freebairn: The only true friend of the worker.

Mr. Virgo: We will see, now that he has a chance to prove it.

Mr. McANANEY: Having checked the principal Act, I find a major difference between it and the present Bill, which increases the area in which people are entitled to workmen's compensation. This amendment is an improvement of the present Act, and the Government has been fair and just in striking a balance between the employer and employee. The Leader of the Opposition has always pleaded that the consumer or employee must have an advantage over the seller or the employer, but a balance must be struck that gives fair play for every section of the community. We all appreciate the fact that the worker must be compensated for injury incurred during employment, but we must also realize that any increase in concessions for which insurance companies or employers have to pay means increased costs that someone will ultimately have to pay, and that someone is probably the worker.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you know anyone who has been injured and never received a cracker of compensation?

Mr. McANANEY: I have been one of the workers of this world, and I received compensation benefits at one stage. Also, I had a claim for personal injury on which I had to pay the premium.

Mr. Langley: It's usual for you to pay a premium.

Mr. McANANEY: Hasn't the honourable member heard of a personal accident claim?

Mr. Langley: You said you paid a premium: you must have expected something back for it.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member is suggesting that I did not pay a premium: someone must pay it and someone else gets the reward.

Mr. Hudson: Did you know that the cost of workmen's compensation is passed on by the employer to the consumer?

Mr. McANANEY: We have to keep a reasonable balance, and I think that the increase in coverage provided by this Bill will benefit all workers. We must try to be reasonable and to be fair to all sections of the community.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I thought we would have heard a better contribution on this legislation from the member for Stirling than what we have heard but such has not been the case. I endorse wholeheartedly the Leader's remarks.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: And the fire he imparted?

Mr. VIRGO: If I had the ability, I would add to the fire of the Leader in this debate. I assure the Attorney-General, if he has any doubts, that this legislation is not a joke and that the trade union movement and the workers of the State do not regard it as such. The only way I can regard this legislation is that it is the work of one of the most competent confidence tricksters I have seen. It can be

described as nothing short of a confidence trick: let us give a pittance with the one hand and take away something vital with the other hand. Maybe the tricksters think the workers cannot afford to turn this offer down because it will give them something, but this is where the confidence tricksters have fallen down in their judgment: the pittance that the Bill hands out is far outweighed by the damage that will be done by the alteration to section 4 of the Act—the onus of proof provision. For the member for Stirling to say that there is no major difference between the Bill and the Act shows conclusively that he has not even troubled to read either one.

Mr. McAnaney: I have.

Mr. VIRGO: Then he has proved that he cannot understand the legislation. Had he been associated with a workmen's compensation case, he would recognize immediately the effect of the major difference in onus of proof because the Bill inserts a provision concerning an injury to which employment is a contributing factor. If the provision covered an injury arising out of or in the course of employment, we would not be complaining; that is what the present Act provides. So, the first question everyone must ask is this: why is the Government altering the provision?

Mr. Broomhill: I think the Attorney-General told us by interjection.

Mr. VIRGO: Well, the Attorney-General has not told us very much. I have read his second reading explanation. Clause 5, by re-enacting section 4 of the principal Act, recasts the basic liability provision by making a causal connection between the employment and the injury: that is, the employment must be a contributing factor to the injury. The Attorney-General has been rather vocal on numerous occasions in the House, particularly when the Opposition has made a major proposal for which he had no other argument but to knock it by saying, "We want uniformity. We should not be out of step." I hope the Attorney-General has been provided with a copy of the *Conspectus of Workers Compensation Legislation in Australia and Papua New Guinea*, 1969 edition, issued by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service, because if he has a copy he will find, on page 23, Table C, which shows the various factors associated with the conditions of liability for injury.

In New South Wales, the conditions are personal injury to a worker arising out of or in the course of employment. In Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia, the conditions are personal injury arising out of or in the course of employment. Tasmania, being the only State that has not yet caught up with the position (arising out of and in the course of employment), provides the same as we provided prior to the progressive legislation introduced by the former State Labor Government. Every State in the Commonwealth (together with the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory, and even Papua-New Guinea), except Tasmania, provides for the payment of compensation for injury arising out of or in the course of employment, but this Government wants to make South Australia the odd State out by making the injured workman prove that the employment was a contributing factor. Why is this being done? I cannot come up with a logical answer, except that I believe that the Government is bowing to the dictates of the insurance companies, not of the employers.

It is the insurance companies that carry the baby in this regard. The Act makes it mandatory for an employer, other than an exempted employer, to take out insurance. The only exempted employers are the Government, the Railways Department, the Electricity Trust and one or two other large semi-government organizations. The member for Stirling tried to suggest that we should not get our thinking mixed up on employer-employee relationships but that we must be fair to both employer and employee. However, it is not the employer but the insurance company that comes into this question.

Mr. McAnaney: The employer pays the premium.

Mr. VIRGO: The employer in every State pays the premium and passes it on to the consumer, the same as he passes on every other cost.

Mr. McAnaney: When he can!

Mr. VIRGO: If he cannot pass it on, he is out of business. Let us not have any stupid remarks of that kind, but let us look at the situation a little further. I have shown by this conspectus that the workmen in almost every State, the A.C.T., the Northern Territory and Papua-New Guinea are all entitled to workmen's compensation for personal injury arising out of or in the course of employment. These workers (and here South Australia is the odd State out) are covered by their own State compensation Acts not only when they are within the State in which they reside but when they go outside the State. So we could

have, if this measure were passed (and God forbid that it should be), the absurd position of some Victorian or New South Wales workers in South Australia working alongside workers from South Australia and, if an accident occurred in which a South Australian and a Victorian worker were both injured, the Victorian worker would be paid compensation because the injury arose out of or in the course of his employment, whereas the South Australian worker could be required to go to the court and prove that the employment was a contributing factor.

Mr. Broomhill: What does the Attorney-General say about this?

Mr. VIRGO: He is not even here. That is how much importance he places on the lives and wellbeing of these people. He treats this House with complete contempt, and it is for that reason that I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member seeks leave to continue his remarks. That the honourable member have leave to continue his remarks.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, the honourable member must continue.

Mr. Lawn: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the first time you asked the question there was no objection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order! I asked if there was any objection to the request that the honourable member have leave and a member called out "No".

Mr. HUDSON: I would suggest that in order to clarify the position, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you might care to ask again.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If honourable members wish, I will ask again. That the honourable member have leave.

Mr. Evans: No.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: No.

Mr. McAnaney: No.

Mr. Edwards: No.

Mr. VIRGO: Thank you very much. Let me express my appreciation to the member for Stirling, the marvellous Minister of Education and the member for Eyre—

Mr. Lawn: And the member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. VIRGO: —I did not hear him so I will leave him out—of the attitude they have so adequately displayed today. Their arrogance is beyond all comparison.

Mr. McAnaney: Lay off the abuse.

Mr. VIRGO: I will give the member for Stirling more abuse if he treats the House with the contempt he has just shown, as has the Minister of Education and the member for Eyre. Not one of you is worth the position you hold.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VIRGO: This House is being treated with contempt when the Minister in charge of the Bill is not even in the House to hear the remarks made; yet the Minister previously said he wanted to hear the remarks during the second reading debate, and on the basis of this he would decide whether he would go on in Committee this evening. It is a disgrace to the institution of Parliament when a Minister in charge of a Bill treats the House with such contempt and it is equally disgraceful for the three members I have named, one of whom is a Minister, to back up that contempt of Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. Hurst: Look at the front bench.

Mr. VIRGO: It is not very pretty, is it?

Mr. McAnaney: They will have the State booming.

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member for Stirling has had South Australia burning away. The way he is going perhaps he is referring to what happened at the weekend. Perhaps he is getting a lot of delight out of the plight of the farmers on the West Coast. Is he one of the sadistic types who get a lot of pleasure out of the misfortune of other people?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will get back to the Bill.

Mr. VIRGO: I could get back to the Bill much more easily if we had the Minister here to listen. Apparently, the Minister is not the least bit concerned about the welfare of the worker.

Mr. McAnaney: You've done more harm than good to them.

Mr. VIRGO: The member for Stirling will have an opportunity to speak again when we get into Committee and I hope he will explain to the Committee and to the workers of South Australia what he meant when he said that the workers must be justly compensated for injuries they receive during employment. He will have his opportunity then.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. VIRGO: In Committee we will see whether he does in fact believe that injured workers should be compensated because the compensation provisions of the Bill are far from what is desired. The pittances in the Bill are more than outweighed by the scurrilous amendment to section 4 of the Act. I would describe this Bill as a suger-coated pill of poison that will do far more to create industrial unrest than any other act of this Government in the short period it has been in office.

I am delighted that the Attorney-General has at last decided to present himself again to listen to the second reading debate. Earlier, I thought he was interested, but then he showed lack of interest by walking out altogether. I am grateful that he has been prevailed upon to come back.

I want to make one or two other references of a general nature to this Bill, although I believe more will be said in Committee than in the second reading stages. This is terribly important and I think this is shown by figures that were given to me yesterday from findings of the Labour and Industry Department: that in 1968-69 there were 14 fatal industrial accidents in this State, in respect of which $113,700 was paid. These figures intrigue me because the Act currently provides for the payment of $12,000 on death or permanent injury, yet in respect of 14 fatal accidents only $113,700 was paid out. It would be most interesting if someone could come up with the answer as to what happened to the remainder. However, the important point to which I want to draw attention is that there were 14 fatal accidents. In addition, 9,888 accidents involved time off from work of one week or more, and this incurred a loss of working time of 40,089 weeks together with payments of compensation of $3,143,100. This is a fairly important Bill and should not be, in any circumstances, treated in a cavalier manner, as it has been up until now.

The Bill can be briefly summarized by saying that, although it rectifies a previously restrictive factor by defining an injury and a disease, it immediately takes away any benefit that these two definitions provide by reversing the onus of proof on to the injured workman. The Bill acknowledges the inadequacy of the present restrictive provision debarring a worker who receives more than $110 a week. Then it fails to acknowledge properly the inadequacy of the average weekly payment, which is presently $32.50 for married men and $22 for single men. The Bill acknowledges the inadequacy of the current $10 fine of an employer for non-insurance, but increases it to only $100 and fails completely to alter the amount in section 108 (2) which is currently $40 a week. In fact, although it gives a little it takes a lot, and where it is giving it is failing to make proper and adequate provision. Frankly, there is only one point in the Bill that I think adequately handles the particular deficiency, and I refer to clause 12, which removes the limitation of 12 months on the bringing of an action. This is one of the few clauses that does anything worth while.

For these reasons, we have seen fit to give notice of many amendments that we believe the Committee should consider. Whether the Bill receives the support of the Opposition will depend on the decision of the Committee, as the Leader has already said. In its present form, the Bill is not worth 1c. It is a backward step and, unless it is amended, it will not receive the support of Opposition members. It contains a vicious re-enactment of section 4. Members opposite are probably not aware of this because of their lack of experience in industrial matters but, if they inquire of solicitors who have handled industrial cases (I am not sure whether the Attorney-General has handled such cases, although he may have), they will find out that these cases can go on for month after month and that, in certain cases, it is almost impossible to prove the point.

One example of this that readily comes to mind is in the case of an injury occurring while a person was travelling to and from work. This case occurred in New South Wales, where a workmen is covered if he receives an injury on the way home from work (this provision now applies in South Australia thanks to the action of the previous Labor Government). The workman concerned was riding his bicycle home from work. He turned in off the road towards his gateway, was hit by a car in the gateway and thrown by the impact, landing in his drive. The court ruled that the accident did not occur on his way home from work, because he had landed inside his own property. That is one example of the complexities associated with workmen's compensation. Regarding a former Bill before the House, this shows the necessity for specialized attention by the judiciary in this field. I know that the Attorney-General has proposed to increase the maximum weekly sum payable

to married men from $32.50 to $40; to single men from $22 to $27; and the minimum payment from $12 to $15. Although I searched the second reading explanation to try to find some logical reason for the Attorney-General's arriving at these figures, I could not find it. Therefore, I am left with only one assumption: that these figures were just willy nilly pulled out of the air and apparently have no relationship to anything. At the appropriate time, we will seek to rectify this position.

I sincerely regret that the representations made by the trade union movement to the Minister (unfortunately he is ill, and we all wish him well in his recovery) that the legislation should be amended to provide that an employee who was injured should receive, during the term of his incapacity, his average weekly earnings, were not succesful; surely any workman is entitled to receive just that. Where is the justification for a man, who earns $60 or $70 a week and who is injured while carrying out functions assigned to him by his boss, suddenly having his income reduced to a maximum of $40, as the Bill provides? Unfortunately, the Government does not pay much regard to logic but plays the old numbers game, whereby the heads are counted, and as long as the numbers are there logic does not count. It has rejected the logic of the argument of the Trades and Labor Council and included the figure of $40 in this Bill. I commend this book to members and suggest that they may be able to obtain a copy of it from the Parliamentary Library. Alternatively, they may purchase it if they send $1 to Melbourne for it. If members read this book they will see the amounts paid to injured workers throughout Australia.

In New South Wales average weekly earnings are paid. If employers in New South Wales are capable of paying insurance premiums to enable injured workers to receive average weekly earnings, can any logical case be made out why it should not apply here? The same system applies in Queensland. I will not go on and deal with all the other States. Trying to be fairly realistic, we accept the fact that the Government has rejected the union submission and has been pig-headed, just as the Attorney-General was pig-headed in connection with the last matter we dealt with.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I had all the arguments on that one on my side.

Mr. VIRGO: If the Attorney-General had all the arguments on his side, he kept them there. Of course, he had the numbers. We intend to seek at least to upgrade the meagre maximum of $40 and to make appropriate amendments to the other figures. Section 18 of the principal Act provides that, where a person is on weekly payments, he can receive an additional $9 for his wife. It is significant that the Bill does not alter the current figure. The figures of $9 for a wife and $3.50 for a child mean little because, whilst the principal Act provides for payment of three-quarters of the average weekly earnings plus $3.50 for each child under 16 years of age and $9 for a wife, it then immediately cuts away the ground by providing for a maximum of $32.50, so it might as well have been $32.50 in the first place.

The principal Act provides for an allowance for a wife, but this Bill also establishes a principle by making provision for an allowance to a mother. However, I am at a loss to understand why the Government stopped there. Surely a step-mother or grandmother who looks after a workman should be in the same position. Even if there is no relationship at all, what is the difference? Plenty of people live together as brother and sister and many people live together simply as good friends. Why should the same position not apply? I hope the Government will see the wisdom of my argument.

Clause 16 increases the maximum fine for failure to insure from $10 to $100 for each employee. This means that, if an employer has in his employ 10 men whom he has not insured, he can be fined up to $1,000. This is just chicken feed. We intend to move an amendment to provide that the fine be $1,000 for each employee. I frankly assert that I hope the fine is heavy enough to send an employer bankrupt if he fails to insure his employees, and ensure that he will not be able to carry on his business. We considered a different amendment but we will not be proceeding with it because we encountered drafting problems.

At present the various insurance companies contribute to a fund so that, if a person is injured by a non-insured driver, he is not left without cover. Similarly, there ought to be a common pool in connection with workmen's compensation. Perhaps a fund could be established from the fines imposed on employers who fail to insure their employees. We will rectify what I presume to be the Government's oversight by amending the figure of $40 and increasing the fine to $1,000. Section 108 (4) of the principal Act at present prohibits a prosecution for non-insurance without the consent of the Minister. What a

wonderful opportunity the Minister has, if he cares to exercise it, to protect the employer who has committed the sin of failing to insure his employees! The Minister has the chance of protecting such an employer from the law. I hope that this provision will be deleted in Committee. I am greatly disappointed with this Bill because there was so much that the Government could have done but, regrettably, it has completely failed in its task of providing adequate compensation for the workers of this State. We have heard many claims by Government members, particularly the Premier, about how prosperous we are in South Australia and how well we are getting on now that we have a Liberal Government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out that the honourable member has five minutes to go before his time expires.

Mr. VIRGO: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I was finishing my speech, anyway. Let us see whether members opposite will now turn their words into actions. In the debate on this Bill they have the opportunity to show whether they will look after the people who have made the State prosperous, namely, the workers who have produced the goods. We will test the sincerity of members opposite when we reach Committee and move the various amendments. I support the second reading purely to get the Bill into Committee, in the hope of getting the few benefits that are in it for the worker, but I repeat the Leader's statement that the few benefits are not worth winning at the expense of placing the onus of proof on the injured worker.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): I wish to say only a few words on the Bill and to refer particularly to my calling "No" and being the first member to do so when the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) sought leave to continue his remarks. I support the Bill. I consider that it gives extra benefits to the worker, particularly the worker who is employed. Of course, not only those persons who are employed are workers: many workers are self-employed. In fact, I think some of the hardest workers in the State are self-employed persons in their own small or large businesses. I support the Bill because I consider that any move by the Government to help those who have an unfortunate accident while employed is a good move. I do not consider that we can go to extremes overnight.

Mr. Virgo: This Bill is going to extremes overnight.

Mr. EVANS: Doubtless, South Australia is progressing for the first time in the last five or six years, and the credit for this must go to the Government. My reason for calling "No" when the member for Edwardstown sought leave was that I believed that the honourable member knew that the Attorney-General had been called out of the House on an urgent matter.

Mr. Virgo: How was I to know that?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member also knew that no agreement had been entered into beforehand about seeking leave to continue. It is the practice for the Whips to reach agreement in these circumstances. The honourable member also knew that the Attorney-General always accepts responsibility honestly and sincerely and never shirks an issue. The honourable member must have known that there was a good reason for the Attorney's absence from the Chamber. The Attorney-General had to leave the Chamber for a reason similar to that for which other Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition have to go outside. The Leader is seldom in this Chamber. My main reason for calling "No" was that, when I had a private member's motion before the House and had arranged with the Whip to debate the motion, the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) secured the adjournment of the debate. The precedent for my action was set by the Opposition. I support the Bill and refute the statements that have been made by the member for Edwardstown.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): With some reluctance, I say that I support the Bill. The machinery of Parliament is such that we on this side must have some Bill before us to try to insert amendments that will improve the Act, not to make it revolutionary but merely to try to maintain the *status quo*. I was somewhat amused by the support for the Bill given by the member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. Clark: What did he say?

Mr. HURST: He merely tried to defend his action in refusing leave to the member for Edwardstown to continue his remarks when, if what the honourable member has said is correct, the Attorney-General was called out of the House on other business. The Attorney-General is in charge of the Bill, and surely his absence would have been sufficient reason for granting leave to the member for Edwardstown to continue his remarks. The Attorney-General had said that he wanted to hear the submissions made by members on

this side of the Chamber, and the objection by a member opposite to the granting of leave to continue in those circumstances shows the high-handed attitude that members opposite will adopt when we are dealing with any measure affecting the workers of this State.

Mr. Clark: Do you know why they objected? They wouldn't have known what to do.

Mr. HURST: They would not: they would have been in a flat spin. Indeed, I have noticed that the Attorney has more or less taken charge of the House to try to get some of these Bills through. His colleagues have been unsuccessful and it seems to me there might be friction in the camp opposite. I hope the Attorney listens to the logic that we intend to put forward regarding the Bill and I hope that, if he does, he will not be treated as some of his colleagues in the Commonwealth Parliament have been treated.

Not long ago in this House we had an experience that is relevant to the statement by the member for Onkaparinga that the member for Edwardstown had not conferred with the Whip about seeking leave to continue his remarks. Even though our Whip had the signature of the other side granting pairs in relation to a particular matter, that arrangement was cancelled when the matter came to an issue and the Government was in a spot. Because of what has gone on, no-one will convince me that there is logic in the honourable member's suggestion about conferring with the Whips, because I refuse to accept that, even if there was a definite arrangement, we could rely on it. My statement is based on happenings in the Chamber in which the Government has been completely unreliable.

One of the most contentious clauses is clause 5, which amends section 4 by placing the onus of proof on the injured worker. I appreciate how embarrassed the Attorney-General is about this particular amendment, because he listened to the debate in this Chamber when the existing provisions were inserted in the section, and he should be reminded of what was said on that occasion. There was disagreement between this House and another place about providing coverage for workers when travelling to or from work. It was at our insistence, after an all-night conference with another place when this matter was thoroughly explored by both sides and all angles were investigated, that finally a proposition was made. Its substance should have been in the Act for many years.

Mr. Clark: That is the one they will try to take out next year.

Mr. HURST: The provision in this Bill is the first step towards weakening the right of the worker by making him prove that his employment was a contributing factor to his injury. I cannot comprehend the logic of the Government. We are sick of this type of legislation. We have recently heard the Attorney-General telling us about this three-tier court system and how it would expedite legal work and provide for the more rapid handling of cases. He really touched my heart, and I did not raise any great opposition to that Bill; I merely opposed it.

What is he up to now in this Bill? He goes into raptures about setting up a three-tier court system that will expedite the legal work and, two days after getting that Bill through, he brings down a Bill containing the type of provision we see in clause 5, which states:

Section 4 of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is enacted and inserted in its place:

4 (1) If, on or after the day of commencement of the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Act, 1969, a workman suffers an injury to which his employment was a contributing factor, his employer shall, subject to this Act, be liable to pay compensation in accordance with this Act.

It had been impossible in some circumstances, because of procrastination by the employers and the insurance companies, to proceed with legitimate claims for compensation. This provision places the onus on the person who has suffered a disability, through no fault of his own, as a result of his honest attempt to earn a livelihood and produce something for this country, to prove that his injury was associated with his employment. That is most unreasonable. If this principle is to be observed, it will open up the way to cluttering up the three-tier court system that the Attorney-General is introducing. In fact, the position will become so serious that he will try to build several more tiers on to his new system, and the sixth tier will be the tears in the eyes of the people of South Australia at the mishandling of this matter.

The Government in the past has endeavoured (and rightly so) to encourage employers to promote industrial safety. I can recall that on one occasion I was invited to attend a large

industrial establishment which was celebrating a certain number of working hours free from accident or compensation claims. I remember that the manager of that company, when we were discussing the amendment of the Workmen's Compensation Act to increase payments, said, "We are not concerned; we shall avoid workmen's compensation payments by preventing accidents." I think this is a sound and just approach.

What will this Bill do? It will open up the way for employers not to take the action to introduce measures for the prevention of industrial accidents that they should be taking. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) has quoted figures of accident statistics. I say unequivocally that I do not believe there is any amount of money that can be awarded that will reasonably compensate a person for the disability and injury he receives. Money will not restore the health or the limbs of an individual. When employees find it is more difficult to successfully claim for compensation, this will tend to distract the employer from providing proper safety measures and promoting safety in industry. Members opposite will recall that periodically questions have been asked in this Chamber about accident statistics. I am pleased to say that, by and large, industrial safety activities reflect on the accident rate and tend to lower it, but only because the Workmen's Compensation Act has been improved to such an extent that it has forced employers to embark on these measures. The more pressure that can be put on employer organizations, the sooner we shall have safer working conditions and less need to be concerned about the incidence of injury to employees.

This Bill is a retrograde step. In many respects, South Australia has been behind the times in these matters. It was not until there was a Labor Government in South Australia that we could improve the situation by introducing a measure to cover every person travelling to and from work. The member for Edwardstown spoke of the case in New South Wales concerning the employee who was at his home when he got thrown from his bicycle. There are many similar cases, and these are factors that should make us consider whether it is wise to take a retrograde step and amend the principal Act by putting the onus of proof on the employee. That will place him in a difficult position and will only clutter up the courts; it will be time-wasting and will create much hardship. I sincerely hope that the Attorney-General will recall the discussions we had a few years ago when the Act was being amended and that he will adhere to the principles he expressed then. Also, I hope that this Chamber will adhere to the decisions it has made in the past and support the amendments that will be forthcoming from members on this side. This Bill attempts to increase the weekly rate of payment, but the amount being provided is not adequate. No worker should suffer any loss of pay as a result of an accident or injury arising out of or in the course of his employment.

People do not injure themselves for the sake of suffering pain and agony. Also, during this period of pain and suffering they are being penalized by a reduction in the amount of their take-home pay. Their families have to be educated and in some cases they are away from work for a long time. The employee's family also suffers from additional mental strain in trying to make the reduced amount meet commitments, to educate the children, and to do everything possible to maintain a standard of living that these people so justly deserve. I support the second reading in the sincere hope that we will be able to include the amendments that are on file. I agree with the member for Edwardstown that if the amendments we propose are not carried the carrot that is being dangled out by the Government is not worth while. The principle is too great to concede, and the meagre increases will not entice me and other Opposition members to vote for the Bill unless the Government sees its way clear to take out this obnoxious provision that requires an employee to prove that his injury was contributed to by his employment.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I am disappointed in this Bill because of the effect it will have on the workmen's compensation position in this State and because of the way the Minister has introduced it. I shall not repeat what I said last evening about the importance of workmen's compensation to the community. The member for Edwardstown and others have spoken about the effect of injuries on the livelihood and economic situation of many families in this State. When debating a similar matter last evening, I said that about 50,000 workmen's compensation claims were made each year. When we consider the number that would occur in 10 years we must realize that workmen's compensation has an important effect on most workers at some time during their working life. For this reason I am disappointed in the meagre

information given in the second reading explanation and disappointed also in the attitude of Government members. Apparently, barbs from Opposition members drew two Government members to their feet in a weak endeavour to support the Attorney-General, but both speakers showed that they were completely unfamiliar with workmen's compensation and the problems that confront employees in this regard, and their contributions only harmed the Attorney-General's already weak case. The most amusing thing about the Attorney-General's contribution was the initial words of the second reading explanation. He said:

It is to some extent the result of discussions with bodies interested in workmen's compensation and effects certain amendments to the principal Act which appear desirable.

Surely the Attorney-General does not suggest that the discussions he had with the Trades and Labor Council (representing the employees of this State) are the reason for this Bill being introduced. That is far from being so. The trade union movement has made it clear (as was pointed out by the Leader) that it wants no part of the Bill while the obnoxious clause 5 remains in it. It is not true to say that the Trades and Labor Council, which is a body interested in workmen's compensation, would consider that these amendments were desirable. Who are the interested parties, to whom the Attorney-General draws our attention, who think that the amendments are desirable? If it is not the Trades and Labor Council it must be the insurance companies.

The Leader of the Opposition expressed the point of view of all Opposition members when he said that, if the Bill passed the second reading with the onus of proof clause remaining in its present form, Opposition members would be forced to vote against the third reading. The Attorney-General has covered up the real intention for introducing this Bill, which is to place the onus of proof for injuries at work on the employee, and has glossed this over by including one or two minor but desirable alterations. The definitions of "disease" and "injury" are consistent with the position in other States and, accordingly, can be supported. The next alteration is the increase in maximum weekly payments from $32.50 to $40 for a married man. Once again we can accept this proposal, which, no doubt, is the icing on the pill that the Attorney-General hopes Opposition members will swallow. It seems to me there is no reason for us to go into raptures over the fact that the employee will be entitled to $40 a week for workmen's compensation.

For too long we have accepted the payment of workmen's compensation to injured employees as being a privilege rather than a right. Why should we be thrilled about the fact that a married employee, who is injured, will received $40 under the provisions of this Bill? If an employee, through no fault of his own and in the course of his employment, is injured and ceases work for some time as a result of the injury, he should receive exactly the same amount as he would have received had he not been injured at work. This employee would have committed himself for hire-purchase payments and for his general living necessities to the fullest extent of his take-home pay, and it seems to me that the increased weekly payment of $40 is not something that should make us accept the other provisions in this Bill.

As has been pointed out, even this increase of $7.50 a week is not sufficient to retain the same relationship with the living wage as existed when the current $32.50 a week was written into the Act in 1963, at a time when it was within $6.40 of the tradesmen's rate. However, since then there has been a 40 per cent increase in the tradesmen's rate, so that it is at present $42.50, which is $5.50 more than the sum contained in the Government's proposal. Therefore, the Attorney-General is not even seeking to retain the relative position that applied previously. The Attorney-General has no doubt had greater experience than I have had of the types of problem that a workman may encounter when he is injured on the job, perhaps receiving a back injury, hernia or some other injury that is not clearly visible. If an employee loses, say, a finger or part of a limb, it is a simple matter for him to receive compensation without any argument, for in those circumstances there is no real need for an onus of proof. However, most accidents that prevent employees from continuing in their occupation involve back injuries. If the onus of proof is on an employee to establish that he was injured at work when there was no particular instance of falling over or of injuring the back through lifting, it is often difficult for a doctor to testify under oath that the work that the employee was doing resulted in his injury.

I believe the onus of proof in this instance should be on the Attorney-General to justify this substantial alteration to the Act. He has

certainly not tried to justify it in his second reading explanation, having confined his remarks on the matter to only half a dozen lines. In the circumstances to which I have referred, it can be argued that an employee may have injured his back while gardening or doing something else at home. In many cases the employee concerned may be getting on in years and suffering from a degenerate condition and not able to determine whether his injury occurred at work or as a result of that condition. The Attorney-General may have acted for people in this category, who have lost their complete earning capacity but, because of the onus of proof on them, are unable to receive any workmen's compensation. The amendment made to the Act during the term of the Labor Government removed that unfortunate obligation from the employee and placed it on the employer. Whereas a particular employee, who may not be able to work again, may not receive any compensation, the employer on the other hand, if a claim is proved, is required to pay only a slight increase in his insurance premiums, for it is the insurance company that is required to pay the employee in these circumstances.

Obviously, the greatest hardship is on the ordinary employee in the community who has much to lose, as against the insurance company that has so little to lose. In all of these matters, the sympathy of the legislators should be with those who suffer most in this regard. The Attorney-General could have placed many other matters before the House if he were genuine in his desire to implement the results of the discussions held with interested persons. He could have considered the submissions previously before Parliament, regarding other disabilities encountered by workmen. There is no reference in the Bill to improving the ability of an employee to establish his rights to compensation as a result of an injury that may have been received in a workshop. For many years, problems have arisen from the fact that, following an accident, the employee concerned is required by the insurance company to see a doctor and to have X-rays taken and reports made.

Whereas these reports and X-rays have been forwarded to the insurance company, the employee has been completely unaware of what is going on. Why cannot the employee be provided with this information, so that he can properly defend himself in respect of any legal action? For too long we have had the situation in which an employee may have injured himself because of faulty equipment in a factory but in which the solicitor engaged by that employee has been refused access to the area in question in order to ascertain the cause of the injury and to see where the blame properly lies. There is no provision in the Bill requiring an employer to allow an injured workman or person acting on the workman's behalf to enter the area where the accident may have taken place. These are the matters we should be considering when dealing with workmen's compensation, rather than considering provisions that clearly place the responsibility on the employee in all instances.

We have also found that one of the real difficulties facing employees who have been injured is that, once they have been injured, the employer immediately loses all interest in them, saying, "You are the responsibility of our insurance company." When the employee, his wife, or some other representative calls at the factory to receive his pay for the first week after the injury, the employer has nothing to do with the matter, saying that the employee's representative must go to the insurance company. The insurance company says, "We do our books only once a month; we will post a cheque in a month's time." This has been going on for years and it is not good enough. Meagre as the weekly payments are, at least if an employee receives them each week he is able to exist and pay his rent. The Attorney-General said that he had listened to what interested persons had had to say about this matter but, if that is the case, why is no provision made to obligate the employer to pay the employee each week and to impose some penalty if that is not done?

I repeat that I am most disappointed with the Bill. I hope the Attorney-General will reconsider the matter, bearing in mind the problems confronting employees as a result of the onus of proof provision. It is no good his saying that it would be difficult for employers to establish that an injury had not taken place at work. It may be difficult for them, but it is far better for it to be difficult for them or their insurance companies than it is for it to be impossible for an injured employee to prove his case. I ask the Attorney-General to look at the points Opposition members have made. All workers are interested in workmen's compensation and realize the need for proper arrangements, for they see their workmates in difficulty in receiving compensation payments each week. If the Bill goes through as it stands, I agree with the Leader that workers

will register this objection most strongly. I support the second reading, hoping that some changes to the Bill will be made in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to the amount of compensation when a workman dies leaving dependants, fixed rates of compensation for certain injuries, copies of medical reports, determination of sums to be invested, appeals, right of entry, questions of dependency, weekly payments and upper limits of compensation.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SUPERANNUATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3248.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support what the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) said yesterday. It is highly desirable that the Public Service should have a satisfactory superannuation scheme, as that is one of the attractions offered to people to become public servants. The member for Glenelg said, after examining the Bill closely, that he intended to move amendments. One thing that concerns all people who are subject to superannuation is the effect that changing money values have on pensions. This is a continuing problem with which people have concerned themselves over the years. I believe we should be able to work out a formula whereby adjustments can be made to superannuation pensions. I realize that it is a weighty actuarial problem, but it should be tackled. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Definitions."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): Because the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) needs more time to draft an amendment to this clause, it is necessary that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

Mr. HUDSON: I draw the Treasurer's attention to the definition of "service", as follows:

> "service" means service under or employment by the Government of South Australia and includes service under or employment by the South Australian Railways Commissioner, the Irrigation Commission, the Commissioner of Highways, the State Bank of South Australia, the Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology and service as defined in the repealed Act and service which is by or under any Act regarded as service under the Government of South Australia.

I believe we should not use the words "service as defined in the repealed Act" in this Bill if the words in the repealed Act can readily be incorporated. Why put on anyone, who has to refer to the Bill when it becomes an Act, the requirement of going back to the repealed Act to find out what is included in this definition? As that seems unsatisfactory, I believe it should be rectified. The relevant words in the repealed Act relate to an amendment in the Superannuation Act Amendment Act of 1966, as follows:

> . . . and includes service under or employment by the Government of the Commonwealth or of any other State to the extent directed by the Public Service Commissioner pursuant to section 76 of the Public Service Act, 1936-1966, where such service or employment is continuous with service under or employment by the Government of South Australia.

I do not know what effect the words "service as defined in the repealed Act" are meant to have. Surely it should be possible to frame the definition so as to avoid reference to the repealed Act.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I see the point that the honourable member has made. I also see the validity of the drafting in so far as it does not leave any loophole or create any problem, because the whole situation is covered.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not in a way that we can be certain about.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I remember that the Leader once introduced a Bill that encompassed in its ambit (perhaps I should say "orbit") I do not know how many other Acts of Parliament. So, I think it ill-becomes him to criticize the drafting on this occasion.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not introduce definitions in that way.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In order to interpret the Bill that the Leader introduced on that occasion, it was necessary to consult all the other Acts affected. Possibly it could

be advantageous to restate in this Bill the terms referred to. It could possibly be done between this place and another place.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You would not have said that if you had been over here.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think it is common ground between people on both sides that when things are different they are not the same. If the Committee desires it, this matter can be attended to between this place and another place, but there is no need to delay this matter now. I will discuss it with the draftsman and the Attorney-General with a view to giving effect to the wishes of the Opposition.

Mr. HUDSON: I accept that assurance. However, I should like a further explanation. We are dealing with persons employed by the following persons or bodies (they shall be deemed to be employed by the Government of South Australia):

(*a*) the South Australian Railways Commissioner;
(*b*) the Irrigation Commission;
(*c*) the Commissioner of Highways;
(*d*) the State Bank of South Australia;
or
(*e*) the Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology.

(3) Any person for the time being holding any of the following offices:—

(*a*) South Australian Railways Commissioner;
(*b*) Irrigation Commissioner;
(*c*) Commissioner of Highways;
(*d*) Commissioner appointed under the Public Service Act, 1967, as amended;
(*e*) Garden Suburb Commissioner;
or
(*f*) any other office the period of the term of which is limited or fixed by any Act—

then follows a series of words that are not in the repealed Act—

and the occupant of which who is by the terms of his employment in that office required to give his whole time to the duties of that employment . . .

Why was it necessary to make this definition stricter? The appropriate provision in the repealed Act provided that any person in any other office in a permanent capacity was entitled to join the fund.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know precisely. I do not think this narrows the situation. The words "in any other office" could widen it.

Mr. HUDSON: The words "in any other office" are in the Act being repealed. The words added are "and the occupant of which who is by the terms of his employment in that office required to give his whole time to the duties of that employment."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Frankly, I have not researched this aspect but I do not think it could be held that a person not in full-time employment should come within the purview of the Act.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not intend to oppose the insertion of those words but I had hoped for an explanation from the Treasurer. I move:

In subclause (4) after paragraph (*d*) to insert:

or
(*e*) he is employed as an apprentice in the service of the Government of South Australia or as an apprentice appointed under the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, 1936, as amended.

The amendment provides that an apprentice in the Government service is an employee for the purposes of the Bill and is entitled to contribute to the fund. I understand that at present no apprentice is allowed to contribute, but I consider that the same provisions as apply to other young people in Government employ should apply to apprentices. Although many apprentices will not want to contribute, because of their relatively low income, those who want to contribute ought to be able to do so. I understand that some railway apprentices who have wanted to contribute to the fund have not been allowed to do so.

Mr. Broomhill: Apprentices would be permanent employees.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and the likelihood of their continuing in employment is increased if they contribute to the Superannuation Fund. The turnover of apprentices coming out of their time is not favourable to the Government and fewer may leave the service if they are enabled to join the fund while they are apprenticed.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not seriously disagree with the amendment, because an apprentice who has reached the age of 20 years is nearing the end of his apprenticeship and is a stable person who would probably be a good person to admit as a contributor. However, the minimum contribution required may be heavy during the years of apprenticeship. That is a matter that is up to him to consider, and can well be left to his discretion. However, I do not wish this move to be construed as an effort to tie an apprentice to the

Railways Commissioner or to any other person if, at the end of his apprenticeship, he does not wish to stay with that department; and it would not be proper to restrict the employer by requiring him to continue automatically his employment of every person who does an apprenticeship. I point out to the honourable member that I am not so happy about his next amendment. If we admit people below the age of 20 years the admission of apprentices becomes more difficult to accept. I am prepared to accept this amendment, but I hope that the honourable member does not persist with his next amendment, because that may create difficulties in this regard.

Mr. VIRGO: Although the Treasurer has accepted this amendment, I am not clear about its meaning. Does the 20-year provision apply to apprentices? The present amendment provides for an apprentice to be entitled to become a contributor on becoming an apprentice. I hope it means that when a person becomes an apprentice and signs his contract he is then eligible to apply and be accepted by the board as a member of the fund.

Mr. HUDSON: This amendment defines the meaning of "employee" and includes an apprentice as an employee. I wish to provide that someone under 20 years of age, whether married or not, or a male or a female, can become a contributor, which is the position under the present Act, but we have to amend clause 27. By the amendment we are giving an apprentice aged 20 years the right to become a contributor, which will mean that he will be on a par with any other Government employee.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to the provision which is not contained in the principal Act that gives the Government the right to declare by proclamation any employee or any person or class of person who is an employee not to be an employee, and then subsequently to revoke that proclamation. Can the Treasurer say why it is necessary to include that provision in the Bill? It appears that the provision gives a wide power to the Government of the day to administer the Act in a way that may defeat the intentions of Parliament. For example, there would be nothing to stop the Government from introducing a proclamation declaring all apprentices not to be employees for the purposes of the Act. I should like to receive an assurance from the Treasurer regarding the way in which the power to make and revoke a proclamation is to be used.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As I understand it, the purpose of this provision is to avoid subsequent amendments to the Act and to provide the machinery whereby the case of a person moving from one class of employment to another class of employment within the service (for example, a person moving from the Crown Solicitor's office to the Supreme Court bench) can be dealt with in a simple manner. It is certainly not to be used for the purpose suggested by the honourable member to the effect that, having declared the apprentices referred to in the amendment just accepted as being contributors under the Act, we would suddenly say that they should be declared not to be contributors. It is purely for convenience, where an employee moves from one class of employment to another.

Mr. HUDSON: If the person concerned, for example, becomes a judge of the Supreme Court, then he is no longer an employee, anyway, because a judge of the Supreme Court is not included as an employee. I presume there are examples relating to the definition of "employee" where the category is not spelt out in the list given.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I used that as an illustration that readily came to mind. It is this class of thing that is intended to be covered by the provision.

Mr. HUDSON: So long as we have the assurance that this power relating to proclamation will be used only concerning people of the kind mentioned in the various provisos to the definition of "employee", I am happy with that assurance.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I give you that assurance.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 21 passed.

Clause 22—"Cost of management."

Mr. HUDSON: This clause, which deals with the general cost of the administration of the fund, states that the general cost of administration shall be paid out of moneys appropriated from time to time by Parliament for the purpose but that, at the end of each financial year, there shall be paid from the fund to the Treasurer in aid of the general revenue of the State the amounts paid into the fund under subclause (3) of this clause, and that subclause provides that each contributor shall pay 2c a fortnight towards the cost of administration. The Treasurer has

explained that there will be substantial savings in the costs of the fund as a result of certain streamlining procedures being introduced that will enable a general computerization of many processes.

As a consequence, after an initial period of congestion there will be savings in administrative costs. At present, the Treasurer intends to continue the charge of 2c a fortnight for each contributor. This amounts to 52c a year, at which figure it has stood since the introduction of decimal currency; before that it had been 5s. a year for some time. I am prepared to agree that at this stage there is no case for any savings in the cost of administration being relayed back to the contributors, because at present they are not meeting anything like the overall cost of the administration of the scheme. Nevertheless, I should like to know whether, if the administrative savings that will come about as a result of the Bill turn out to be substantial, the Government will be prepared to review the fortnightly contributions each contributor is required to make.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As I think it will be some time before any substantial savings in administration are achieved, I would not like to give an undertaking that would bind the Treasurer of that time. I am informed on the best authority that at present the income derived from the charge of 2c a fortnight is about $11,000. I am also told that by far the major cost of administering the fund is borne by the Government. Therefore, savings would have to be substantial indeed before the Government enjoyed recoupment of the full cost of administration. I do not think the honourable member really expected me to give an assurance (obviously I cannot give it), but that he merely wanted to draw attention to this matter. As the attitude of the Government to the fund has been generous in the past, I have every reason to believe that, if and when the time arrives when substantial savings are made, the Government will consider the matter favourably.

Clause passed.

Clause 23 passed.

Clause 24—"Directions of the board."

Mr. HUDSON: The provisions concerning new contributions commenced and concerning existing contributors who have commenced contributions for additional units are such that there will generally be a delay in the making of these contributions, compared with the existing procedure. The delay will average six to seven months more than the period at present applying. In some cases the contributor may have to wait for 14 months before making the actual payments for additional units. In these circumstances it would be wise for the board to make available a general circular to all contributors stating what is involved in the new procedure and pointing out that no contributor will lose as a result of the delay in commencing contributions. If someone receives a salary increase and, under the present situation, elects to take more units, the extra units immediately become a taxation deduction. Such a contributor will want to know why he has to wait for up to 14 months before he can commence contributions under the new system. I hope the Treasurer will take up with the board the question of preparing the kind of circular I have referred to.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will do that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 25 and 26 passed.

Clause 27—"Certain employees not to contribute to the fund."

Mr. HUDSON: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(6) Notwithstanding anything in subsection (1) of this section, the board may in its discretion accept as a contributor an employee who has not attained the age of twenty years.

The existing Act gives every employee, of whatever age, the right to become a contributor to the Superannuation Fund. This Bill takes away that right by providing that, if a person is under the age of 20 years, he can become a contributor only if he is a married male. If someone under the age of 20 years wishes to become a contributor he should at least have the right to apply. If the board is satisfied that he is in completely sound health, I can see no reason why he should not be accepted. We ought to be encouraging people under the age of 20 years to become contributors. I expect that there is a much smaller turnover of staff in Government employment at present amongst those under 20 years of age who do become contributors than there is amongst those under 20 years of age who are not contributors. Therefore, I suggest that the Committee accept the amendment. It does not oblige a person under 20 years to be a contributor but merely gives him the right to contribute if the board accepts him.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot accept the amendment readily. I think that, in practice, little discretion is left to the board,

because if a young man applies to become a contributor and the board, for reasons that seem to it to be adequate, is not willing to exercise discretion in his favour, the situation becomes difficult. Doubtless, the board would assess the person's stability and maturity and his aptitude for his work, but it may not wish to give to the applicant the reasons or assessments if they are unfavourable to him. This could give rise to heartburning, heart-searching and recrimination by a young man of 18 years or 19 years if the board exercised its discretion not to accept him.

We must be more realistic than to believe that this discretion is of any value to the board or to the applicant, because the board may find it not expedient to admit any persons under 20 years as contributors or it may find that it has to accept them all. The point is whether it is desirable that unmarried men under 20 years of age be accepted as contributors automatically. A problem about that is that there is a large turnover of people at this stage of their employment. Although many young people who join the Public Service after leaving school consider their position attractive and think they will be happy in their career in the service, at that time of life people change their mind, perhaps because the job becomes tiresome or boring, and if industrial conditions outside are buoyant and they have the aptitude to accept other opportunities they leave the Government service. This creates administrative problems for the board, and it is not unreasonable not to accept the amendment.

Previously, it was the practice for a person to serve a probationary period before being admitted as a contributor, but this practice has now been eliminated. Frequently, this period would have taken the person over the age of 20 years. Also, it is not now required to obtain a medical certificate. In many respects the provisions that applied under the old Act are relaxed and, in these circumstances and bearing in mind the amendment that has been inserted in the definition clause to include apprentices as employees eligible to join the fund, I believe it would be proper not to accept this amendment. I think my reasons are fair and valid, not discriminatory, and in the interests of the administration and of all concerned.

Mr. VIRGO: I regret that the Treasurer has rejected the amendment. I think his action makes a mockery of accepting the previous amendment, which permitted apprentices to be regarded as employees. Now, young men cannot be regarded as employees until they are either 20 years of age or married. A person at 16 years, 17 years, or 18 years of age could find it necessary to hasten to a church or the Registry Office to be married, and immediately he becomes eligible to apply to join the fund. I see no difficulties in permitting the board to use its discretion. All the Treasurer's arguments have been directed to those under 20 years of age, but they could equally apply to those over that age. If the Treasurer considered the records of departments, which are regarded as Government departments, he would find that the turnover of labour was just as high proportionately for those over 20 years of age as for those under that age. He would also find many senior officers who started in a department as apprentices and who have retained their service.

If the amendment is accepted, it will be an added inducement for young people joining the service of the South Australian Government to continue in that service. We must face the fact that there are not many benefits today in Government employment over and above those available in private employment: most of the benefits for which the South Australian Government employment was noted have been equalled or surpassed. At one time one could get annual leave only in the Government service, but today some outside employees are getting more leave than are Government employees; the same applies to sick leave, and so on.

Therefore, superannuation is one of the few privileges remaining for Government employees. I consider that everything possible should be done to encourage the retention of apprentices in the Government services, and this amendment would have just that effect. I appeal to the Treasurer to consider this matter further and, if he so desires as a result of the views I have put forward, I would be pleased if he would discuss it further with Cabinet.

There is much to commend the amendment. The added benefit that will be derived ought to be grasped with both hands. If superannuation were extended to apply to persons under 20 years of age, the Government, instead of being faced with an alleged high turnover of younger people, could find this turnover reducing.

Mr. HUDSON: I am disappointed with the Treasurer's attitude. It cannot be denied that the Government is taking away from these

people a right that exists in the present Act. At present every employee under 20 years of age has a right to contribute to the Superannuation Fund. However, the Government is now saying that those persons should no longer have that right, and that they must wait until they turn 20 before they can contribute. This may not be significant for a number of employees in this age group, but it will cause concern to some. The very fact that apprentices have desired to become contributors (the member for Edwardstown has had instances of that) indicates that people in this age group want to commence their contributions to the fund as soon as they possibly can.

Mr. Virgo: They are not as irresponsible as the Treasurer suggests.

Mr. HUDSON: That is correct. These young men would receive a taxation benefit as a result of their contributions. However, by the amendment, the Treasurer is denying them this.

Mr. Virgo: They'll go to insurance companies.

Mr. HUDSON: They will probably end up by doing that as a result of the Treasurer's attitude. Basically, for years and years, the Government of South Australia has provided that all of its employees, no matter what are their ages, have been entitled to be contributors to the Superannuation Fund. However, this Bill, initially by stealth (because nothing has was said in the explanation about taking away this right), is taking away the right of the people under the age of 20 to contribute for superannuation. I think the Treasurer's attitude is wrong. I do not think that this Bill, which is represented as a consolidation Bill, should be taking away rights, but that is what is happening. I press the amendment as strongly as I can.

Mr. LAWN: I am surprised at the Government's attitude in this matter, for it is not so long ago that it introduced a Bill to permit 18-year-olds to drink alcohol in public places. Now, it seeks to take away from 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds the right to contribute to the Superannuation Fund. The Government is not concerned about 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds, except when it suits it. The Attorney-General said last session that now was not the time to give 18-year-olds the right to vote; it would have to be done by uniform legislation when the other States had progressed to the extent that the Attorney-General thinks he has progressed. In this consolidation, the Government is leaving out 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds.

Mr. Corcoran: Yet their Commonwealth colleagues sent them overseas to fight for this country.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Members opposite support the Commonwealth Government's attitude in conscripting boys of 20 years for service overseas, yet they are here taking away from 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds the right to contribute to the Superannuation Fund. These boys will be at a voting age in 1971 and they will not forget what this Government has done to them.

Mr. Broomhill: It makes them sign an apprenticeship.

Mr. LAWN: During the last 18 months the Minister of Labour and Industry (who is unfortunately not with us this evening) has been doing his utmost to encourage apprenticeship, and I presume that includes apprenticeship in the Government service. This is another example of the Government's inconsistency. I hope one of the two Ministers present in the Chamber will say why the Government has acted so inconsistently in the past 12 months, but I do not think either Minister is interested.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, Stott, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Riches. No—Mr. Coumbe.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 28 to 42 passed.

Clause 43—"Amount of contributions."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

After "43" to insert (1); and to insert the following new subclause:

(2) The contributions for the first fourteen units of pension of a contributor who first becomes an employee after attaining the age of forty-five years shall be reduced in accordance with the following table:

Determining Age	Fraction of Reduction
46 years	1/30
47 years	1/15
48 years	1/10
49 years	2/15
50 years and over	1/6

and in that table—

"Determining age" means the age of the contributor on the anniversary of his birth next following the last day of the month immediately preceding the month in which his first payment day occurs:

"Fraction of reduction" means the fraction by which his contributions (other than his contributions payable pursuant to section 22 of this Act) for his first fourteen units of pension shall be reduced.

These amendments reinstate the benefiits that the Government has removed from section 75c (17) (*b*) of the current Act. These benefits were first introduced by the previous Government in 1965 and I understand that since then about 100 people have taken advantage of the benefits. However, although this Bill is supposed to consolidate the present legislation, these benefits are being removed without any explanation being given by the Treasurer. Members on this side consider that an employee who first joins the service at the age of 45 years or more is often confronted with difficulty in providing effectively for superannuation. The amendments introduced in 1965 were designed to make it easier for such a person to provide superannuation for himself. It is for this reason that they should be restored. The Government has not played it fair by removing these provisions without giving a full explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: I have some reservations about the admissibility of this amendment moved by a private member. Whether the amendment would involve Government expenditure is not clear from its wording and I would appreciate the assistance of the Treasurer in informing the Chair whether this proposed amendment attracts the appropriation of Government money or not.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As I understand it, the amendment would provide, in effect, two bonus units for new entrants into the fund after the age of 45 years.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has to determine whether this amendment attracts the appropriation of Government money or not.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think that there is little doubt that it does incur increased expenditure, but I do not want to rely on a technical point in order to have the amendment discussed. Therefore, I leave it to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, whether the amendment should be allowed. I have no wish to restrict or restrain the discussion of the amendment on a technical ground, and I make that clear.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not intend to create a precedent. I shall allow the matter to be discussed further, if the Committee so desires.

Mr. HUDSON: Are you ruling that the amendment is in order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I am not ruling it out of order.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept the point that the honourable member has moved this amendment and you, Mr. Chariman, have not ruled it out of order. Therefore, it is before the Committee for discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: That is so.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment. This provision was inserted in 1965, but the proposal not to continue this concession only applies to new entrants. It does not take away the benefit from those who have it now, but it will apply to new entrants in the future. The 1965 amendment was introduced to increase the attraction of the fund to persons over 45 years of age. However, during the period of its operation only about 100 people out of 20,000 contributors have taken advantage of it. It contained some anomalies: it did not include persons over 55 years of age contributing for a pension when they attained 65 years of age or persons over 55 years contributing for a pension when they attained 60 years. It did not, therefore, by any means cover the whole range of persons.

New members coming into the scheme have the full benefit of the fund, no matter how long they have contributed. With the exception of Queensland, where the position is obscure because of the complexity of the Act there, all other States reduce entitlement to benefit for persons of advanced age of entry. All other States reduce it, but we do not. This practice is also common in private superannuation funds.

Under our scheme, a person has, regardless of his length of service, a minimum entitlement if he takes all his units of a pension amounting to 60 per cent of his salary. The Committee will agree that this is fairly generous and that it should act as an incentive to the recruitment of older persons to the fund, without adding any additional attraction, as was proposed and, indeed, as was included in the 1965 Act.

The benefit of this large entitlement far outweighs the entitlement granted pursuant to the 1965 amendment. Few persons have been recruited at an age that has entitled them to this benefit. Recruits from other Government

funds do not come into this category as they are covered by regulations providing for the transfer of their contributions received on resignation from the other fund. They are therefore placed in a position in our fund as though they had commenced contributing to it at the age at which they joined the other fund. The concession therefore affects only those persons who come from outside the Government sector.

As I intimated earlier during the second reading debate, this is a restricted group, which comprises for the most part people who come into the service at 45 years of age and above and who have, generally speaking, special qualifications. It is not the practice of the Public Service Board to call for applications for positions from outside the service unless a special reason exists for so doing, or unless a specialist person of some sort is required to fill a specialized job. Applications are called from outside the service only if the Government is satisfied that no person within the service is suitable or has the necessary qualifications for the position.

One therefore finds that the group of people likely to benefit from this amendment is indeed small. This is proved by the fact that few people have availed themselves of it in the four years in which it has been in operation. I can see little equity in this. Indeed, this concession is extended to this small group at the expense of other people contributing to the fund. Therefore, I do not see that that is equitable. That this is an extremely complicated and difficult administrative provision, which confers so little benefit, which is so selective in its application, and which is so little sought after by people (on the experience of its operation over four years), is in my view full justification for removing it. I hope that the Committee will not accept the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: I am disappointed at the Treasurer's short-sighted attitude.

Mr. Clark: Are you surprised?

Mr. HUDSON: No, not altogether. After all, the Treasurer was responsible for removing these provisions from the original Act, although in 1965 he and other members of his Party supported their inclusion in the Act, when they were introduced by the previous Government. We heard nothing at that time about whether or not these provisions should be in the Act. Government members, who are now apparently under instructions from the Treasurer, are going to vote to exclude them. It seems to me that the position of someone who reaches the Public Service at an age greater than 45 and who needs to provide for superannuation is often a difficult one if he has family responsibilities, because he has to pay for those superannuation rights at a significantly higher rate. As they stand, the provisions give everyone at such an age a benefit, but the benefit is proportionately greater for those on lower salaries.

It is not a question of the tall poppies getting the most out of it. The benefits applied by this amendment affect only the first 14 units of pension and, for someone who is on a high salary, those first 14 units of pension are a smaller proportion of his total number of units, so that the benefit granted in that case is to that extent smaller. The amendment is designed to help where it is most necessary, and the help given is greater proportionately for those on a lower salary than for those on a higher one. I ask the Government to reconsider its attitude. After all, if a matter such as this is left out of the Bill, without members even being told about it, then the Government cannot consider it to be a matter of any great importance and, therefore, it must be something that is rather marginal in nature. Surely in those circumstances, if the Government thinks it is of a marginal nature, it should be prepared to reconsider its attitude.

In 1965, the Minister of Education was fairly vocal about the need to provide additional benefits. I should have thought she would be interested in my amendments from the point of view of attracting teachers from England who may first join the service at the age of 45 years or 50 years. Teachers of such ages in England may be worried about the expense of contributing to superannuation for the first time and may be influenced by the opportunity to make cheaper contributions. A person of the age of 50 would receive the first 14 units on the basis of his contributing 25 per cent and the Government's contributing 75 per cent. That is the effect of the one-sixth reduction for a person first joining at the age of 50 years. Unfortunately, we find that more people in this age bracket in private employment are getting the sack.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: In what circumstances?

Mr. HUDSON: People in semi-managerial positions. I know of some general retail firms that tend to dismiss employees at this age. Since I have been a member, many

such people have told me that they have great difficulty in getting a job. Even if they get an ordinary clerical job in the Public Service, if they have family commitments they have difficulty in taking out superannuation at that age. All the amendment seeks to do is to give them the opportunity to obtain superannuation a little more cheaply than would otherwise be the case.

The Treasurer has said that the Bill does not remove the rights of existing employees, and that is so, but it removes the rights of all potential employees of or over the age of 45 who join the service. In 1965 members of the Government Party complained bitterly about the stingy benefits granted by the Labor Party's proposals, yet the benefits proposed in this Bill are almost negligible, whereas certain benefits, such as the one we are now dealing with, are being removed. I ask Government members to vote in a way that is consistent with the way they voted in 1965, and I hope they will not remove real benefits that will help to attract a few employees of that age into the Public Service. These benefits will provide some comfort to people with family commitments who join the service at this age and who need this kind of superannuation cover.

Mr. McANANEY: Because we are not taking anything away from any person who is at present a member of the Public Service, some of the criticisms made by the Opposition are unjust. We all realize what a benefit superannuation is, and those who are at present in the Public Service are entitled to the benefits provided by this Bill. South Australia has led the way in some aspects of industrial legislation, and it is completely unjust to say that we do not do the best we can for the workers. There is now full employment, and the average wage is increasing at a much faster rate than it did in previous years.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think the honourable member can develop that matter.

Mr. McANANEY: I think I have made the point I wished to make.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I wish only to emphasize that our Act is the most generous in the Commonwealth and that few people would benefit from the amendments. Since 1965, when many of us thought that the benefit would attract people to the Public Service, this hope has not been realized. In those circumstances, the provision should not be retained. As I have said, these people benefit, notwithstanding that they have been contributors for only a short time, and it is not necessary for any further concession to be given to them at this stage. If a person comes into the service at this age and brings funds from a superannuation scheme from which he has resigned, we could make it easier for him to contribute to our fund. I hope the Committee does not accept the amendments.

The Committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Riches. No—Mr. Coumbe.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I record my vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendments thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 44 to 78 passed.

Clause 79—"Imprisonment of female pensioner."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

After "as if that" second occurring to insert "pensioner or".

This is purely a drafting amendment necessitated by one of the slips that occur occasionally as a result of the Attorney-General's drafting. I understand that no problems will be experienced in this regard.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept the amendment. I only wish to add that I do not hold the Attorney-General responsible for this drafting.

Mr. Hudson: I do.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Well, that is your privilege.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 80 to 99 passed.

Clause 100—"Additional pension supplementation."

Mr. HUDSON: This clause represents the extent of the Government's tremendous generosity to existing pensioners or to widows of existing pensioners. Subclause (1) provides:

On and after the commencement of this Act there shall be payable from the account to

a former contributor or the widow of such a former contributor who is in receipt of a pension under this Act on that commencement and whose pension determination day was on or after the first day of July, 1966, and before the first day of July, 1967, a supplementary pension which when aggregated with any amount payable to that former contributor or widow pursuant to section 68c of the repealed Act equals an amount of two per centum of the pension payable to that former contributor or widow as at the thirtieth day of June, 1967.

I was interested to read the remarks of certain members opposite when the Labor Government introduced a Superannuation Act Amendment Bill in 1965 that made more substantial changes to the provisions for existing pensioners and widows than this one makes. The Attorney-General said, at page 2819 of 1965 *Hansard*:

I am intensely disappointed that the Government has not been more generous, in view of what it has said especially about the improvements to this Act. . . . In my district there are many people (as there are in all districts) who are on superannuation. I think particularly of two friends of mine living at Eden Hills. They are on superannuation, and are retired civil servants of many years' standing. One retired in 1949 and he and his wife live alone in their home, and have a hard struggle to make ends meet. The other friend lives with his wife. He has not been retired so long. He is in somewhat better circumstances.

The present Minister of Works (Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe) then interjected and said, "They were banking on it." The Attorney-General replied:

Yes, because the value of money is steadily declining and what was adequate in 1963 is not enough to live on in 1965. Yet the Government by this Bill has done nothing to help these people in spite of what it has said. This is a great shame. The member for Glenelg can make faces at me if he likes. It is hard to tell when he is making faces and when he is not, but I think he is making one now. He can brush this matter off if he likes.

I have waited a long time to give the Attorney-General a serve for that effort. I am still waiting to hear from him about his great disappointment that the Bill does not do something to try to restore the position of pensioners, whose pensions have been eroded to some extent by inflation for which the Attorney-General has been responsible because of his attitude over price control. The Minister of Education should also be bewailing the miserable attitude of the Treasurer. In 1965, when the Labor Government was much more generous, she said:-

We as members of Parliament all have an interest in this legislation, because most of us have living in our midst people who are retired public servants and for whom we feel some concern, for they have been waiting a long time for this Government to give them some increase in their rate of pension. I consider that this is disappointing legislation. As the member for Torrens said, it is supported only in part by the Opposition simply because it does make some concessions, however slight they may be, and I suppose that half a loaf of bread is better than none at all.

And all those pensioners who retired between July 1, 1966, and July 1, 1967, have got none this time. The Minister continued:

I think the last time this legislation was before the House was in 1963, when it was quite considerably amended, in fact. Of course, in the two intervening years money values have change again.

As the Minister of Works is not here I will not read out his pearls of wisdom, but they were in the same general tone. I hope members opposite are embarrassed by having their words recalled to them, because the Government has been extremely niggardly with respect to the position of existing pensioners.

In reply to a question I asked the Treasurer the other day about what the Government intended to do about existing pensioners, he said, in effect, that nothing at all would be done, arguing that they were not entitled to anything from the fund. This is a general problem on which we should comment. If we were able to identify exactly just how much of the fund, plus interest, belonged to members of the fund in any age group at any point of time we might be able to make some consequential adjustments to pensions in certain circumstances, but no attempt is ever made to do this. Only a rough and ready judgment is ever made whether pensioners are entitled to more of the fund than they are currently getting. The position that exists is common to just about all superannuation funds. Those who are the current contributors say that those on a pension are not entitled to anything more than they are getting as a result of their own contributions. All those pensioners have in the post-war years suffered a continuous devaluation of their real pensions because of price increases.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: People enrolled in insurance schemes have suffered similarly.

Mr. HUDSON: Not necessarily; many insurance schemes and some superannuation schemes give the contributor a lump sum at a certain time.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is very much less in real terms than they had expected to receive.

Mr. HUDSON: The university's superannuation scheme, to which the contributor contributes one-third and the university contributes two-thirds, provides a lump sum, not a pension, on retirement. The contributor can then invest that lump sum partly to provide income and partly to provide a hedge against inflation. However, the kind of asset in which the usual kind of superannuation fund can invest does not provide an effective hedge against inflation. I do not know what the State Government can do to assist existing pensioners who have suffered a reduction in the real value of their pensions, but we ought to consider some process of regular adjustment to the pensions paid.

It is not difficult to imagine an Australia-wide superannuation scheme under which the pensions payable are fully adjusted to price increases and the current contributions are used to pay out current pensions. As the number of contributors increases and if inflation occurs, higher pensions can be paid. I am not convinced at this stage that one State can institute such a scheme on its own. I cannot understand why there must be so much emphasis on building up a fund. I am certain that the scheme I have outlined would work on an Australia-wide basis.

As a result of comments that Government members have previously made, greater adjustments should be made to the scale of existing pensions. It is not good enough to say what the Treasurer said the other day—that existing pensioners had no rights to anything from the fund other than what they were now getting. I expect that their present pension has been assessed actuarially on expectation of life, and it would assist to know whether the assessments have been correct. The Government should help its former employees and so grant an incentive to present employees. The present employees will become pensioners and their pensions will be affected by inflation. However, the Government has provided only a paltry 2 per cent increase for pensioners who retired during one year. I protest at this niggardly action, which is out of line with the protestations that members of the present Government made when in Opposition.

Clause passed.

Clauses 101 to 109 passed.

Clause 110—"Returns."

Mr. HUDSON: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(3) Any offence under this section may be dealt with summarily.

This minor amendment restores the provision in section 80 (3) of the current Act.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree to the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (111 to 116), schedules, and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I thank the House for its co-operation, as this has been an important and a major Bill, and I appreciate the help of and the discussions I have had with the member for Glenelg. I think that, as a result, we have proceeded speedily with the measure and that is, of course, to the advantage of all concerned.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 2267.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): During my term of office as Minister of Lands I did some work on this measure. It has been pointed out many times over the years that when real estate agents subdivide parts of the metropolitan area they give those parts names that cause wholesale confusion. Although a nomenclature committee has advised the Minister, who has certain powers in connection with the naming of areas, it is now considered desirable to set up a statutory authority to name places. The main purpose of the Bill is to prevent proliferation of names, particularly in the metropolitan area but also in the larger country towns. A right of appeal is provided for citizens who are affected. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I move to insert the following definition:

> "the Registrar" means the Registrar-General under the Real Property Act, 1886-1969, or the Registrar-General of Deeds under the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1962.

This amendment and the amendment I will be moving to clause 16 eliminate the possibility that, if the Geographical Names Board changes a name, the Registrar-General of Deeds may

be involved in a very big obligation in connection with many old titles. It was never intended to impose such an obligation on him; the amendments make this clear.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 3 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—"This Act not to affect rights and liabilities."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN moved to insert the following new subclause:

(2) Nothing in this Act imposes any obligation upon, or otherwise affects, or applies to, the Registrar.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (17 to 21) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 20. Page 3179.)

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I support the second reading with enthusiasm, because this is a useful measure. Even though it is particularly brief, we were provided (doubtless, by the Minister of Health) with a lengthy explanation of the objects of the Bill, and I think that is a good lesson to some other Ministers, who have not been giving sufficient explanation of Bills recently. I consider that the purpose of the Bill is most commendable, because we are providing a means of granting assistance to persons licensed to conduct psychiatric hostels whereby they will be able to obtain, on favourable terms, the finance they require to alter or add to their establishments.

The Minister has explained that, in 1968, the former Government amended the Mental Health Act to provide for the registration and licensing of hostel managers and hostel premises, and from that time hostels have had to comply with requirements of the Central Board of Health and local health authorities. I imagine that, because of these requirements, the hostels have had to spend money to improve premises and, I hope, to enlarge them. I was pleased to hear the Minister's reference to the decrease in the number of patients in all mental health services in the last 10 years. In 1959-60 the daily average number of in-patients was 2,570 and the number dropped to 1,991 in 1968-69. This trend is desirable, and one reason for it could be that the hostels house about 400 ex-patients. Doubtless, those persons would otherwise be patients in Government hospitals and the Government would have the heavy financial burden of caring for them.

I am surprised that these hostels charge only an amount equal to the pension that pensioner patients receive. The present invalid pension is only $12.50 a week and the patient receives a service for a reasonable rate. Further, the Government has not the responsibility of caring for these patients in a hospital, where the cost would probably be treble the amount now charged by hostels. The hostels serve a useful purpose. There is a strong argument for the Government to provide additional assistance to these hostels. I do not need to point out the desirability of having the hostels treat a person who suffers from some mental problem but is not sufficiently badly affected to be hospitalized. While the hostels can care for these people and have a social worker visit regularly to find out whether patients require particular treatment, the atmosphere for the patient is better than the atmosphere in a hospital, where they would be with patients who were much worse off.

I hope that the Government sees its way clear to provide for the treatment of patients in this category, because many of them cannot be cared for by relatives. The Bill provides for assistance to be given, by guarantee by the Treasurer, to enable hostels to borrow money on favourable terms. Until now persons controlling hostels who have wanted to modernize or add to their premises have had to borrow at most unfavourable interest rates. The Bill gives the Treasurer power to offer a guarantee so that money required can be borrowed at normal interest rates. I commend the Government for its action in introducing the measure.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I, too, agree with the principle of the Bill, which provides a means of granting assistance to persons licensed to conduct psychiatric rehabilitation hostels whereby they would be able to obtain on favourable terms the finance they require for making necessary alterations and improvements to their premises in order to comply with conditions subject to which they hold their licences.

As we have been told, most of these hostels were formerly private houses. Alhough the Bill refers to such terms and conditions as may be imposed, we do not know the full details of how much the person seeking assistance will be guaranteed and we do not know the terms

that will be laid down before assistance can be given. I hope that the Premier amplifies this in the Committee stage. We have also been told that there are 22 such centres in the State, accommodating about 400 patients, who are visited by mental health workers and social workers. In particular, the patients are visited in the first three months after their discharge from hospital. I have not seen any of these places, because none of them is in my district.

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

Mrs. BYRNE: I said before the adjournment that I had not visited any of these centres, but it would be in my interest to do so, as it would be in the interest of all members to visit these places. I do not know where one of these centres is situated, and I should like a list of their addresses. Like the member for West Torrens I realize that there must be places such as these in which patients, who have been discharged from mental hospitals, may remain for a time because, in some cases, they would have nowhere to go as their families would not want them. We could liken their plight to that of some ex-prisoners, who find themselves in a similar situation when discharged from prison.

I was pleased to notice in the second reading explanation that the rate charged at these centres could be afforded by patients, particularly as most of them receive only an invalid pension. If these people had to seek board elsewhere they would not be able to pay the rate that they would be charged. These centres are necessary, because if they did not exist people who now live in them would be in a sad plight. I should like to see more assistance given to patients, although this provision is not included in this Bill, but this will assist them in an indirect way and will be a step in the right direction.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I commend the Government for introducing this legislation and I sincerely hope that it will be accepted in its entirety. The improved facilities at these licensed centres will assist patients for whom accommodation is provided, as these people are justly entitled to have the same facilities as those available to others. I am pleased that the number of patients has decreased from 2,570 to 1,991 during the last 12 months. This decrease would benefit the State, as it would mean less expense, because these people live in a centre rather than in a Government institution or hospital. Because of the use of modern drugs these people can be removed from various institutions and are able to take their rightful place in society. I sincerely hope that in the near future our mental institutions as we know them will no longer exist and that the people in such institutions will be able to find accommodation in hostels, to which, I hope, the Government is prepared to make loans to enable their facilities to be improved.

I understand from the remarks of the honourable member for Barossa, who has given much thought to this matter, that 22 centres in this State provide assistance for about 400 people. I commend the medical and nursing professions for the wonderful and understanding way in which they have been able to assist these types of person. One cannot speak highly enough of their magnificent work.

I also express appreciation to the people who over the years have not found but have made time to visit these types of patient. I will not mention individual organizations, but some of them have rostered their members to visit these people, as a result of which some joy has been brought to them. I refer also to the ministers of the various denominations who have been faithful in visiting such institutions. I commend the Bill to the House, and I commend the Government for introducing it.

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

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VALUATION)

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMISSION)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3232.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the second reading, but only in order to move an amendment in the Committee stage.

The SPEAKER: Order! On the matter of time, I understand that the member for Glenelg will be the main speaker for the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): That is so.

Mr. HUDSON: I am glad I have unlimited time. I obviously need it on such an important matter as this. For some time the racing industry in South Australia has been in certain difficulties, largely because the clubs

have been cut out of any share of the winning bets tax, with the removal of that tax on the initial introduction of the Totalizator Agency Board, and also because T.A.B. has meant a substantial reduction in attendances at race meetings. Of course, this has affected the overall economies of operations of the clubs. If we are to establish the racing industry as a viable industry, not requiring continual approaches by the clubs to the Government or continual consideration by the Government of the state of the industry, there should be substantial increases in prize money. In view of the overall position at this stage, there does not seem to me to be any justification whatsoever for a Government share from on-course totalizators in the metropolitan area of 6½ per cent ultimately after two years, while the Government share of off-course betting is 5¼ per cent. If it is necessary that T.A.B., in order to have a reasonable return on its off-course operations, should be able to retain 8¾ per cent of its turnover for the purpose of covering its costs, concerning a distribution to clubs, it is difficult to see why, with on-course totalizator betting, the return to cover the cost of providing it and the distribution to the clubs should be reduced to 7½ per cent.

Mr. McKee: Do you know the difference in turnover between on-course and off-course betting?

Mr. HUDSON: Off-course turnover is normally three times more than on-course turnover and, if we allow for interstate betting and mid-week betting, the total off-course turnover during the year would be four to five times greater than the on-course turnover. It would seem to me, therefore, that the justification, if any, is for a higher return to the clubs regarding on-course facilities than the return regarding off-course facilities, rather than a lower return as is proposed in this measure. I was one of those who argued strongly, when the Bill introducing T.A.B. was being considered, that the additional 1¼ per cent involved in the deduction from on-course totalizators should remain with the clubs.

At that time it was my view that that 1¼ per cent should remain with the clubs permanently. The best that we were able to achieve then was that the clubs were allowed to have it for three years. It seems to me that the occasion has now arisen, with the establishment of T.A.B., which has done well but not quite as well as we had hoped, to provide that this percentage should remain permanently with the clubs and not revert partially or wholly to the Government. No approach has been made to me on this matter. I have had this view for a considerable time, having held it before the Bill that established T.A.B. was introduced. As a result, no-one has had to ask me to bring forward my amendment, and no approach has been made to any member of my Party to have the amendment considered. After all, the original basis of the compromise that led to 1¼ per cent to the clubs for the first three years of the operation of T.A.B. was that the matter could be reviewed after three years in the light of the position of the clubs.

I point out to the Treasurer that the approach he is taking is rather short-sighted. It seems to me that he has an interest in encouraging clubs to build up on-course totalizator turnover. The Treasurer would be interested to know that it will require the on-course totalizator turnover to build up by only about $600,000 over a full year for the return to the Government to compensate it fully for not getting this extra 1¼ per cent. I point out that 1¼ per cent of on-course turnover is a little over $30,000. However, if there is a build-up of on-course turnover the Government, even without this 1¼ per cent, takes 5¼ per cent and it does not take much calculation to work out that, as an expansion of on-course totalizator turnover on $100 brings an extra $5 into the Treasury, on $1,000 an extra $50, and so on, an increase in on-course totalizator turnover of $600,000 over a full year would more than compensate the Government for not getting the extra 1¼ per cent.

I believe that the clubs are involved in a considerable expenditure if they are to reach the position where they can make the on-course totalizator facilities sufficiently attractive in order to get the necessary increase in turnover. At present, when one examines the three metropolitan racecourses, the on-course totalizator facilities in respect to indicator boards and selling points are unsatisfactory at ll three courses. Only at Victoria Park can ne say that there is a reasonable catering or the ordinary racegoer in the way of indicator boards, and even at that course improvements could be made. However, any improvements in this area are expensive for the clubs. For capital expenditure on T.A.B., the Government is providing the lot. All of the capital of T.A.B. will ultimately be paid for out of the Government's share of 5¼ per cent. I am not suggesting that capital developments in connection with on-course totalizator

facilities should be paid for by the Government out of its share of 5¼ per cent, but I am suggesting that the clubs will be much better able to carry out the necessary improvements if the 1¼ per cent stays with them.

I do not think we can legitimately compare the percentage return to clubs in South Australia with the corresponding figures for Victoria and New South Wales without taking into account South Australia's lower level of turnover and the much higher percentage of costs associated with the T.A.B. in South Australia than in Victoria and New South Wales. Some allowance must be made for the smaller turnover and the smaller attendances at race meetings in South Australia. In other words, there are economies of scale in the operation of the racing industry in other States that are not available in South Australia.

Because we introduced off-course betting through the T.A.B., we must see that the racing industry is established on a proper basis, and we must recognize that the breeding industry is one of South Australia's important sources of revenue. Race horse breeders in South Australia rely significantly on the prices they can get at the annual yearling sales, and the willingness of potential owners to pay the prices expected has been adversely affected by the proportionately large increase in training costs. So, in recent years it has become considerably more difficult and less economic to own race horses in South Australia than it used to be.

If we believe that the racing industry ought to be on a viable basis so that the clubs do not have to make the perennial approaches to the Government that have occurred in recent years, not only must we see that the breeding industry is operating effectively (though that is a very important source of revenue and employment in this State) but we must also see that those involved as ordinary workers in the industry (the trainers, stable hands, foremen, jockeys, etc.) are able to get a reasonable return in normal circumstances. It is certainly true that the top trainer and the top jockey will always do fairly well but, when we are considering the viability of the industry, the question at issue is the return that accrues to the ordinary trainer, the ordinary jockey, the ordinary stable hand and the other ordinary employees in the racing industry. And there are plenty of them.

Once the community has taken a moral judgment that racing is to continue and to be established on a viable basis, it is no good adopting a pinch-penny attitude toward the industry simply because it is easier to tax it than to tax other industries. No-one would suggest that football ought to be taxed—I certainly would not do so. No-one would suggest that attendance at cricket matches or other kinds of sporting activity ought to be taxed—I certainly would not do so. However, because a section of the community objects to racing on moral grounds, it becomes easier for any Government to get additional funds from this source. As I have said, I do not even believe that the net increase in Government revenue from this Bill will be anything like the 1¼ per cent of turnover on on-course totalizators because, if this 1¼ per cent is retained by the clubs, there will be a much more significant expansion of on-course totalizator turnover than would otherwise be the case. The propositions that I have put forward were the basis of my argument in 1966, when the T.A.B. system was introduced, and I was trying to have the 1¼ per cent retained by the clubs permanently.

The Premier and the Treasurer are crying poverty, but they were willing to give away the winning bets tax to punters and, regardless of how desirable that tax was to punters, it did not put anything into the racing industry. If we believe that the racing industry must be established on a proper basis, then we should put it in a position where the Government can say, "This is a reasonable basis on which we are are providing for the industry. The growth of T.A.B., with the growth of on-course totalizator turnover, will enable clubs to increase prize money, in line with increasing costs of owning and training horses and, consequently, this industry will be able to continue to operate on a viable basis without continual assistance from the Government."

One of the present problems of the industry is associated with the insufficient use of capital facilities involved in the industry. The Morphettville, Victoria Park and Cheltenham racecourses are each used only about 18 times a year, and greater use would enable clubs to operate more economically. I do not know whether the Government has been approached about mid-week racing in the metropolitan area, but members are entitled to be told whether it has been and what it intends to do. I support the second reading so that in the Committee stage I can move an amendment to try to achieve the position that should

have existed from 1966. If it had, the present position would not have arisen.

The Hon. R. S. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3231.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): It seems that, when the Opposition suggests moving amendments to any Bill, the debate will not be continued. That is not the kind of tactics to which the House should be subjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to pursue that matter in the debate on this Bill.

Mr. HUDSON: Certain suggestions were made to me that, if an amendment to the previous Bill was moved, the Bill would go up in Annie's room.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot debate that subject at this stage.

Mr. HUDSON: I am worried that if we move an amendment in relation to this Bill the Treasurer will put it up in Annie's room. What sort of tactic is that? Let me make it clear that, for me and my colleagues, no stand-over tactics will be successful on this or any other Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill about tactics; that is a different subject.

Mr. HUDSON: I am worried that if we make certain points about this Bill during this debate the Government will adjourn the debate, because it is afraid that the Opposition will move amendments.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot continue with that line of debate. He must connect his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. HUDSON: Certain difficulties in relation to this Bill may arise largely because of the somewhat limited imagination and vision of the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth subsidy to aged citizens clubs applies only if a council provides $6,000 towards the establishment of a club. If a council does that the Commonwealth will also provide $6,000, and under the provisions of this Bill the State will contribute its normal $6,000. By these amendments $18,000 will be available to establish a senior citizens club, provided that we bring our legislation into line so that we are able to subsidize clubs that are used mainly, if not wholly, for elderly citizens.

Under the present Act, we can provide a subsidy only if the club is to be used solely for elderly citizens. However, where no subsidy has been available from a council, several clubs have been established in South Australia mainly on the initiative of service clubs. In my district, the Rotary Club of Glenelg was responsible, in the main, for initiating the Glenelg Senior Citizens Club, and the Lions Club of Brighton was responsible for initiating a public appeal to establish the Brighton Senior Citizens Club. Fortunately, in both cases the council provided the land. At Glenelg, the council provided part of Colley Reserve, and at Brighton the council provided land on Brighton Road near the Hove railway station. So long as the value of land is $6,000, one presumes that this would qualify as the $6,000 contribution that local government is supposed to make in order to obtain the Commonwealth subsidy. However, if the land is not worth $6,000, or if a service organization such as the Rotary Club or the Lions Club is prepared to buy land and assist in the building of a senior citizens club, no Commonwealth money is made available because local government is not involved. I am pleased to say, however, that although that is the case State Government money is available.

Where local government is not involved, the only assistance received from Governmental sources is the $6,000 provided by the State Government. We have the anomalous position that a Government (be it a Labor or a Liberal Government) is prepared to provide $6,000 towards the establishment of a senior citizens club but the additional $12,000 is available only if local government contributes $6,000.

Mr. McKee: The service club would have to give it to the local government authority.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, that could be so. I am not sure what the Commonwealth Government would do if that occurred. It would probably say, "This will not do." Nevertheless, I should like the Treasurer to indicate that the Government will ask the Commonwealth Government to broaden its attitude in this matter, because typically in many areas the service clubs take the initiative in providing finance for the establishment of senior citizens clubs. If local people want to initiate an appeal for the establishment of such a club, the best way of doing it is to get the local service clubs interested. If a subsidy of $6,000 is available from the Commonwealth Government

when local government contributes $6,000, such a subsidy ought to be available from the Commonwealth Government if a local service club consisting of members who are serving the local community contributes $6,000.

I hope that as a result of what I have said on this occasion the Premier or the Treasurer at the next opportunity (although I know one has certain difficulties in creating opportunities with the present Commonwealth Government) will put to it the arguments I have presented. We do not want to have the situation which has existed for years and which was rectified only last year regarding the building of pensioner flats, where for years the Commonwealth Government would subsidize private organizations only in the building of such flats but refused to subsidize State Government housing authorities in the construction of rental-only pensioner flats, an area in which the need was greatest. This should not be allowed to happen in this area, and I hope the Government will bring what pressure it can to bear to ensure that it does not happen.

I am delighted that in the case of the Brighton Senior Citizens Club, an appeal for which has just been established and has raised about $2,000 in only a few weeks, the combined sums now available should enable an early start to be made on the building of this local facility. As I have said, the Brighton council has purchased land and given it for the establishment of this senior citizens club. As that land probably would be worth more than $6,000, the Commonwealth Government subsidy should be attracted, and the State Government subsidy of $6,000 will also be available. This seems to me to be an adequate solution. The Treasurer will know that, concerning the Brighton project, I have made previous approaches to him requesting that the limit of the State subsidy be increased beyond $6,000, because building costs have increased since the Aged Citizens Clubs (Subsidies) Act was passed in 1963. However, the solution that is provided in this Bill regarding the Commonwealth subsidy will provide some alleviation. It would provide much greater alleviation if the State Government could persuade the Commonwealth Government to broaden its vision a little and to extend the circumstances in which the Commonwealth subsidy of $6,000 would be made available. I support the second reading.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): All members are aware that the present Act, which was passed in 1963, authorizes the State Government to subsidize to a maximum of $6,000 clubs used wholly by aged citizens. Of the 32 such clubs established in South Australia and receiving the subsidy, 26 are in the metropolitan area, and the remaining six are in country areas. The State Government has paid out $130,000 to date under the Act. However, we all know that other senior citizens clubs could and should be established in this State. The member for Glenelg referred to such clubs in his district. A club in my own district is at present using temporary quarters which, because the membership has grown, are now inadequate, and, for the people concerned, a building of their own is the next step. Of course, the difficulty is to provide finance, because $6,000 does not go far. The extra money that has to be raised is usually obtained through fund-raising activities, and all of us who have engaged in such activities know that fund raising is not easy. Money is also raised through public donation or subscription.

The land, which is usually provided by the local council, normally costs about $6,000 if not more. The amendments to the Bill that have been suggested will allow the elderly citizens clubs in this State to qualify for the additional $6,000 that is now available from the Commonwealth Government through legislation recently passed. I am sure that this provision will be welcomed by many elderly citizens in our State, as well as by other people engaged in helping them establish such clubs. Like the member for Glenelg, I hope that as a result of this Bill no anomalies will arise later that will prevent elderly citizens from receiving the additional benefit that they can now receive.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill. When it applied to the Playford Government, the Wallaroo Aged Citizens Club was one of the first of these clubs to apply for a subsidy to set itself up. In fact, Mr. Allen, the chairman of the committee formed at Wallaroo for this purpose, wrote to me even before the legislation was introduced in the House. Immediately I received his letter I forwarded it to Sir Thomas Playford, who informed me that the Government intended to introduce a Bill whereby approval would be given for a subsidy on a $1 for $1 basis to enable such clubs to be formed. He rightly said that he could not commit the Government to any obligation until the legislation had been accepted by Parliament. Immediately the Bill had passed Parliament, the Wallaroo club renewed its application and must have been one of the first aged

citizens clubs formed in South Australia. All those who attend this club receive great joy and pleasure.

When a person retires from a most active life he sometimes finds that he is not wanted in certain areas, and other people who have not played a great part in community life do not have much to do apart from some gardening. I know that some members of the Wallaroo club have gone out of their way to get this type of person interested in the club, and this has had good results. I know that some people who attend this club today and who play an active part are people who did not go out much at all previously. Because of the atmosphere in these clubs there has been an incentive to improve membership wherever they have been formed. I notice that there are 26 clubs located in the metropolitan area and six in country areas.

Kadina also has a most successful aged citizens club that is appreciated by the people there. Thanks to the service clubs at Kadina, which initiated the move, the appropriate subsidy was provided and a hall was purchased, renovated and furnished. Today that hall is one of the nicest in Kadina. I have been to various functions in that hall (I have also been to the hall at Wallaroo) and, from the type of person attending the club at Kadina, I know that it is a real success. It is encouraging to see how many retired people attend these clubs, and not only the type of person who has retired from active work attends. People who have means and who could perhaps find other entertainment attend these clubs, because they like moving among the type of people who meet there.

This Bill provides for other types of people in addition to those already associated with aged citizens clubs. I think it is a wonderful idea, for it will bring many hours of enjoyment to people who would otherwise be forced to remain within the four walls of their homes. The additional money from the Commonwealth Government will not only provide additional entertainment for aged citizens already associated with the clubs but also provide for invalids and mentally retarded people who have not previously been associated with these clubs. The additional money will enable new buildings to be built and a better class of building to be purchased.

I realize that there are some very good buildings housing aged citizens clubs in the metropolitan area but, because of the smaller number of people in country towns, it is not always as easy to raise large sums of money there to enable really good buildings to be provided. The sum of $12,000 that is at present provided does not permit the purchase and furnishing of a very large building. The addition of $6,000, making a total of $18,000, will provide an incentive to the various committees to look for something better.

People who have contributed to the prosperity of this State are justly entitled to have a good class of aged citizens club and the amenities that go with it so that their declining years are as happy as possible. The number of friendships that grow up in these clubs is most pleasing. I sincerely hope that more service clubs and community organizations, knowing that additional money is available, will become interested in aged citizens clubs. I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I do not think any member on this side will argue about this Bill. We all support it. Although we do not have a modern building for the aged citizens club in my district, the club is extremely active. There are such clubs throughout the Lower South-East, and aged people get much pleasure from visiting other places in the South-East and in the western districts of Victoria. These visits are reciprocal. Many people in their later years get much pleasure from their association with the clubs. I am particularly pleased that the Government is increasing the amount of money that will be available if a council is willing to contribute $6,000 or if some other worthy organization, such as a service club in the district, can be sponsored.

An amount of $18,000 will materially assist these commendable aged citizens clubs to provide buildings that will be a pride to themselves and to the towns or cities in which they are located. I know that the aged citizens club in Mount Gambier will be interested in this move. Action has already been taken, and I hope that the recently-formed committee will be able to provide a building and the necessary facilities. A significant point about the amendment is that other sections of the community will be brought within the scope of the measure.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I join with the previous speaker in supporting the Bill, particularly as in Naracoorte we have formed an aged persons council. I agree with what my colleague from Mount Gambier said about the need for senior citizens clubs. I am sure

that this legislation is a milestone in the history of these clubs, and that it will provide the finance needed to build clubs that will benefit our elderly citizens. I do not wish to cast a silent vote on this Bill, and I express the gratitude of the senior citizens of my district to the Government for introducing it.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I, too, support the Bill. In the Unley District we have one of the best senior citizens clubs in South Australia, and this club cost about $75,000. I assure members that this club is one of the landmarks of the district, and its members have been chosen on a selective basis. The club building was erected in a particular area, and many of the elderly citizens have been unable to attend it. However, this Bill will provide the opportunity for many other sections of the community in the Unley district to enjoy the benefits and enjoyments of this type of club. It is noticeable that in the Unley district there is a large population of elderly citizens, so that many clubs are necessary, but the council has not been able to help everyone. I agree with what the member for Glenelg said that service clubs in most areas are able to raise the necessary finance to ensure that at least a start is made in building these clubs.

In the Clarence Park district there are 200 members of the senior citizens club, and they want a larger clubroom, but the council cannot provide the money, although it is spending about $75,000 on certain sections of the district. With the incentive from the Commonwealth Government of a subsidy of $6,000, other sections of the community in the Unley District can be provided with this type of club: these buildings would not cost $75,000 each, but many people do not need expensive buildings. Furnishings are required in an appropriate building, because this atmosphere helps to promote friendship among members. I know that in many districts service clubs have done outstanding work for the community, and much is owed to them. Today, I attended a function in a small hall at which there were many elderly citizens. They were happy, and I am sure that if money can be made available, additional centres can be built that will benefit many more elderly citizens in the Unley District. This Bill will bring to the notice of the council that it should look after not only elderly citizens but many others who live in the district.

I have always maintained that $6,000, which was available from the State as a subsidy, was not a sufficient grant from the Government for this worthy cause, although I realize that the Treasurer has many calls on the money that is available to this State. Although the Treasurer, having examined the matter, has said in the past that the Government can contribute only $6,000, I should like this sum increased to $10,000. No strings should be attached to any assistance provided for our elderly citizens, who have been the backbone of this State for many years and who would use such establishments. These people deserve such facilities, and I hope that in the future more will be done for them. We should ensure that, no matter who contributes the $6,000 to attract the subsidy, opportunities should be given in various districts for these projects to be pursued.

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

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3233.)

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the Bill, which, as the Minister pointed out in the second reading explanation, enables charges to be levied on grain shipped through the facilities being erected at Port Giles, although the Bill does not specifically name Port Giles. So that any doubts might be cleared up, I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that, because Port Giles has facilities in addition to those mentioned in previous Acts, it must be treated differently. As a result of approaches made by people on Yorke Peninsula to the Government in which the present Treasurer was Minister of Marine and, later, to the Labor Government when I was Minister, and because an advantage would be created for the farmers in the area, an agreement was entered into. The advantage was that, as farmers would not have to cart their grain to Ardrossan or Wallaroo, they would be paying a charge of 2½c a bushel, thus saving 7½c a bushel that they would otherwise have had to pay. It was stated in evidence before the Public Works Committee that 400 farmers, at a meeting held at the time, agreed on this charge and were happy to pay it. People whom I later questioned about the charge said that they were also quite happy to pay it.

When I asked whether they would object to this being written into the legislation, they said, "No, but there will be no necessity for it."

The people concerned expressed complete satisfaction with the facilities provided to serve their activities, despite the subsequent suggestions that have been made to the effect that people do not want this provision now and should not be committed to it. I understand that, while the legislation is written in rather broader terms and makes no direct reference to Port Giles, it is designed to recoup the cost of facilities that are provided in this instance and perhaps subsequently. I am confident that the people who use the facilities and pay the charges under the Bill will be satisfied in doing so and will stand to gain financially, for there will be greater development in the area that would not otherwise have occurred. The Bill is a worthy measure that will meet a need in the area.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): In supporting the second reading, I hope that the Treasurer will be able to accept the amendments that I intend to move in Committee. I think it was in the late 1950's or early 1960's that representations were made to the Government of the day for Edithburgh to be made a deep sea port. Just prior to that time Edithburgh was recognized as one of the outports of South Australia. In fact, at one time of its history Edithburgh was regarded as the third most important port in South Australia. As it was recognized as an outport for grain there was a differential of only 1d. a bushel at that port. However, overnight the differential on wheat was increased from 1d. to 9d. Of course, this caused graingrowers in the area to urge the Government to have Edithburgh made a deep sea port. In February, 1963, the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) met the graingrowers of southern Yorke Peninsula on the wharf at Edithburgh. He explained to representatives of the deputation that it would be impossible to establish a deep sea port at Edithburgh but that possibly deep water could be found at Port Giles, which was then known as Giles Point. He undertook that, if favourable conditions could be found at Port Giles, he would ask the Public Works Committee to inquire into establishing a deep sea port there. In 1967, the Public Works Committee issued a favourable report that included the following basic condition in a paragraph headed "Financial Aspect":

If facilities are to be provided in addition to the existing bulk handling terminals a basic requirement is that the people who use the facilities must be prepared to bear the extra annual costs incurred. In this instance the local growers have voluntarily offered to contribute an additional 2.5c a bushel to the Marine and Harbors Department for grain handled across the proposed new berth. Whilst this amount is insufficient to fully cover the costs when related to the current production the prospects of increased output are sufficiently encouraging to indicate that the installation will become self-supporting within approximately 10 years. The committee considers that before any expenditure is undertaken on the project, the voluntary arrangement between the interested parties should be made legally binding by means of enabling legislation empowering the Australian Barley Board and the Australian Wheat Board to collect the requisite additional levy on behalf of the Marine and Harbors Department.

The findings of the committee stated, in paragraph (6):

There are no immediate prospects of substantial tonnages in addition to barley and wheat and consequently enabling legislation empowering the Marine and Harbors Department to obtain an additional levy from the wheatgrower and the barley producer is a basic requirement of the committee's recommendation.

Therefore, according to that report, it is evident that Port Giles would never have been established unless the graingrowers in the area of southern Yorke Peninsula had agreed to pay 2.5c a bushel extra charge. Evidence was taken from the Marine and Harbors Department, the Wheat Board, the Barley Board, the Agriculture Department and from local people at Yorketown. On that occasion the Chairman of the Public Works Committee asked whether the growers would accept the responsibility of paying the surcharge of 2.5c. The late Mr. Honner replied that he was speaking on behalf of the people of Yorke Peninsula and that he had publicized the matter. Because there had been no objection he took it that the growers were prepared to pay the surcharge.

Mr. Clark: Many individual growers told the committee the same thing.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes. In 1964 the then Minister of Works announced that the Public Works Committee had approved the construction of the installation and that preliminary work would commence immediately. Unfortunately for the growers on southern Yorke Peninsula, it was deferred for two and a half years. However, I believe that it is planned that the installation will be completed by the end of May, 1970. A true estimate of the amount of grain that will be delivered to this

port cannot be made while the grain boards treat the bulk handling installation as an inland silo—this is what is being done at present.

Even in this delivery season the Barley Board has placed a differential of 3.4c a bushel on barley and the Wheat Board has placed a differential of 4.1c a bushel on wheat. So, we can understand how the differential applied by the grain board and the extra 2.5c entices grain growers, even in the southern part of Yorke Peninsula, to deliver their grain to Ardrossan. Because of the savings it will mean to growers, this has taken place this year. It is possible that Port Giles will be used for other commodities; a feasibility test is at present being undertaken in connection with a possible salt industry at Peezey Swamp. If this industry is established its minimum output will be 500,000 tons of salt a year, and it may rise to 1,000,000 tons a year. If this should happen, if there should be shipments of gypsum over this belt, and if grain should be transported from Ardrossan to Port Giles to enable larger ships to be used, I do not believe the growers near this port should have to continue to pay the amortization on this port. I therefore intend to move some amendments in the Committee stage.

If the port does become economically self-sufficient, I do not think the grain growers on the southern end of Yorke Peninsula should have to continue to pay this surcharge. I consider that, if the Treasurer accepts my amendments, the extra charges can be reduced accordingly. I support the second reading.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I think the House should be told of some of the aspects involved in the Bill. The member for Yorke Peninsula has asked questions about Port Giles and on November 13, I asked a question, at the request of some friends in the area and because of rumours that were circulating. I had read press reports about concern expressed at meetings held on southern Yorke Peninsula about the Government's decision to add 2.5c a bushel on all grain that went over the belt at Port Giles. In reply to my question, the Treasurer stated:

When the port at Port Giles was first proposed, it was clear that only a comparatively small quantity of grain would pass over the installation and that the operation would be uneconomic. Therefore, farmers were asked whether they would pay a loading so that the port could be established. This suggestion was agreed to, but the farmers subsequently considered that circumstances had changed and wanted to discuss this matter so that they could be relieved of the undertaking which they had given when the establishment of the port was first proposed and which was in accordance with evidence they had tendered to the Public Works Committee when it inquired into the project. That is as far as I can take the matter today. The member for Yorke Peninsula, having had this matter well in hand, has discussed it with me several times, as have his colleagues in another place. However, I have agreed to meet a deputation of farmers from that district one day next week so that we may discuss the whole matter.

Although I do not know the details of what was put to the Minister, I assume that the deputation submitted its point of view. It seems to me that factors will be considered now that were not considered when the report was given. The member for Yorke Peninsula has referred to the quantities of gypsum and salt for export that are likely to go over the belt. I consider that the honourable member's amendments show the wisdom of what has been put forward since the project was investigated. The honourable member is suggesting that the charges should be reviewed. In his second reading explanation the Minister states:

This Bill is the result of negotiations and agreement between the farmers in the area adjacent to Port Giles who are concerned with the establishment of the new port, which agreement was confirmed at various times during the examination of proposals. This Bill gives authority for the collection of the levy which was agreed in evidence tendered to the Public Works Committee and to other inquiries in regard to the matter.

On examining the Bill and on considering the reply I received to my recent question, I have to ask myself whether this Bill has had the full concurrence of farmers in the district. When one examines the Bill one finds that there is no specific reference to Port Giles. New section 132a (1) provides:

Where the Minister is satisfied that—

(*a*) port facilities have been provided or will be provided in South Australia primarily for facilitating the shipment of grain;

and

(*b*) the use of those port facilities to facilitate the shipment of grain will result in a higher net return to the majority of the owners of the grain who deliver the grain, or caused the grain to be delivered, to licensed receivers that would be the case if those facilities were not so used.

Also, new subsection (2) provides:

The Minister may, with the approval of the Governor and in relation to any declared port facilities, by notice published in the *Gazette* fix a charge not exceeding two and one-half cents a bushel of grain, for each bushel of grain . . .

This Bill is not, as we were led to believe, fixing the charge for grain over the belt at

Port Giles but is, in effect, amending the Act in such a way that the Government can, if it desires, by proclamation make adjustments to charges for facilities at any other port.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Read it again.

Mr. HURST: I have read the Minister's explanation, but I cannot find that this Bill's operation is restricted to Port Giles, and I should like the Minister to explain this point. From my experience I know that a court is not concerned with what has been said by the Minister when introducing the Bill. The court takes note of what is provided in the Bill.

Mr. Burdon: Are you saying that the Bill is all-embracing?

Mr. HURST: Yes. If that is the case we must bear in mind that there are mineral developments throughout Australia, and if other port facilities are to be established why has the Government restricted the provisions of this Bill to apply to grain only? Why should the man on the land be singled out? Circumstances could arise in which these facilities could benefit the State. I refer, of course, to the handling of minerals, salt, gypsum, iron ore, sand or any other mineral. Why should we place the burden, whether at Port Giles or anywhere else, on the man on the land?

Mr. Burdon: It could apply at Semaphore, where they are removing the sand.

Mr. HURST: Yes, it could apply anywhere. I cannot see where the Bill is restricted to the facilities at Port Giles.

Mr. Burdon: You say it affects the grain growers only?

Mr. HURST: The Bill specifically mentions grain, which is defined as being wheat or barley. I suppose a loophole could exist regarding oats. Why should we pick out just wheat and barley? If we are to be fair and just, the Bill should apply equally to everything else.

Mr. Burdon: You say it should apply to all other produce going overseas?

Mr. HURST: Yes; if there were bulk handling of oranges, eggs or anything else, it should apply to them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. HURST: I have seen conveyor belts used for more than just the handling of wheat. Indeed, in terminals conveyor belts are used for transporting personal luggage, and even people.

Mr. Burdon: They are used for sawdust, too.

Mr. HURST: Yes, in the timber mills in the South-East. Unfortunately, the honourable member for Mount Gambier has not been successful in having a deep sea port established in that area, as has been promised on so many occasions. I should like the Minister to explain these matters. I cannot see where the Bill is restricted only to Port Giles; it is of a general nature. Other members have discussed the charges that are to be levied. If we are to consider the merits in this respect, it would be appropriate for us to do so when the Government tables the regulations. The Subordinate Legislation Committee can then consider them and, if any member considers them to be unjust, he can move a disallowance motion.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you find that this Bill goes against the grain?

Mr. HURST: It goes against the grain of many farmers on lower Yorke Peninsula. The Minister said that there was an agreement among the farmers, but I do not know when all these farmers were consulted. Have the farmers concerned now changed their minds? What are we to understand from the statements in the newspaper to the effect that there have been protest meetings concerning the charge to be made? I hope these matters are clarified in the Committee stage. I believe the member for Yorke Peninsula is at least trying to clarify the situation by making the provision subject to review every 12 months.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the second reading. I attended a meeting at Minlaton about six years ago at which the Hon. Colin Rowe said that the then Government would proceed with the construction of facilities at Port Giles and that, for this to be economical, all grain, gypsum and salt would have to go over the belt at this port. However, for some unknown reason it was not long after that announcement that salt and gypsum were removed from the operation. Although the depth of water to be provided for the jetty facilities was reduced at the time, I am pleased that the depth has been increased subsequently. As salt and gypsum have been withdrawn from the operation, the undertaking given by the growers in respect of the surcharge is now more justified than ever.

With the change of Government in 1965, the project was delayed while a further committee was set up to examine bulk loading facilities required in this State, and Port Giles

came under fire once again. However, as is well known, that committee reported in favour of this project, and that it should proceed on similar conditions to those recommended earlier. I am a little concerned that, although we have the present bulk handling facilities, with no shipping facilities to be available until about May of next year, growers in the area should be trying to have this surcharge waived. I believe that, if additional tonnages can be taken over the belt at Port Giles in the future, the project can be amortized, with the result that the producers in the area should not have to pay the surcharge initially agreed on in order to get the project under way.

South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has spent much money on providing facilities at Port Giles. Although there are limited areas in this State where there is a sufficient depth of water, Port Giles will be able to provide facilities for loading larger vessels, and this will be a great help to the co-operative. I support the second reading, and look forward to the amendments to be moved by the member for Yorke Peninsula.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I agree entirely with the comments made by the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens), who is familiar with this whole project, having for three years administered the Marine portfolio while this matter was being researched and processed. What he had to say about the arrangements and negotiations leading up to the decision to build the port is correct. I noted what the member for Semaphore said about the Bill. First, it is correct that the Bill makes no specific reference to Port Giles, but it does lay down certain criteria which, in the event that other ports are established, can be applied to them. I think it is perfectly proper that, when a new additional port is created from which people nearby will derive some immediate freight advantage, there should be some contribution towards the economic liability of the undertaking by the people who receive the benefit. It does not matter whether the port is to be for grain or for any other commodity: the same principle would apply. Incidentally, there are consequential amendments to the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, and therefore nothing is said about any other commodity.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The Bulk Handling of Grain Act sets out what were the established export ports at that time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, and no other port can be added to those except under the Governor's hand. As it was obvious from all the information gathered by committees of inquiry, including the Public Works Committee, that this additional port was not a viable proposition in its own right, the growers were consulted in the first place and informed that the port could not be considered unless they were prepared to make some contribution, and they agreed to do this.

Mr. Ryan: Unanimously.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: When I was formerly Minister of Marine, I attended an inaugural meeting at Yorketown at which the three councils concerned were present (and there were subsequent meetings to which the member for Hindmarsh referred), and I saw the response there. I do not think anyone questions the fact that this was agreed to.

Mr. Clark: The Public Works Committee was assured of it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, as it stated in its report. However, there is no need to stress that point. The member for Semaphore suggested that the Government was pointing the bone at primary producers. He said we had confined the Bill to grain, changing the term "wheat" to "grain", but this is in consequence of other amendments to the Bulk Handling of Grain Act. The proposition at Port Giles is that whatever commodities go over the belt will be credited to the revenue of the port. As the Government does not desire to make any inordinate profits from the operations of the port, the member for Yorke Peninsula's proposal is reasonable, but we may discuss that later. The Bill is perfectly in accord with the arrangements made. The amendment of the member for Yorke Peninsula does not remove from the growers concerned any of the liability for which they have contracted as a result of their undertaking; it merely assures them that the Government will not continue to levy beyond the time when the port becomes self-supporting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the Treasurer to discuss the amendment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to save time later on, but apparently I am not saving it. However, I think the Bill is acceptable to the House as it is and, with the amendments that have been foreshadowed, I hope the House will support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Charge for use of declared port facilities."

Mr. FERGUSON: I move:

In new section 132a (2) after "used" first occurring to insert ", subject to subsection (2a) of this section,"; and to insert the following new subsection:

(2a) The Minister shall in the month of September in each year review the charge fixed or as varied pursuant to subsection (2) of this section and for the purposes of that review the Minister shall have regard to a report from the Auditor-General stating—

(*a*) the total amount of revenue derived from the use of the declared port facilities in respect of the shipment of grain in respect of which the charge is payable;

(*b*) the total amount of revenue derived from the use of the declared port facilities in respect of the shipment of all other goods, including grain, in respect of which the charge is not payable;

and

(*c*) the total of the expenses incurred in earning the revenue referred to in paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) of this subsection,

and in varying the charge pursuant to subsection (2) of this section the Minister shall have regard to—

(*d*) the relationship between the amount of revenue referred to in paragraph (*a*) and the amount of revenue referred to in paragraph (*b*) of this subsection;

and

(*e*) the expenses referred to in paragraph (*c*) of this subsection,

and any such variation shall be expressed to have effect from the first day of October next following that month of September.

My amendment means that, after having received a report from the Auditor-General in September, the Minister shall make an annual assessment of the total tonnage that goes over the belt annually. I should like to read the following extract from a report in connection with the Port Giles proposals:

Evidence submitted by Mr. J. R. Sainsbury, then General Manager of the South Australian Harbors Board, revealed that the scheme was estimated to cost £830,000. This figure was subsequently amended to £844,000, but that slight increase did not materially affect the financial aspect of the project.

Mr. Sainsbury advised that the rate for shipping grain at any of the bulk installations provided at ports nominated in the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, was 2d. per bushel.

He produced a chart which set out the annual costs of the Port Giles scheme for various throughputs of grain, from which we have extracted the following:

For an annual throughput of 50,000 tons, the cost a bushel would be 9d., for 75,000 tons it would be 6d., for 100,000 tons it would be 5d., and for 125,000 tons it would reduce to 4d. a bushel, taken to the nearest penny. Actually, from the cost a ton, it would be something less than 4d. a bushel. From a logical extension of Mr. Sainsbury's chart, the cost, based on the throughput of 150,000 tons, would be little more than 2d. a bushel required to place our port on an equal basis with the average of the other ports. Mr. Sainsbury added that, with a 3d. a bushel subsidy from growers on Southern Yorke Peninsula, an average annual throughput of about 100,000 tons would have to be maintained in order that the scheme should be economically self sufficient.

That scale, which was produced by Mr. Sainsbury, showed that he recognized that, if Port Giles had an annual throughput of grain ranging from 100,000 tons up to 150,000 tons, the surcharge on that construction could possibly be removed. The Public Works Committee report shows that Mr. Frank Pearson, of the Agriculture Department, estimated that within 10 years the increased production of grain probably could bring the quantity shipped from Port Giles to about 150,000 tons. Although salt and gypsum were mentioned when the committee was taking evidence, at that time they were not seriously considered as being commodities that would be shipped over the belt. However, a feasibility study is being undertaken in connection with the production of salt at Peezey Swamp and, if this industry eventuates, it intends to produce a minimum of 500,000 tons of salt, so it is possible that the tonnage going over the belt will be increased. On July 22, 1969 (as reported at page 314 of *Hansard*) I asked the following question of the Premier:

Some time ago the Minister of Works assured me that the installation of bulk handling facilities at Port Giles would be completed by the end of May. This is a very important matter for the wheat industry of Australia in general and of South Australia in particular. In the absence of the Minister of Works, can the Premier say whether work on the project is on schedule?

The Premier replied:

Before I left for overseas earlier this year I called an urgent conference in my office with the aim of shortening the time needed to complete the Port Giles installation. The reason for the conference was that South Australia had had difficulty in getting ships of the right size to take wheat from this State. Although Port Giles was not the answer for the entire State, since an installation was being built there we wanted to finish it earlier and have at least one installation to fit into the general picture.

That reply indicates the possibility of grain being road freighted from other places to Port Giles to enable larger ships to top up and to take more grain from South Australia. If this port had been available in the last two years for this purpose, additional grain would have left South Australia.

If the Minister accepts my amendments the Government will be acknowledging that more wheat can be shipped from South Australia. When the deputation met the Treasurer about a week ago one of the people who submitted evidence concluded by saying:

Should we prove wrong in our judgment the way would still be open in future for your Government to review the whole situation.

If my amendments are approved, the Government will be accepting that, if it proves to be wrong, it shall review the charge that has been placed on this port. I strongly urge the Treasurer to accept the amendments, because I believe they are fair.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I accept the amendments. They do not remove any liability from the people who have contracted to pay a certain charge, but they require that the charge shall be considered each year in September, as that month would be an advantage to the authorities in deciding its programme for the year. It will be some time before the 2.5c can be removed, depending on progress and development at the port and the rapidity with which other ancillary industries develop and can use the port. It will probably be some time before the charge can be completely removed. However, the Government does not wish to make a profit out of this or any other port in the State. People can be assured that the matter will be considered from time to time.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Having discussed the amendments with most of the Opposition members, I assure the member for Yorke Peninsula that we have no desire, whether in Opposition or in Government, for the State to make money out of these installations. However, the State's expenditure should be recouped, and the people in the area agree that this should be done. Accordingly, the charge will be reviewed. I am sure all honourable members hope that production will increase as a result of the provision of these facilities, and that the greater amount of tonnage passing over the belt will provide opportunities for a resultant reduction in charges. I am sure every member would be happy to grant such a reduction when the production in this area increased. On behalf of the Opposition, I support the amendments.

Mr. McANANEY: I support the amendments, which will undoubtedly benefit the farmers in the area and will save them from the considerable charges involved in taking their grain to other ports. I was interested to hear the member for Hindmarsh say that it was not the objective to make a profit on harbour installations, yet during the three years that his Party was in Government it raised harbour charges to make excessive profits.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That is entirely outside the scope of the Bill.

Mr. Hudson: And the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: That action is not consistent with what the honourable member has just been saying.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not object to the amendments. I suggest to the Minister that the Government should consider also the costs for grain that passes over the Wallaroo installation. If this matter is to be reviewed over a period of time, it is only right and proper that charges made in relation to other installations should also be reviewed. This matter has been raised with me on various occasions and, whilst I do not object to the amendments, I would like the Minister to consider a similar arrangement being made in relation to other installations in the State.

Mr. FERGUSON: I remind the member for Wallaroo that an extra charge of 2.5c a bushel is to be levied on grain that goes over the Port Giles jetty. The Government's harbour charges at Port Giles will be the same as those at Wallaroo.

Mr. HUGHES: I accept that explanation that the amendments refer only to the additional 2.5c. I wanted this matter clarified because often matters are passed as a result of our not having had sufficient opportunity to consider amendments. I received a copy of the amendments only five minutes ago, as a result of which I have not had a proper opportunity to study them. Now that I have received the assurance of the mover that the amendments refer only to the additional charge and not to the normal harbour charges, I do not object to them.

Mr. VENNING: I support the amendments, which I consider are reasonable and acceptable to the growers in the area. It may be of interest to members to know that recently a reduction was made in the charges applying in ports throughout the State. I should think that when the time was ripe this matter could be reviewed in order to

see whether the project had been further amortized. However, we are dealing here with the surcharge agreed to be paid by the growers, a factor that was considered prior to establishing Port Giles as a deep sea port.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.3 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 27, at 2 p.m.