HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 13, 1976

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

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. BLACKER presented a petition signed by 60 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (September 23).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The following staff are Ministerial appointments within the Premier's Department:

R. Dempsey (Executive Assistant),
S. Wright (Private Secretary),
J. Templeton (Press Secretary),
A. Koh (Research Officer),
C. Keys (Secretary),
B. Sumner (Secretary),
K. Stegmar (Secretary),
K. Crease (Media Co-ordinator),
D. Baker (Secretary),
J. Colussi (Inquiry Officer),
F. Hansford (Inquiry Officer),
E. Koussidis (Inquiry Officer), and
D. Bail (Inquiry Officer).

It should be noted that Mr. Wright and Mr. Colussi are on secondment from the Public Service.

PAY-ROLL TAX

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (October 5).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following my announcement late last year of pay-roll tax incentives to encourage industry to expand or establish in the iron triangle, the green triangle and Monarto, a number of applications have been received and are currently being processed. Therefore, to date no pay-roll tax incentives have been granted. I might add, however, that the initial slow response from firms to take advantage of the incentives is not unexpected in view of the recent depressed economic climate. Obviously, the Federal Government's economic policies have not assisted in this respect.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the Government has any proposals to extend the ambit of the pay-roll tax remission announced for the Riverland last week? The Premier announced concessions for all co-operative packing sheds in the Riverland and for Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative and Riverland Cannery Limited. These concessions are satisfactory to those concerned and we welcome this relief, but I have been approached by fruit processors in my own district who also believe that they are entitled to the same concessions. Does the Government intend to widen these concessions to include other packing sheds and processors in the hard-pressed fruit industry?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not decided to widen the pay-roll tax concessions that it has already announced. If the honourable member has a case of specific hardship and submits it to the Government, we will examine it.

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Premier say whether, in view of the pay-roll tax concessions made to certain Riverland industries, the Government will introduce a Bill to provide for a decentralised industry pay-roll tax rebate Act to enable all decentralised industries to apply for remission and for their financial disabilities to be judged on their merits? While the concessions already announced by the Government have been greatly appreciated in the Riverland, the Government has, on the other hand, equally disadvantaged certain other industries that did not fall in the bracket named by the Government. Therefore, I believe it is necessary, if the Government is genuine in its desire to promote decentralised industry, that it should provide a vehicle whereby all decentralised industries can apply and present their case to the Government for remission, to be judged on individual merit.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not possible for us to lay down a purely subjective test as to hardship in relation to businesses in decentralised areas. We have investigated this matter over some months and have examined a whole series of conceivable tests and criteria that could be adopted in relation to it. The announcements the Government has made are the result of lengthy investigation, an investigation by a working party of a whole series of alternatives. I do not believe that the Government can go further than it has presently gone. I believe that the incentives we are offering will meet the situation of industries that need encouragement in a decentralised area.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's not what you said to me. You said you would look at some cases of hardship.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I said that, if the honourable member had a specific case of hardship in relation to packing sheds in his district, we would consider it. I do not believe that we can at present go further than the criteria we have now laid down. That does not mean that I am not willing to consider specific circumstances.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are the criteria in writing?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have been set out at some length, and I will obtain details of them for the honourable member.

JUVENILE COURT

Dr. TONKIN: My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Government reconsider the terms of reference announced yesterday for the Royal Commission into the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act, and the appointment of the Royal Commissioner? There appears to be evidence of undue haste in the drawing of the terms of reference for the Royal Commission. This shows up in the wording of the first and second terms. The first, paraphrased, should surely more suitably read: "Improperly interfered with the exercise by (Judge Wilson etc.,) of his powers and duties pursuant to the provisions of those Acts or with his judicial independence". The second should include a further clause, asking "whether such acts or omissions should have been prevented". The third term of reference, referring to the policy of

the Government and quoting section 3 of the Juvenile Courts Act, should ask if that policy has been properly implemented, and then go on to ask what changes by legislation are necessary or desirable, and it is unclear just how wide the scope of the inquiry will be from the wording of that term. The difficulties which might arise from appointment of a judge of equal status to Judge Wilson as the Royal Commissioner have been ventilated before, and have caused concern in the community. It is not yet too late to appoint a judge from outside the State, if no Supreme Court judge is available in South Australia. The terms of reference generally could well be too restrictive and seriously inhibit a full and free inquiry into all the matters surrounding the Juvenile Court and the treatment of young offenders.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer is "No". There is no undue haste in the appointment of the Royal Commissioner or in fixing the terms of reference. I find the Leader somewhat strange in complaining at this stage, when last week he suggested that, in fact, we were tardy about it. He cannot make up his mind which way he wants to go: as long as he criticises the Government he does not mind about inconsistencies. The Leader complains about the details of the terms of reference, which he says are in some way restrictive, but nothing he said this afternoon could indicate any restriction on the terms of reference of this Commission.

Dr. Tonkin: They are extremely restrictive.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are not, and they cover the matters contained in the report of Judge Wilson and the matters of policy regarding what is being carried out and how it should be carried out in future.

Dr. Tonkin: They don't cover the matters raised in the motion in the House which you supported.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, they certainly do. The Leader has criticised the language of the terms of reference, but that language was agreed between the Crown Solicitor and the Royal Commissioner, and I should have thought that both of them had rather more experience in drafting than the Leader had.

Dr. Tonkin: I think that's a matter—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has not made out much of a case, and I think that those gentlemen are better at English than he is. The suggestion of appointing a judge from outside the State is, again, strange, because, on a previous occasion when we appointed an officer to a Royal Commission, from outside the State, the Opposition criticised it.

Dr. Tonkin: But these are special circumstances.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When things are different, they are never the same for the Opposition. The judge appointed to this Royal Commission is a competent, experienced and able judge who is fully able to investigate the matters he has been asked to investigate by direction of the Governor in Council, and I am sure that he will carry out his commission adequately and properly to the benefit of the people of South Australia.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Deputy Premier, as Leader of the House, outline the proposed time table concerning the sittings of the House?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Cabinet considered this matter last week, and it has been decided that the sittings of the House will continue this week and next week, followed by a week's break. I think that that would mean our recommencing the sittings of the House on November 2, from which time the House will sit, without a break, until December 9. Although we will resume the session in the new year, the exact date will depend on several factors, such as the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference in February and the Queen's visit early in March. However, the Government will announce in due course when the session will resume in the new year.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Transport say what the newly-constructed route of the Stuart Highway is to be linking Port Augusta with the Northern Territory border? The Minister has tabled a report of the working party on the new highway, and I have briefly perused the recommendations. I notice that alternative routes are referred to but which of the routes is to be used is a matter to be decided by the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments after considering the long-term future of the Weapons Research Establishment range.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The report that I tabled this afternoon has been or will be tabled in Federal Parliament today by the Federal Minister, because this report was compiled by a joint working party of the South Australian Highways Department and the Federal Department of Transport. This is one time when we have been able to have the Federal Minister's activities and mine co-ordinated. On receiving the report, I communicated with the Federal Minister and told him my preferred route, but I have since received from him a letter indicating that he has referred the report to the Minister for Defence (Mr. Killen) and that, until his opinions are known, Mr. Nixon is not willing to decide, and he has asked me not to publicise my preferred route. For that reason I should respect the request of the Federal Minister. I hope that a final decision will soon be made. However, as can be seen from the report, many of the various alternatives have a common ground, and on that basis we will be proceeding with planning and design work in the hope that we can expedite the building of Stuart Highway. I must point out that the building of the highway depends entirely on the Federal Government's providing funds, because it is one of the boasts of that Government that it provides 100 per cent of funds for the national highway system. It has not done that for South Australia until now, but I look forward to that Government's keeping its promise in relation to the Stuart Highway.

TATTOOING

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health whether the Government will introduce legislation to ban tattooing of minors and to establish health standards for tattooing of adults? Tattooing of minors should be banned, and doctors and plastic surgeons are alarmed at the increased number of young people who are waiting to have tattoos removed by surgery. In spite of this operation, they will remain scarred for life. It is most important that young people be protected from making a mistake that they will regret later in life. Unfortunately, it is a mistake that is not easily rectified. Any such legislation should also establish strict standards in order to ensure that the risk of infection is eliminated or at least kept to a minimum. Recently,

a hospital superintendent has claimed that there is risk of infection because many tattooists do not use sterile needles and dyes. As a result of septic tattooing, several people have contracted hepatitis B and had spent up to six weeks in hospital. Previously, the Minister of Health has stated that legislation was "not warranted" at present. However, Victoria has now adopted such legislation, and I ask that the Government reconsider its policy.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will refer the matter to my colleague in another place. When this matter was brought to my notice by a constituent, I asked the Attorney-General to ascertain whether there was any breach of present laws in respect of persons carrying out tattooing on minors. I can assure the honourable member that I will be just as interested as he is in what my colleague intends to do.

SUPPLY

Mr. SLATER: What are the Premier's views on a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition in another place (Hon. Mr. R. C. DeGaris) that the thought had crossed his mind that in the Upper House he would block Supply to the Government? Will the Premier comment on that statement?

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure whether members are allowed to refer in Question Time to another debate. I am not sure whether the honourable member is referring to words uttered in another debate.

Mr. SLATER: I am referring to a press report relating to remarks made in the Upper House.

The SPEAKER: The question is admissible. The honourable Premier.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Rulings have been given in this House that questions requiring someone to comment are out of order. That was the tenor of the question just asked and, for the sake of consistency, I ask for a ruling on this matter.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order that I can uphold. If the honourable Premier wishes to comment on this matter, that is his right as the Leader of the Government. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reluctance of members opposite to have any comments on this matter is obvious.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And understandable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, quite comprehensible. In the history of this State the Legislative Council, quite properly, has never refused Supply to a Government. That is because of the tradition and convention, which have been essential features of responsible Government, that Upper Houses do not interfere with Appropriation and Supply Bills passed by the House which grants Supply, the Lower House, to which the Government of the day is directly responsible. Any other course for an Upper House is completely defeating responsible Government, because it could mean that an Upper House could, in effect, send a Lower House in which a Government had obtained Supply to an election while that Government had the support of the Lower House. However the Upper House, which was sending all the members of the Lower House to an election, would not need to go to an election itself. If that type of course were to be followed, the continuance of responsible government would be virtually impossible. The convention has always been observed in this State that the Upper House does not interfere with Supply and Appropriation Bills. The suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House that this matter of refusing Supply had crossed his mind was apparently on the basis not of any malperformance by this Government but of his pique at the fact that the Electoral Commission, authorised and directed by legislation passed with an absolute majority in both Houses of this Parliament, had brought down recommendations in accordance with the instructions given it by legislation passed in this House (legislation which was entirely in accordance with the mandate of the Government at previous elections) and that the results of the redistribution did not suit him.

The second matter to which the Leader in the Upper House has referred is the question of the voting pattern for the Upper House, again a system incorporated in a Bill which was passed by an absolute majority in both Houses of this Parliament and which was finally agreed at a conference between the two Houses at which Mr. DeGaris was present, and he recommended the acceptance of that compromise in the Upper House. It is on those two matters, utterly unrelated to the performance of the Government and the nature of its Budget, that Mr. DeGaris has seen fit to say that the thought of refusing Supply has crossed his mind. I cannot imagine a more irresponsible attitude on the part of anyone in politics in South Australia in relation to the continuance of proper responsible Government responsive to the people. His whole complaint relates to these matters in the South Australian Constitution, yet at last, as has been said by present members of the Liberal Party, we have a Constitution which is a model for Australia in giving effect to the democratic wishes of the people of this State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As it is private members' day, I should like to ask a question of the Leader of the Opposition. I realise that he does not have to answer the question unless he so wishes, but I hope that he will answer.

The SPEAKER: I trust that this is a matter that concerns the business of the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Indeed it does. It concerns the business of Parliament, anyway. Let me put the question and I hope that you will allow the Leader the opportunity to answer it, Sir. Will the Leader use his good offices with his colleague, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, the Leader of the Liberal Party in another place, to dissuade that honourable gentleman from further contemplating using his Party numbers to block Supply in the Legislative Council?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He didn't really contemplate it anyway.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that, but I want to make sure that there is no misunderstanding about this matter. My question is supplementary to that asked by the honourable member for Gilles of the Premier this afternoon. On this occasion I entirely agree with what the Premier said in reply, and I hope that at least some members of the Liberal Party would share that view. This question is asked to give the Leader an opportunity to make crystal clear to the people of South Australia where he stands. It may be (and this is the final point I make in explanation) that just on this occasion the Liberal Leader in another place does not speak, as he usually does, for all numbers of the so-called Liberal Party in

both Houses and, even at the risk of causing a split between the two so-called Liberal Parties, I ask the Leader this question.

Dr. TONKIN: This is the first opportunity I have had of answering a question from this side, and I thank the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: I hope that you'll answer it, too.

Dr. TONKIN: The answer, if the honourable member will allow me to continue, is crystal clear. There is no suggestion at all by the Liberal Party that Supply or the Budget will be blocked. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris made a statement during the course of a debate in another place. That I cannot comment on. He referred to the possibility having crossed his mind outside that place of later on blocking Supply. That is an expression of his personal opinion, and he is perfectly entitled to say that that possiblity has crossed his mind. He was not speaking for the Liberal Party in so doing, and I do not believe that he represented himself as doing so.

MEDIBANK LEVY

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Premier investigate the position applying to deductions for Medibank cover through the State Superannuation Fund for former public servants and, if it is found to be inadequate, will he make more suitable arrangements? An elderly lady has informed me that the Superannuation Fund is deducting her basic Medibank cover but she has been told that she has to make her own arrangements direct with Medibank for the full Medibank private cover. If this is true, the situation leaves much to be desired, especially in the case of the aged or infirm, who may have a problem in travelling to a Medibank office to pay the levy each quarter or financial difficulty in paying a full year's levy in advance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier say whether he or his department has received any calls or a deputation from the Footwear Manufacturers Association in this State? For many months there has been speculation in this trade concerning loss of employment. A warning has been made by the Industries Assistance Commission that its policies could throw out of work a further 200 000 employees in the footwear and clothing industries in Australia. The I.A.C. seems willing at the moment to see increased unemployment in several fields. In this State we have one large and several small manufacturers in this area that employ many South Australians.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not received a deputation from the footwear manufacturers. However, I believe they have made some representations to my department, which is concerned about the report of the I.A.C. in this matter, as in so many others. I notice that a leading manufacturer today suggested that the I.A.C. was about dismantling Australian industry and I would think that that, from the kind of reports which we have had to contest in the last couple of years, was an obviously justified criticism. In fact, the I.A.C. appears to be on a course that will be so much concerned with economic rationalism in the use of world resources that there will be no way that a country like Australia can continue with manufacturing industry and provide the necessary diversity and security of employment to its people required in our social structure. South Australia, which is, in Australian terms, a decentralised industry area is bitterly affected by free trade policies and the abolition of the necessary protections to maintain efficient industry in this country. My division will be talking to manufacturers in this area. We have constantly made representations to the I.A.C. and, alone of the States, have appeared constantly before the commission to make submissions on behalf of the State Government in support of our industries. We will be in touch with the manufacturers in the boot trades area concerning this matter.

SAMCOR

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works, as Minister responsible for the Services and Supply Department, obtain a report for me about the progress of work in updating the freezing and killing rooms, the killing capacity each day, and the total long-term storage capacity of the Samcor works at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report from my colleague, the Chief Secretary, who is now the Minister responsible for the department.

SINGLE-PARENT FAMILIES

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare outline what assistance is available from the Community Welfare Department to single-parent families? It is generally known that the department provides financial and other assistance to families in need. However, I believe that most members would know from personal experience that single-parent families can and do face difficulties similar to those of other families in need and are often unaware of the help that is available.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As the honourable member was kind enough to let me know that she wanted this information, I am pleased to be able to provide it for her and other members. I can assure her that a full range of services are available to single-parent families and that they are eligible, in the same way as are others, for emergency and other services provided by the department. For instance, under the family assistance scheme, which is designed to prevent the breakdown of family units, the department can provide, for example, the following: an emergency home-maker service when a parent cannot provide the necessary care because of hospitalisation or because of desertion; emergency accommodation; holiday camps for children who would otherwise be deprived of such an experience; and the purchase of special items, such as furniture and clothing, needed to maintain the family unit. Special financial assistance is also available for the payment of overdue electricity and gas accounts, emergency food supplies, bus and train fares, medical expenses, emergency accommodation, and for other purposes. Other departmental services, including early childhood services, family day care and community care projects, are also available to sole-parent families.

PERPETUAL LEASE LAND

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands whether he can give any reasons for the massive increases being experienced in rental charges at the time of a change of ownership of perpetual lease land? I have been contacted by at least two constituents

concerning this matter. I wish to refer to one instance now. The gentleman concerned has approached me about a problem he has in selling his dairy farm. His property, which is a viable enterprise, has an unimproved value between $600 and $700 an acre. When this gentleman approached various land agents about listing the property for sale, two of the agents said that they were not interested in selling perpetual lease land. He was told that the farm, having a high unimproved value, on changing hands and perhaps land use, would attract a much higher lease rent than the current rental. On contacting the Lands Department on this point, my constituent was informed that the lease rent could go as high as $2 000 a year. The gentleman no longer wishes to be involved in dairying in the Adelaide Hills, and therefore does not intend to extend to bulk milk installation. A prospective buyer wishes to breed horses and cattle, and I do not believe that this, in fact, constitutes a change in land use. The property cannot be subdivided, and the probable changes in land use for a property of this size and type, depending on water supply, could be only potato growing, beef cattle raising, cereal cropping (and these are mostly done in conjunction with dairying), horse breeding, and perhaps poultry raising.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall refer the matter to my colleague. This must be an extremely unusual perpetual lease. Anyone with any knowledge of the Crown Lands Act would know that, apart from some leases which were last issued in about 1895, no adjustment can be made to the annual rental required by the Crown on a perpetual lease once it is struck. There are about 500 or 600 of these leases, and they are subject to a rental review every 14 years but are not subject to any land tax. There are obviously few of those throughout the State. A perpetual lease means just what the title implies: it is a lease in perpetuity, and the rental struck at the time of the lease can be altered in only one way: it can be reduced, but not increased. That is the situation with a Crown perpetual lease.

Mr. Wotton: It could be a Crown perpetual lease.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is the situation with such a lease unless certain peculiar conditions obtain. I wonder whether the honourable member is talking of a miscellaneous lease —

Mr. Wotton: No.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —which is an entirely different thing.

Mr. Wotton: No, it is not.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can tell the honourable member, from my knowledge of the Crown Lands Act, that the only types of perpetual lease I know of are those I have mentioned, subject to a review every 14 years, and that goes on forever and can only be reduced. Because of what the honourable member has said (and it must be a most peculiar lease), I shall have the matter examined and give him a report as soon as possible.

OUTER HARBOR DEVELOPMENT

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Marine say whether any applications have been received from firms or industries wishing to establish themselves at Outer Harbor? One is mindful of the excellent reclamation scheme presently being carried out by the Marine and Harbors Department on previously swampy wasteland. At present, an area of more than 15 hectares is suitable for industrial sites and, as the new deep-sea terminal will shortly be operable, I should like to know whether inquiries have been received from firms which use seagoing dispatch of goods and which are prepared to use the adjacent sites.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member no doubt refers to the excellent work undertaken by the Marine and Harbors Department over some years in reclaiming land between Outer Harbor and Port Adelaide. This serves as a memorial to the former Director (Mr. Sainsbury), who played a prominent part in promoting this scheme and the reclamation of the area. Adelaide is the envy of every other major city of Australia in relation to the area available for development near its major port. I think 242 hectares to 323 hectares of land is available for development. I have discussed this matter recently with the Director of Marine and Harbors (Mr. John Griffith), pointing out to him that I believe it is necessary that any industry wishing to develop in this area should be, if possible, involved in the use of the port. We have other land in the Adelaide metropolitan area suitable for the development of industry, and I am anxious to see that industries than can best use the port facility are the industries which establish in this area. At the moment, the matter of considering inquiries is under review, and I am happy that a great deal of the land has been taken up by industries that are associated with the use of the port. From his own knowledge, the honourable member would be aware of those industries. I am pleased that he is interested in the area, as I know he would be because of his association with it. I can assure him that, not only are we interested in people coming to the area but we are also interested in promoting the availability of this land. If he read last Saturday's paper, the honourable member would have noticed that we advertised for a Commercial Manager to be appointed to the Marine and Harbors Department. One of his duties will be the control of the development of this land.

CASINO

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether an approach has been made to the Government for a licence for a casino or a legalised gambling house by the owners of the Round House, Glenelg? If no approach has been made, would consideration be given to such a request? I understand that amended plans for this building have been approved by the Glenelg council. I believe it is to incorporate a 78-unit motel, several bars and restaurants, and a games room. Under the Lottery and Gaming Act, for the year ended June 30, 1975, 309 people were prosecuted for gaming offences, and 468 prosecutions related to persons being present at an unlawful game. In view of the approval of a gaming room at the motel, can the Premier say whether an approach has been made, or whether an approach was made some time ago to establish a casino, a type of casino, or a gambling room at Glenelg, or to legalise certain card games that I understand are played in South Australia, resulting in this large number of prosecutions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I personally have had no recent approach from anyone connected with the Round House at Glenelg. I believe that some years ago some suggestion was made, amongst a great many others, that the Round House development could be considered as a site for a casino licence, but I have heard nothing recently on this score, and I do not think that is surprising. The Government has made its position perfectly clear on the subject of casino licences. No measure will be introduced to alter the Lottery and Gaming Act to provide for a

casino licence until a motion has been proposed in this House (and it will not be proposed by me) instructing the Government to introduce such a measure. Any measure to be introduced by the Government would provide for an independent and public investigation of contenders for a casino licence, and then a recommendation would have to be made by that independent authority to Parliament as to the granting of a casino licence in specific circumstances. That is the way in which the matter would have to proceed if it were ever to be discussed. I have made perfectly clear that the Government has formed no intention of introducing legislation relating to a casino licence. It would not do so unless instructed by this House to do it.

Mr. Becker: What about unlawful card games?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If card games occur that are unlawful under the Lottery and Gaming Act, and if a complaint is made, the police will investigate and a prosecution will ensue.

Mr. Becker: Are you prepared to legalise certain card games?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am not prepared to alter the Act.

Mr. Millhouse: The same as with massage parlours?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not at all. If the honourable member, from his personal investigations, has information on card games as well as on massage parlours, I hope that he will let the Vice Squad have it.

MARINELAND

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Local Government give the House any information on what stage the new $180 000 filtration system recently commissioned at Marineland, West Beach, has reached, the number of workers employed on this project (which was funded from South Australian Government unemployment relief funds), and whether any further work or project is planned for Marineland after the present project has been completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The new filtration plant was inspected by the Minister of Labour and Industry and me about three weeks ago, at the stage when it was virtually completed. It is a feat of which I believe the Minister of Works has very good reason to be proud, because his department designed it. This State's unemployment relief funds provided the finance for the installation, of which the Marineland project now has the benefit. The plant was certainly needed, because the old scheme was unsatisfactory: in fact, Marineland was losing considerable numbers of fish. Additional projects are envisaged, apart from about $100 000 spent on the plant, on the northern side of the Marineland building where there is now a lawn park and picnic area. The front will be improved next and, subject to the availability of funds, parking will be improved at the front and a large lawn area will be provided so that children may play safely.

Mr. Becker: When will you fix up Military Road? A real con job!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is the kind of interjection one would expect from the member for Hanson, who is not interested in the Marineland project or in the West Beach trust. I believe that the trust has done, and is continuing to do, a great job for the whole of South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: It is doing very well under private enterprise, isn't it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is strange to hear the honourable member refer to private enterprise, because the State Government bought out Marineland when private enterprise failed to carry it out. So, let us not hear too much of that twaddle from the member from Glenelg.

Mr. Becker: A real con!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Hanson will take note of his Leader, who is telling him to shut up, I think Question Time would go much better.

PREMIER'S VISIT

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say what useful information he intends to impart to Rocky River constituents when he visits Wilmington next Friday evening and Clare the following day? The Premier is coming into my area next weekend, and he will open the Wilmington centenary on Friday evening. He is coming to an area that has gone from experiencing severe drought to one that has received severe flooding since the rains came about 10 days or a fortnight ago. The Premier may wish to talk to the Minister of Local Government prior to his visit, because I led a deputation to the Minister last week in connection with certain aspects of the flooding in those areas. Despite the shameful attention that the Governor-General receives when he visits South Australia, as member for Rocky River I intend to welcome the Premier and show him the greatest courtesy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Will the Premier welcome the member for Rocky River?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful for the honourable member's welcome to this area.

Mr. Gunn: You haven't got it yet. It's only a promise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, I have previously been in the honourable member's district on occasion. He has shown me every courtesy, and I appreciated it.

Mr. Chapman: Certainly if you say the right things.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I even get appreciation on Kangaroo Island on occasion. I am unable to forecast to the member for Rocky River what information I may impart to his constituents and to him while I am in Wilmington, Quorn and Clare at the weekend. I have been asked to each of those places because of certain celebrations. I was asked to go to Wilmington because my family farmed there previously, and I have been told by the council's Chairman that they regard me as one of the—

Mr. Coumbe: Sons of the soil!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, sons of the soil. I shall be going back to a place where my family had connections in the last century, I shall be going to Quorn for some celebratory activity, and to the Clare Show. The Clare Show Society was kind enough to ask me to open its show, and I shall be more than pleased to do so, because I have long personal associations with the Clare district, which I used to organise for the Labor Party in the past, and because I know many of the people in the area. I shall be pleased to see the honourable member, and I shall try to compile as big a compendium of information for him and his constituents as I can.

BREAD

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what he intends to do about the future of the bread industry in South Australia and, as a result of the

report issued by the committee of inquiry into the bread industry, can he say whether he intends to establish a permanent bread council? Also, can the Minister say whether he has any other of the committee's recommendations in mind that he wishes to implement in future?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The report from the bread industry committee was examined but, except for two parts that I have explained previously to the House, was not accepted by the Government. Without going into the past, I am sure the honourable member would recall that the Government tried to do something but was pressurised by both sides of the political arena (that is, by trade unions on the one side and employers on the other) not to do what we intended to do. I do not intend to take further action in regard to the report and I do not intend to set up a bread industry council, at this stage anyway.

GRASSHOPPERS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to reconsider the decision about making spray available to landholders in the Ceduna area who now believe they will have to spray for grasshoppers? I was contacted last evening by one of my constituents who was concerned that there might be a large outbreak of grasshoppers in that area. At present, landholders can receive from district councils spray at $1·80 a litre, which means that it costs about 40c an acre to spray. My constituent pointed out that a large quantity of spray could be needed, involving landholders in considerable expense, and that spraying was to the benefit of many other people as well as the person unfortunate enough to have the outbreak on his property. I shall be pleased if the Minister could ask his colleague this question, so that he could make an urgent decision. This morning I contacted the Minister's office and spoke to some of his officers at Northfield.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will do that, and obtain a reply as quickly as possible.

SWANPORT BRIDGE

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the completion of the construction of the Swanport road bridge south of Murray Bridge across the Murray River will now be delayed? The Minister will be aware of recent industrial difficulties concerning the staff working on the bridge and also of the difficulties experienced with seepage which is continually occurring in the piers area of the bridge and which has caused some delay in the work. It would seem to a layman that these matters combined could delay for some weeks or perhaps months, the completion of this new structure.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The most recent report that I have received indicated that the industrial trouble had been quite negligible in relation to the overall project and, whilst it had created a small degree of delay, it was only a matter of days and, as far as I am aware the same situation applies to seepage. I understand that the work is on schedule, and the commissioner is now preparing a fairly comprehensive report preparatory to letting the tender for the third stage. This indicates that work on the structure is well on time, but I will check and, if there is any variation from what I have said, I will tell the honourable member.

LAND COMMISSION

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister for Planning say what action, if any, has been taken by the Government or by him to ensure that the Land Commission's programme of building block development is maintained in a reasonable balance with demand for serviced blocks? I pinpoint specifically the development of building blocks as opposed to the procurement of broad acres, because it is in the development of building blocks that real costs arise for the Land Commission. This situation has been referred to previously in the House, and it becomes important to ensure that the supply of serviced blocks is not some years in advance of requirements, as the funds that would otherwise be tied up in that development may well be used by the Government for housing.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The present position is that the Land Commission is still expanding its activities in providing serviced blocks in the general metropolitan area (and for that purpose I include Gawler). I am sure the honourable member would appreciate that. This process of expansion involves greater use of capital, and cannot take place overnight. I believe that in the present financial year the commission is planning to place on the market about 3 500 serviced blocks in the metropolitan area.

Dr. Eastick: Has it determined a demand?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It can within broad limits, and it is considered that in this financial year there may be (and probably is already) some tightness in the supply of serviced blocks. That is the basic reason for presenting to the House a Bill to extend urban land price control for a further two years, because we are not sure at this stage that we will be able to satisfy the demand to the extent we should be able. The only other point I make is that our objective must be to have an adequate supply of serviced blocks available for the market for at least no later than the next 18 months to two years. The existing allotments available throughout the metropolitan area as they are used for building purposes will probably cover us for that time, but it is essential that the Land Commission should be able to expand its activities much more significantly than will be the case this financial year. The present position is one of balance but tending towards the shortage side. I appreciate the point made by the honourable member that it is a waste of community resources to have an excessive supply of allotments available at any one time and that money tied up in the development of these blocks and the provision of services could be used to greater effect elsewhere. However, when I receive a report from the commission on this matter, if there is any change in the situation as outlined by me, I will tell the honourable member.

RAILWAY SLEEPER CAR

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Transport say what is the nature of the problem recently experienced with the railway sleeper car that travels from Adelaide to Mount Gambier? I appreciate that the car may be rather archaic and near the end of its service, but is the problem a recurrent one? Two elderly persons recently approached me and said that they had booked sleeper accommodation on the train. On arrival at the station they were informed that the sleeper was no longer available. It was then too late for them to obtain alternative transport (by plane for example), and they had to sit up all night on the 12-hour journey. I would appreciate a report about that matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member will give me the details of the names of the people, the date and so on, I shall be delighted to find out why that happened. It certainly should not have happened, and adequate advice should have been given. I will be pleased to find out the details for the honourable member.

At 3.5 p.m., the bells having been rung;

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ARTS SUPPORT

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Federal Government should continue to stimulate and support the Arts in Australia, and should not accept the recommendations of the recently announced I.A.C. report.

I placed on the Notice Paper yesterday this notice of motion because I was extremely disturbed about reports which had come from the Industries Assistance Commission recommending that performing arts aid should be phased out over the next five years. That concern is shared by many people in the community. I have since received an answer to a representation I made to the Federal Government on this matter, and I am in a much happier position now, so much so that I believe that this motion is not strictly necessary. Nevertheless, I intend to proceed with it because it will adequately set out the views of this House and, I believe, of the people of South Australia as a whole. It is important that we look into the entire matter of the inquiry from its inception. This inquiry was first commenced by the Prime Minister of the time, Mr. Gough Whitlam, on October 6, 1974. The document, which was signed in Williamsburg in the United States of America during one of Mr. Whitlam's periodic absences from this country, directed the I.A.C. to look into the matter of assistance to the performing arts in Australia.

The terms of reference included whether assistance should be accorded the performing arts in Australia and, if so, what should be the nature and extent of such assistance. The performing arts covered were ballet, dance, opera, music, drama, music hall, vaudeville, puppetry and the like. In considering the matter, the I.A.C. was to have regard to the desire of the Government that it have power to consider any other matter related to assistance to the performing arts. As soon as I heard about the report that came down as a result of the deliberations under those terms of reference I was seriously disturbed. Many words were written about the report, all of which, I think, were far from being helpful.

The SPEAKER: Order! Far too much audible private conversation is taking place.

Dr. TONKIN: Hear, hear! A report of what was contained in the I.A.C. report stated:

Available funds should be redirected towards improving education and encouraging innovations in the performing arts. Attention also should be given to disseminating the performing arts further throughout the community, particularly through the electronic media. Some of Australia's most heavily subsidised performing arts are of marginal relevance and limited availability to the community.

This general dissemination must be considered. The report continues:

Too little is known about the relationship between the arts and the benefit to the community to allow any person, institution or performing group to use scarce public resources to impose their own cultural standards and priorities on society.

These statements made in the course of the I.A.C. report were totally and absolutely shortsighted and wrong, in my opinion. The reaction from various members of the media and the arts was predictable. They reacted and made their point very vigorously indeed. Opera dance groups faced deathknell: there were many people in Australia who are vitally concerned with the arts who felt that without Government assistance their own interest in the arts would no longer be in existence or able to exist.

The reactions flooded in. It seemed not only an absurd but a ridiculous report, because it was the I.A.C. which had been asked to bring down that report. I do not think it is, in fact, entirely the fault of the I.A.C. One can wonder, in the first instance, why the I.A.C. was asked to report on the matter of assistance to the arts. The performing arts are not constituted on a commercial paying basis. If any branch of the performing arts had to depend on being commercially financially viable, I doubt that we would have very many of them left in Australia. The members of the I.A.C., Mr. Boyer and Mr. Robinson, are very distinguished men indeed. They have made worthwhile reports to the community on commercial and industrial matters, but it seems to me inappropriate that they should have been the ones to regard the matters which were referred to them in the best interests of art in Australia. Indeed, the *Financial Review* summed up the situation well. I believe the blame lies to a large extent with the former Prime Minister. A report in the *Financial Review* of October 12 states:

It is ironic that Mr. Whitlam, the self-proclaimed patron of the arts, the self-described Rattigan man and indeed the architect of the I.A.C. as an independent body inquiring into subjects beyond tariff protection for manufacturing industry, should have been the man who has—by giving the I.A.C. a downright silly inquiry—exposed it to danger at a time when it is under attack from organised and determined lobbyists.

I do not intend to deal with the last part of that report, but I agree that it was a silly inquiry and should never have been referred to the I.A.C. in the first place. The development of the performing arts and the fine arts has always depended on patronage of some sort. In days gone by it was patronage from the church and royal houses. One can think of the Brandenburg Concerto that was written for the duke. One can recall many other works of art being commissioned and dedicated to various persons. Latterly, that patronage has had to be given by Governments and Governments have a real duty to support the arts and culture in any society. In Australia that support is given for the benefit of the entire community, not on a Party basis, because art and culture are beyond Party politics.

As soon as this matter was raised I contacted Mr. Staley (the Minister assisting the Prime Minister) and put to him strongly my own personal protest and the protest of my Party. Indeed, I took it on myself to echo what I believed to be the views of all South Australians. I now have his assurance that nothing in the I.A.C. report will affect the Federal Government's absolute commitment to the support of the arts. The attitude of the Federal Government is clear: the last Federal Budget provided ample evidence of it. It contained a most generous allocation to the arts, and the activities of the Federal Government since then in relation to the Elizabethan Theatre Trust and the opera bear out the fact that it is committed and dedicated to supporting the arts. Its attitude is clear, and I personally

cannot see any possibility at all of the Federal Government's cutting down on subsidies to the arts as a result of the I.A.C. report, which was not commissioned by the present Federal Government. I believe the report will not be heeded in this respect by the present Federal Government.

Certainly, I can give an assurance to the House that as a Party in Government we would continue in this State to maintain the present high support the arts enjoy. I understand that in the Federal House today further reference will be made to this report and the Federal Government's attitude to it. I am most grateful that the Federal Government has the attitude it has towards the performing arts, and I commend it for that. I repeat that this motion is probably not now really necessary, but I believe that it provides an opportunity for all members who wish to do so to indicate their support for the arts and their support for the present system and degree of funding. I do not believe that the Federal Government will accept the recommendations of the I.A.C. report. I commend the motion to members and thank them in advance for their support.

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

After "report" to add "and that Senators for the State of South Australia should take appropriate action in the Senate".

I support the motion, but I want to move that amendment. This Government has had a long-standing policy of development of the arts in this State and has gone far further than any previous Government in this State, or indeed than any other Government in any State of Australia, in support of a wide-ranging arts development programme. That has shown to the people of South Australia where this Government stands, and we have no apologies whatever to make about an arts development policy. This policy has been supported widely in South Australia because it has brought real benefits to the people in many ways.

The Leader of the Opposition asked why this matter was referred to the I.A.C. and said that it was not a matter of commercial activity at all. The reason for the reference to the I.A.C. was that the former Federal Government received, as has this one, requests from commercial theatrical organisations that they should receive a subsidy and that they were at a disadvantage compared with subsidised companies for performers, venues and audiences. The previous Federal Govrnement did not refuse them consideration but referred that matter, of their receiving some subsidy as well as the State-supported companies, to the I.A.C. The present Federal Government has simply rejected out of hand the submissions of the commercial theatrical managements. That was the reason for the investigation.

This Government, as in the case of other submissions to the I.A.C., made a lengthy submission to it as to the benefits that the community received from the arts and the arts development policy of this State. It was clearly pointed out that not only had we provided money for the Festival of Arts, and for the capital works of the Festival Centre and that we intended to provide money for regional art centres in capital development, but that we had also funded heavily the South Australian Symphony Orchestra (now the Adelaide Symphony), the South Australian Theatre Company, the Australian Dance Theatre, and what was then New Opera but is now the State Opera Company. In addition, through the Arts Grants Advisory Committee (a creation of this Government) we supported numbers of other artistic endeavours of various kinds throughout the State.

Furthermore, we were concerned to see that the performing arts activity of the State-supported companies was not confined to those people who could afford to go or were physically able to attend the performances in a capital city. Not only did we provide touring activity through the Arts Council in South Australia, also funded heavily by the State, but we also provided a series of educational programmes providing work through the schools in South Australia, with the youth work group, the Troika Theatre, the Carclew Centre and the youth section of the South Australian Theatre Company under Helmut Bakaitis and his officers. It was shown to the I.A.C. at the time it made its investigations here (and I personally discussed it with Mr. Boyer) that we were seeing to it that there was an effective dissemination into the community as widely as possible of the activity of the arts supported by the State, and that we were setting out to see that there was an effective communication at as many levels as possible through the community. Naturally, that would take time. It was not possible in just a few short years to change the habits of some generations since the collapse of widespread commercial theatre in Australia in the 1920's. To reverse the process of people's involvement in the performing arts would mean a very considerable re-education of the community in the area of the performing arts in their own lives.

The I.A.C. was apprised fully that a policy of this kind was operating in South Australia. In fact, Mr. Boyer told me that South Australia was the one State in Australia where a policy of this kind seemed to be working. I cannot credit why the commission, having seen that policy working in South Australia, has recommended a phasing out of the present support for companies. Let me summarise the findings of the Industries Assistance Commission and then deal with them. They are as follows:

1. The assistance currently given to support the operating costs of performing arts organisations should be phased out over the next five years.

This would mean that in South Australia the S.A.T.C. and the State Opera would have to wind down their activities and in the case of the S.A.T.C. it is doubtful whether it could survive without a continuing grant from the Commonwealth Government. It would also mean a major "rethink" of the Adelaide Festival of Arts in terms of its entrepreneurial activities, and would virtually ensure that South Australia never saw performances of the Australian Opera and the Australian Ballet. It would also mean that the Australian Dance Theatre, at present being reformed, would not be able to continue. The only way for us to continue these activities would be for the State to pick up the shortfall of funds, and that is something about which I express no enthusiasm in view of such demands being placed on the State by the Commonwealth Government to pick up the shortfall in its funding in other areas of previous Commonwealth activity. The second finding was as follows:

2. The Commission found that the available assistance should be progressively redirected towards (and shared reasonably equally among) the three major objectives of:

(*a*) improving education in the performing arts, especially the understanding among children of the basic elements of these arts;

I presume the commission took that from our programme. We have already got it. The findings continue:

(*b*) expanding dissemination of the performing arts to the community generally, mainly by the use of modern technology;

If we do not have arts activity, how do we disseminate it? It is not much good putting on a record with nothing on it or turning on television where only a blank screen is showing because no performing arts activities are available to be seen on the television screen. The findings continue:

(c) encouraging innovations in the performing arts, particularly those relating to a distinctive characteristic of the Australian community.

That seems to stem from a view that, if you do not have traditional arts companies of world standard, somehow or other within the community there will grow up a distinctive art form that is formed without support by creative ability of the community. That is a nonsensical notion and cannot occur. What we can do is support what we can find within the community in the way of the development of matters of importance locally. We have funded ethnic festivals, we have supported several fringe activities, and we have community arts development officers. However, unless a standard is provided through professional companies a satisfactory standard will not obtain in other arts companies.

We believe that there needs to be an expansion in South Australia of activity in areas beyond the funded companies. It is a basic necessity for the development of satisfactory arts activity in South Australia that the funded companies exist and that they set a world standard in their work. We have, as I have said, through the Education Department adopted many initiatives in the performing arts, such as making it possible for theatre-in-education teams to work in schools; seconding education officers to major organisations and companies; supporting the development of activities such as the Carclew Arts Centre; subsidising the performances for children in the Adelaide Festival Centre; and attempting to rationalise and co-ordinate the touring of performing arts activities to schools within metropolitan and country areas. We need companies that can do this.

Without performing artists professionally employed we cannot disseminate the performing arts to the community. The commission found that assistance to achieve these objectives should, as far as possible, be neutral as between art forms and be accorded both performing and creative activities, whether commercial, professional or amateur. It is extremely difficult to provide assistance to amateur activities without the necessary activity of the funded companies. Simply to adopt what is supposed to be a neutral attitude between amateurism and professionalism means that satisfactory standards are not adopted at all. The commission's findings continue:

4. The existing Commonwealth instrumentalities should continue to distribute performing arts assistance with the Australia Council having specific responsibility for monitoring and a general responsibility for co-ordinating its use in a manner consistent with Government policy.

All instrumentalities should give reasoned accounts of the money that they have spent, the commission said. The findings continue:

6. The Commission thought assistance from the Commonwealth Government should not be accorded:

(a) by restricting the importation of live or recorded performing arts.

That can cause real problems. Although this country needs to import artists of world standard (no-one would deny that), we certainly do not need to have the dumping into our community of poor standard, cheap works from other countries that throw our artists out of work. The findings continue:

(b) for assistance for theatre ownership or for performing arts capital projects (except with the A.C.T. or N.T.).

The Leader of the Opposition has said that the present Federal Government has set out its support for the performing arts. I can only say for the people in the profession that they are not particularly impressed by that support. So far the Federal Government's activities, particularly in relation to the Australian Broadcasting Commission and the Australia Council, have meant a marked decrease in employment in the industry. One need merely talk to members of Actors Equity or the Musicians Union and suggest that the Federal Government is pursuing a policy in favour of arts development, and they will laugh bitterly. In this recommendation the Industries Assistance Commission acts entirely in accordance with what the Prime Minister has already said, that there would be no further assistance for State arts capital projects outside the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory—no assistance for capital projects at all! That was already Federal Government policy before the I.A.C. report was issued. It means that, in relation to regional art centres in Mount Gambier or elsewhere, the Commonwealth Government will not give support, although support was available under the policy of the previous Federal Government.

In view of what has been said in Canberra in relation to expenditure in these areas, it is not surprising that the I.A.C. has come out with the kind of report that it has issued. I do not wish to be associated with the Leader's remarks when he says that the present Federal Government is doing all right by the arts—I do not believe that it is. The commission came out completely against tax deductibility for donations to performing arts organisations, even suggesting that the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust should not continue to operate as a tax deductibile organisation.

The attitude of the I.A.C. is not entirely opposed, by any means, to attitudes expressed in Canberra by the present Federal Government concerning arts development activity. We do not know what is going to happen, for instance, to the Australian Opera, and whether we will see it here, even though this State pays money towards it. This State Government last year spent $1 727 000 on grants for the arts, excluding money spent on the Adelaide Festival Centre, the Art Gallery, the South Australian Film Corporation, and the South Australian Craft Authority. That figure includes the major companies: the South Australian Theatre Company, State Opera, the Adelaide Festival, and the Arts Council. This year there will be a reasonable increase in that overall amount, even within the present tight budgetary situation. It is our view that the performing arts, and indeed the arts generally, cannot be dispensed with by any Government in Australia, let alone the Federal Government. We believe that it is necessary for pressure to be kept up in Canberra. It is no use people's expressing support for the view that there should be performing arts in the community and then saying that State Governments can assume full responsibility for them. That attitude has been taken in relation to capital expenditure by the Federal Government.

We question whether, in view of the I.A.C. report, it is not going to extend further to the attitudes already expressed by the Federal Government in relation to the Australian Broadcasting Commission and its performing arts activity. This is serious. At the moment, the A.B.C. is up against it for the employment of live performers in this community. That was an area where the performing arts could be disseminated very markedly. If the Federal Government is not to go further, it will be necessary for pressure to be kept up in this area. I welcome the Leader's statement that he and his Party believe in the continuance of support for the arts. I believe, however, that it is necessary for us to show Canberra, in a real and practical way,

that, while there is no diminution on the part of this State's effort in the area, there should be no diminution on the part of the Commonwealth, either.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I rise to speak in this debate largely because I have been boiling about this subject for most of the weekend. The thing I want to protest most about is that Governments within this country can operate always on the basis that anything is done only if people are willing to put a price on what they will pay; if the performing arts cannot survive over a period of time without a subsidy, the subsidy is withdrawn. That sort of attitude is appalling, and seems to display a nineteenth century economist's point of view which is, I believe, completely out of tune with what should apply in the modern world.

Are we to put a price on what people in some remote country area will pay for their education and, if they will not pay sufficiently, either directly or indirectly, not provide them with education? What will we have next? Will it be an I.A.C. report into the education industry? If that report comes down, will it show something similar: that, unless the education industry can stand up economically and viably, Government support should be withdrawn? That is fully consistent with the kind of attitude the I.A.C. has displayed in this matter. The I.A.C., after all, is merely an updated version of the old Tariff Board, and why the matter of assistance to the performing arts should be referred to a body basically made up out of the old Tariff Board is beyond my comprehension, in the first place. I cannot understand, and I never could understand, why the previous Government abdicated its responsibility in the matter to make value judgments about what kind of support should be available for the performing arts.

Dr. Eastick: Which Government?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I said "the previous Government".

Dr. Eastick: The Whitlam Government?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is right. Its overall Budgets in terms of budgetary policy were very much in support of the performing arts, but it seemed that this reference to the I.A.C. was an unworked-out piece of inconsistency by that Government. I am certainly disturbed, as is the Premier, about the kind of response we will get from the present Federal Government, because it has shown an attitude towards the A.B.C. which in many respects is consistent with the kind of thing we find in the I.A.C. report.

Let us make one fundamental point: if we are to develop a community in which everything we do as a Government by way of assistance to anyone ultimately has to be justified by putting some kind of price tag on it, we had better give up as a community, and give away this country to someone else, because we do not deserve it. Surely we have a responsibility towards future generations of Australians. Surely we have a responsibility in any significant area of human endeavour to raise the standards that now apply within our community. That responsibility extends to the artistic field. In any area involving human endeavour, the standard of achievement is always a comparative one.

A ballerina, for example, can never aspire to the highest standards if she is unable to see the finest in the world, and, if local professional standards in that area of artistic endeavour can be raised so that the access to seeing those higher standards is more readily available, inevitably that will have an impact on the aspirations of future generations of artists. The same point applies in every area of artistic endeavour, whether it be music, drama, ballet, or anything else. It is the quality of the work and the standards achieved by those already in the community with whom the aspiring performer can expect to come into regular contact which will ultimately determine the aspirations of the younger person. Aspiration and determination are the basic qualities that lead to higher standards. The fact that the Australian film industry has produced first-class films is inevitably an inducement to film producers to improve the quality of their work. During the period when the quality of Australian films was at the "Ocker" level in the main—

Dr. Tonkin: At what level?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The "Ocker" level. I thought at least the Leader would understand that. During that period, local film producers had very little to which to aspire. I put it to honourable members that the Premier's position on professionalism is 100 per cent correct. In any field of artistic endeavour, the highest standards will be established within the local community only if professional work can be established. In the theatre, that means the need for a fully professional company. The same applies to ballet, opera, and every other field of endeavour. Professionalism, and the business of making a particular artistic form one's profession, inevitably lead to higher standards. To suggest that in any area of endeavour this professionalism can be allowed to develop only if there are sufficient people in the community who will put a price tag on it sufficient to justify it economically is the worst form of nineteenth century obscurantism one can possibly imagine. Frankly, having read the newspaper reports of the commission's recommendations, I have come to the conclusion that artistically its members are peasants, and not twentieth century peasants, either.

Something needs to be said also about the way in which attitudes of the younger generation can be influenced. I recall seeing a performance by what was then called New Opera (a school performance of *Professor Cobalt and the Catfish that Cried*). I do not know whether any Opposition member saw that performance but, if he did and watched the youngsters and the pleasure they obtained from that performance (which was of the highest professional standard), he would have appreciated the kind of influence that artistic work for the younger generation could conceivably have in the future. Also in this connection, I mention that, while I was in Europe only a few months ago, I attended a Konzifest on a Sunday at the Lucerne Conservatorium on an occasion when various performances were being given (some were just fun performances, whereas others were aimed at the highest artistic level). Because in that community artistic achievement was recognised and applauded to the full, one of the extraordinary things apparent within that community was the willingness of people to applaud and cheer what they regarded as a worthwhile performance. It was almost as though one was at an Australian rules football match here watching the crowd respond to a high mark or to some magnificent goal. Certainly, it was a pleasure to see and it was indicative of what can be built up in the community over generations during which there is audience response to an artist because the audience is familiar with that kind of art work, and the artist, in turn, can respond to the audience.

The economist's methods of judging what should or should not be done by Government have always implied values. If an economist employed by the I.A.C., or an academic

economist or a politician such as I am judges purely in material terms, then his value judgments have no significance to the community any greater than have anyone else's value judgments. If an economist comes along and says, "I know what you must do to solve the problems of the community. You must do this, this and this," and his judgment is in purely economic terms and on material values, his recommendations are worth no more than are the recommendations of anyone else who may possess other values and who may judge matters in a different way.

After all, if we are to judge these things purely from a material point of view, we ought to consider some of the peculiarities that arise from our system of measurement of material things. We are supposed to be better off if our gross national product, in real terms, increases, but, if it increases in real terms because we have spent more and more on roads in order to stop our traffic problems from becoming worse, can we say in those circumstances that the gross national product a head is an effective measure of a better life? All manner of snags are involved in using the gross national product and the economist's measure as suitable guides on which to make judgments of policy. Whoever heard of the gross national product being used as a measure of the quality of life of people? Whoever heard its being used as a measure to determine the extent of pollution in our community? When has it ever been used to measure the degree of freedom of people or the quality of life and joy in children's play? What absolute nonsense! But this is the kind of standard the I.A.C. has used in relation to the performing arts.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Whitlam was crazy to refer it to the commission, wasn't he?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I agree. I have already said that, and I am not embarrassed to say that. I am pleased that the Leader has seen fit to move this motion, which I think the amendment improves, because the Premier is correct in drawing members' attention to the fact that it is not good enough merely to express ourselves in this forum: we need to bring our attitudes to the attention of other representatives in the Australian Parliament. Certainly, I intend to proselytise on this matter to the best of my ability and point out again and again that, if the I.A.C.'s standards are used to judge policy matters in areas such as the performing arts, make no mistake: very little of our subsidised industry will survive. If the commission's report is accepted, what possible basis can there be for continuing a fertiliser subsidy?

Dr. Tonkin: It was just an association of ideas.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I apologise, on the Leader's behalf, for his association of ideas and for his distracting other members with that point. What basis is there for making any value judgment that decentralisation should be encouraged by Government action? If one is unable to meet the economic test of viability, according to the I.A.C., one will be phased out in five years. How can we justify any endeavour of any Australian community to support any regional development? The issue involved in this matter is wider than just the performing arts, because what the I.A.C. is recommending to the Federal Government is that it use the economic measuring stick as the only determinant of the value judgments the Federal Government should make regarding assistance to industry. If that happens, if that is the way in which judgments are to be made, it is not just the performing arts that we can forget about but many industries as well, and some of the current difficulties of primary industry in relation to which farmers are looking to the Government for assistance will have no chance of standing up.

People's endeavours, if they achieve a high standard, are valuable in themselves. I have always believed in what might be called a productive ethic, which I believe applies whatever we are producing, be it a product or a service, because certain types of service are capable of being produced in our community that have an ability to last beyond one generation; they affect the standards of future generations. It is not a question of investing for the next few years. We are investing in the country's future, and there is no way that we can get any kind of measurement of the rate of return from that investment. It is purely an immeasurable and qualitative thing, and the kind of thing on which we have to make a commitment. If we cannot have a community in which people make commitments, we have a lousy community, and the sooner we can give it to someone else who may make a better job of it, the better off we will be. I support the motion and the amendment with all the vehemence and annoyance of which I am capable.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I, too, support the motion and the amendment. Perhaps we could say that the Liberal Party is not philistine in its approach to the arts, because the liberal arts have long been associated with our Party, including the muses of the dance and music that go back to Grecian times. I support the Leader's comment that it was the Whitlam Government which referred this matter to the I.A.C. and which drew the whole thing to a head. However, I agree with Government members who have said that cuts in capital funds are to be deplored. Previously, I have defended the Federal Government and have said that I hope that any cuts that have been made will be temporary and have been made in order to finance a massive deficit, and that before long we can look forward to a hand-out of goodies in many areas, and not necessarily as pre-election promises, either. I am sure that the attack on inflation by the present controls will mean that we can look forward to better times in the next 12 months.

The I.A.C. report does not do the commissioners much credit. They have placed financial values on things that are and always have been essentially aesthetic. One does not have to look far to see that the Whitlam Government considered many things. It is like the walrus and the carpenter with the shoes and ships: the shoe and ship-building industries have been the subject of complaint recently, and they were both subject to the Whitlam Government policies. Now we have many other things including the arts industry. World wide the arts have been heavily subsidised in many ways. In the United States are the Mellon trust, the Rockefeller trust, the Rothschild family trust, and the Stuyvesant company trust with its art collection and subsidy to the performing arts. In Great Britain, Russia and Italy, artistic achievements are financed by the State as well as at private levels. Wherever we go art is heavily subsidised, because it is aesthetic and we cannot place a financial value on it, as the value is as deep as people will go.

I agree with everything said by the Premier and the Minister. The costs of acquiring collections, of paying salaries of artists, of erecting buildings and now of maintaining buildings and staffing them, are matters that are well beyond the means of the average community. All these costs have escalated so rapidly in the past few years, and obviously one has to look somewhere for support for

the arts. It is up to the Federal Government to set an example to all of us. I am especially sensitive about this matter because I am from a smaller, remoter provincial area in which we heavily depend on Government support. We have a culture. I appreciated the reassurance obtained by the Leader of the Opposition from the Federal Minister that the I.A.C. report was not to be heeded, and that the Liberal Government would continue to support the arts. I hope that the present cuts in the programme are to be ephemeral. This is a clear demonstration that the Liberal Party is not philistine concerning culture.

In this State the Festival Centre, of which the Premier is justly proud, was a product of the Playford Government, the Walsh Government, the Steele Hall Government, and culminated by being completed under the Dunstan Government. There is ample evidence that in this State many Governments have been and will continue to be interested in the performing and static arts. The Premier referred to the need to support decentralisation. I submit that decentralisation of the arts is an extremely important aspect of decentralisation of industry, because without decentralisation of the arts people will not leave larger capital cities to go to an area that is a cultural desert. They will not have the cultural base diminished in any way, because they prefer to go to an area in which they can find a similar cultural base.

In the South-East we have prize-winning artists. We have had a ballet dancer whose talents were recognised recently by the Royal Ballet, and she is now in London as a student. We have had a prize-winning band performing in the Australian championship, and bringing back an award to Mount Gambier this year. We have the Mount Gambier Theatre Group which has taken prizes in many successive years in the Adelaide One-Act Play Festival. We do not have a cultural wilderness in the South-East, but we are desperately looking for a permanent home in which to house the various talents.

Another comment one may make is that a considerable amount of Australian talent in the past few years has been drained from Australia and has gone overseas. Here again, one may say that perhaps the overseas markets are what has drawn the artistry from Australia, rather than the fact that one performs better overseas, because that is where the money is. This situation highlights the need for Governments to continue financing heavily the performing arts in order to retain talents in Australia. Australian local talent has long demonstrated that it can compete with the best in the rest of the world. I support the motion and the amendment, and look forward to a continuing influx of money from the Federal Government, State Government, and local government to help the performing arts.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I thank members who have spoken for their support of the motion. The amendment moved by the Premier is not strictly necessary, but I do not object to it if he considers that it will strengthen the motion. The Premier took some time to outline the State's record in promoting the arts, and it is a record of which every South Australian can be proud. It is a matter of pride indeed that every South Australian has had something to do with the development of some part of the performing arts in this State, either directly or indirectly. It is much a matter that is above Party politics. I totally agree, as I think all members do, with the remarks of the Premier that, if the I.A.C. report is adopted, the result would be disastrous for performing arts in South Australia.

Mr. EVANS: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day: Other Business to be postponed until Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 10 be disposed of.

Motion carried.

Dr. TONKIN: I spoke in moving this motion rather less fully than I might otherwise have done because of the assurance I received earlier today that the Federal Government by its actions had already demonstrated its support for the arts and it was most unlikely to accept the I.A.C. report, which I repeat was one commissioned by the Whitlam Government. I believe the Federal Government is committed to supporting the arts and that it will continue to do so.

The Premier referred to the situation relating to the A.B.C. Regarding what has happened in relation to Australian artists performing on A.B.C. programmes, that is a matter of extreme regret and a decision with which I do not agree. The A.B.C. has been the subject of some cutbacks in administration and not so much in the performing arts field. The Premier also mentioned the activities of the Australia Arts Council and said that the board of the council had been reduced. The effect of that has been to streamline the operations of the council and it has now become more efficient. Being more efficient, it can provide a greater service to the arts. I do not think anyone can quarrel with positive measures such as that.

The Premier also said that he did not think the Federal Government was doing very well by the arts in Australia. I totally disagree with him and suggest that he look at the last Federal Budget where he will see subsequently increased grants to the arts. Whether or not the same amount of money will be available for regional centres depends entirely on the method of funding and how that money will be coming to the State. The fact is that that money will be coming to the State in General Revenue and it will be open to the State Government to spend that money on regional art centres if it so desires.

It seems to me that the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy have assumed that the I.A.C. report will be, or has been, adopted by the Federal Government. I point out the obvious: it has not been adopted by the Federal Government and I repeat that it is most unlikely to be adopted by the Federal Government. I think any doubt about the matter will be resolved shortly. The Premier and Minister are obviously criticising the I.A.C. report (with every reason), but in criticising that report they are trying to spill off that criticism to the present Federal Government. That tactic will not work. The Federal Government has a very sympathetic attitude to the arts, and I think the Minister of Mines and Energy will be proved wrong. Australia is a relatively isolated country, even with the most modern forms of transport, so it is most important that we maintain and improve our standards of performance, what the Minister has called our "professionalism". I think Governments in both the State and Federal spheres have a clear duty to support and encourage the performing arts in this country.

The State has certainly given, and will continue to give, appropriate support to the arts. A State Liberal Government would act in exactly the same way. There is no reason to think the Federal Government will not act in the same way, also. There is no indication that the I.A.C. report will be accepted and there is every indication it will not be, and I am delighted to hear that. This State Government appears to be suspicious of the Federal Government on principle. In the circumstances, I repeat that I do not believe the second part of this motion that one "should not accept the recommendations of the

recently announced I.A.C. report" is strictly necessary, but obviously it must stay there. I do not believe the amendment is necessary. Although I have not been provided with a copy of it, I understand it relates to notifying South Australian Senators to take action. I do not think that that is necessary, but I do not mind it because, if it strengthens the motion, fair enough.

I suspect the position will be clarified before any action can be taken by the Senators from South Australia, or anyone else. One cannot judge the value of the performing arts by commercial standards and cold, financial viability. Basically, that is where the I.A.C. report has gone dreadfully wrong. I am quite certain that this Federal Government, not the one that commissioned the report, is well aware of this principle, and I am certain its actions will be dictated by its absolute commitment to the performing arts in Australia.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS BILL

(Continued from September 15. Page 1036.)

The SPEAKER: Since the Legal Practitioners Bill, introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, was last before the House I have closely examined whether or not it complies with Standing Orders and the Constitution Act as to whether or not it is capable of being introduced by a private member. Standing Order 286 provides, in effect, that money Bills shall be introduced only by a Minister of the Crown, thus enshrining the ancient Parliamentary principle that the financial initiative rests with the Crown. Section 60 of the Constitution Act provides, *inter alia*:

(3) . . . a Bill, or a clause of a Bill, shall be taken to deal with taxation if it provides for the imposition, repeal, remission, alteration, or regulation of taxation . . .

The definition of "money Bill" is as follows:

"money Bill" means a Bill for appropriating revenue or other public money, or for dealing with taxation, or for raising or guaranteeing any loan, or for providing for the repayment of any loan:

The definition of "money clause" is as follows:

"money clause" means a clause of a Bill, which clause appropriates revenue or other public money, or deals with taxation, or provides for raising or guaranteeing any loan or for the repayment of any loan:

Clause 65 of the Legal Practitioners Bill provides:

No stamp duty shall be chargeable upon any receipt, cheque or other instrument for or relating to the transfer of moneys between any of the following:

(*a*) the combined trust account;
(*b*) the statutory interest account;
(*c*) the legal assistance fund;
(*d*) the guarantee fund.

This clause clearly deals with remission of a tax, namely stamp duty, and is therefore a money clause, making the Bill a money Bill as defined by the Constitution Act and, as such, should be introduced by a Minister and recommended by a message from the Governor. Clause 76 also falls into this category as it also deals with exemption from stamp duty. In view of the foregoing and loath as I am to restrict the right of private members to introduce Bills or motions for discussion in this House, I, as Speaker, must uphold Standing Orders and the Constitution as they exist and, accordingly, I rule that the Legal Practitioners Bill introduced by the honourable Leader of the Opposition is out of order and may not be proceeded with any further.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I ask why you chose to deal with the matter at this stage and not when the Legal Practitioners Bill was called on? I ask this because this is the first I have heard about any such move. I am not in any way suggesting you are wrong in ruling as you have done. I think it would have been courteous if perhaps the Government, if it had picked this up, had let me know about it. I think it might have been courteous for me to be informed about the matter beforehand, anyway. If the matter had been drawn to my attention and the Bill had been called on in the usual way, I understand it would have been competent for me to give notice to the House that the clauses which, I agree, under that strict interpretation come under this ruling, could have been withdrawn and that would not have made much difference to the Bill. It is important when dealing with matters of this kind that we follow the normal Orders of the Day in the order set down, and they can be dealt with as they arise. This has taken me completely by surprise. With respect, it has been less than courteous, and it has placed me in a difficult position.

The SPEAKER: This has nothing whatever to do with the Government; it is my own decision. I became aware of this after the Bill was on the Notice Paper and I decided that, when it came up in due course, as I believed it would, I would rule accordingly. However, it seemed evident to me that, as it was getting pushed back further and further on the Notice Paper, it would not come up. Therefore, rather than have it simply removed from the paper, when it could have been said that I was not aware of it, I decided at this time to have it removed from the paper and to give my reason why so that it cannot be held against me later.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a further point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the matter had been called on and you had ruled on it when it was before the House, could I have sought leave of the House to withdraw those clauses?

The SPEAKER: No. There is nothing wrong with the Bill; it is a matter of the introduction of the Bill. As I explained, if a Minister of the Crown were to introduce it or if it came as a message from the Governor, it would be in order. I have dealt with the method by which it was introduced into the House.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1039.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): So that the member for Davenport will not have a heart attack as he did a few weeks ago I will speak to the Bill today. I think his conduct was abhorrent on that occasion, running around the House screaming his head off. That is not abnormal conduct for him: that is the way he carries on most of the time.

Mr. Gunn: What about you and the way you have carried on?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Minister to speak to the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am speaking to the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why weren't you ready to debate the Bill three weeks ago?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will I be given the opportunity to speak to the Bill or will I be interrupted as usual by the member for Eyre? The only reason he gets elected is that he interrupts the Minister of Labour and Industry. There could be no other reason. I wish to

make nine points regarding this proposed legislation. First, it is a farce; it is an attempt to pre-empt the Government. If the Opposition is sincere with regard to the Workmen's Compensation Act in this State, why does it not wait until the Government has introduced its Bill and then move amendments?

Mr. Dean Brown: The last time the Government introduced a Bill—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport will have an opportunity to speak later. I do not want this debate to become a private slanging match, and I am warning all honourable members at this stage that I will not let it develop in that way.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I hope I am not rudely interrupted again by the rude member for Davenport. Again, I ask why the Opposition did not wait until a Government Bill was introduced and then move amendments accordingly. I repeat that this legislation is a farce; it is an attempt to pre-empt Government legislation. On February 16, 1976, I gave the following press release:

The Minister of Labour and Industry, Mr. Jack Wright, has decided not to proceed with the Workmen's Compensation Amendment Bill during the current session of Parliament.

Mr. Gunn: Did you get instructions from the Trades and Labor Council?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the member for Eyre be allowed to carry on like this? Is that conduct to be allowed during my speech? It is his normal—

Mr. Coumbe: Knock off.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Even the member for Torrens is telling him to knock off. His Leader ought to put him under control.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Gunn: Speak to the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Eyre is not a bad sort of a bloke outside the House but something seems to happen to that man when he comes into the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot see anything about the honourable member in the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It would be best if he kept his head out of it, too. The press release continued:

Mr. Wright introduced the Bill last week and it was scheduled for debate today. Mr. Wright said that since the introduction of the Bill last week it has become apparent to the Government from statements made by Opposition spokesmen and some industry sources that they see no value in the proposed amendments dealing with the rate of weekly compensation payments.

I was referring to the criticism directed at the Government legislation in February this year. The press release continued:

In particular the Chairman of the Industrial Development Advisory Council, Mr. E. W. Schroder, an advisory body to the Premier, has indicated that his council can see no advantage to industry in the proposed amendments.

That is why we did not proceed with the Bill in February. The Government had a lot of confidence in Mr. Schroder as Chairman of that committee, and he had indicated to the Premier that there was no advantage in the proposed legislation concerning weekly payments. If that committee was to act as an advisory committee to the Premier, I think we had a responsibility at that stage to take notice of the Chairman of the committee. The press release continued:

"As the intention of the Bill was to provide some relief to employers by ensuring that an injured workman did not receive more while on compensation than he would have done if he had continued in employment, the Government is surprised by this response. However, in view of the attitude of industry, which had requested that some amendments be made, the Government has decided not to proceed with the Bill this session," he said. When introducing the Bill into Parliament Mr. Wright indicated his intention of seeking comments from interested parties on certain proposals concerning insurance arrangements with a view to introducing legislation later this year. Those proposals have since been circulated.

The member for Davenport would well know that they have been circulated. It is all right for him to have a snide look on his face, but I am sure he would have been in touch with industry or industry would have contacted him, and he would be fully cognisant of the situation that all these matters have been circulated to people throughout industry. The press release continues:

"The deferral of the Bill will enable comments to be also made on matters contained in the Bill", he said. Mr. Wright said one of the Opposition's proposals is that the weekly payments while a worker is incapacitated should be reduced to 85 per cent of average weekly earnings.

When the press release was issued I also stated:

The Government is firmly committed to ensure that a workman who is injured at work should not be disadvantaged while he is incapacitated.

That press release is a clear indication of the Government's policy. I have no doubt that the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw was well aware of my press release. I also have no doubt that the member for Davenport is well aware of it.

Mr. Dean Brown: Can we have a copy of it?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member can have my personal copy. That is, if he has not picked it up from somewhere else, because he has picked up most other things I have said and done around the State. In fact, he has picked up things I have not said and done, and has blamed me for things that I have not done around the State. However, he has given me no credit for what I have done in South Australia. I have never seen anyone who can create as much fantasy as that created by the member for Davenport, but that is another matter.

The second point I wish to put is that the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, in his speech in another place, said that there was an urgent need to amend some of the provisions of the Bill. The Government has never deterred from that need: it has never backed away. The Government introduced legislation in February this year that it hoped would solve the problems that had arisen, but it was withdrawn because industry had indicated that it was not satisfied with the legislation. It was only industry, no-one else, that complained that no relief was being given by this measure. The Government's intention regarding this legislation has never changed.

Mr. Dean Brown: We still haven't seen the legislation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Cabinet has already ratified the new legislation.

Mr. Dean Brown: But Caucus is the stumbling block.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Caucus, too, has ratified the legislation as, too, have my committees. I may make mistakes, but I do not deliberately tell lies in the House. From time to time everyone makes mistakes in the House, irrespective of the side on which they sit. The legislation is now in the hands of the Parliamentary Counsel. That may be a tremendous surprise to the member for Davenport: in fact, he seems quite disappointed about it.

Mr. Dean Brown: I knew it was on the way.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Then why did the honourable member interject about Caucus?

Mr. Dean Brown: I knew it was on the way. He said 18 months.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have not been a Minister for 18 months, and I gave no pledge that I would alter the Workmen's Compensation Act when I became a Minister.

I did not make a pledge until late last year or early this year that I would examine and amend certain aspects of the Act.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Premier made a promise about it at the last election.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Of course he did, but that was only last June, which is not 18 months ago. It seems that not only can the honourable member not speak or conduct himself properly but also he cannot count. I have already stated that the legislation will be introduced: it will be introduced within the next two weeks. The fifth point I wish to make is that there was no intention to abandon the legislation. In fact, on February 12 I wrote to all sections of employers, insurers and unions requesting comments and suggested amendments to the insurance arrangements. On February 18 I also requested comments about the Bill.

I am pleased to say that the response to my letters and to the suggestions regarding the legislation that had been referred to in the House has been beyond my expectation. People from all parts of industry, trade unions, employers, lawyers, doctors—people from all walks of life—have shown an interest in this humane subject. The difference between the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal Party is that the latter sees this measure not as being humane but only as a political weapon with which to get at the Government. That is the only reason why this legislation has been introduced. I will not today, but I will certainly, during my second reading speech, refer to a conference I had with the Rev. Alan Scott. I hope that someone from the political wilderness opposite will take notice of—

Mr. COUMBE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Minister has displayed a document and, under Standing Orders, I ask him to table it.

The SPEAKER: I am not familiar with the document. Is it an official document? Is the Minister quoting from the document?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have not quoted from the document. I said that on this occasion I would not refer to the document but that I would, during my second reading speech, refer to it.

The SPEAKER: There is no need for the Minister to table the document if he is not quoting from it.

Mr. COUMBE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Minister was displaying the document and, as such, even though he did not quote from it, I believe it should be tabled. Standing Orders provide that if a newspaper or other document is displayed a member can ask that the document be tabled, which I so do.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. It could be a blank piece of paper or any piece of paper.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is a very good point, but I give the member for Torrens a guarantee that he will not have to wait long to see the document, because I am willing to table it within the next week or so.

Dr. Eastick: Is the Rev. Scott the industrial chaplain?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes. It is an interesting interview.

Mr. Dean Brown: He came to see me, too.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am pleased that he came to see the honourable member. I would be pleased if he spoke to everyone, because he is extremely intellectual and understands the problem with which we are dealing. I was dealing with the correspondence that was sent out to various organisations in the State. The many submissions received in response to my letters have taken much time to analyse. It has taken some months to prepare and set in order what we consider is now a proper Bill. I have given a guarantee to the House, a guarantee which I have given in public previously, that the Workmen's Compensation Act will be amended. It may not be amended in line with what members opposite wish nor has it any parallel with amendments moved by the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw in another place, although in fact, the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw stole from me many aspects of that legislation. That is well known. It is futile even to consider debating the question further. I have given the House an assurance that, within the next couple of weeks, the legislation will be prepared and introduced into the House. It may even happen next week, but, so that I am not put in a position of being accused by the member for Davenport of not fulfilling my obligations, I will say not that it will be introduced next week but that it will be introduced within the next two weeks. I give that guarantee. The other relevant point is that in the Legislative Council, when the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw introduced this legislation, there was no debate other than that by the Hon. Mr. Sumner.

Mr. Coumbe: No opposition.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There was no opposition at all, no debate; it was treated with scorn. It came here, and my Government is treating it in exactly the same way. That is all it is worth.

Mr. WELLS moved:

That the debate be adjourned.

Mr. COUMBE: Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER: I called the honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS moved:

That the debate be adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells (teller), Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan, Broomhill, and Jennings. Noes—Messrs. Nankivell, Becker, and Wotton.

The SPEAKER: There are 20 Ayes and 20 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the adjourned debate be made an order of the day for—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On motion.

The House divided on the question:

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

Noes (20)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne (teller), Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Nankivell, Becker, and Wotton. Noes—Messrs. Duncan, Broomhill, and Jennings.

The SPEAKER: There are 20 Ayes and 20 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes.

Question thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: Order! That the adjourned debate be made an order of the day for—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Wednesday next.

Motion carried.

MEDIBANK STRIKE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Dean Brown:

That this House urge the State Government to supply free legal assistance to any person who has received notice of a fine by or expulsion from a union, or the threat therof, for working during the Medibank strike on Monday, July 12, 1976.

(Continued from October 6. Page 1329.)

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I oppose the motion. In moving it, the member for Davenport appealed to all union officials and executives to withdraw the threat of fines for industrial action against persons who worked during the Medibank strike on July 12. The mover said that, if this appeal was accepted, there would be no need for this motion. However, he proceeded with it. I wonder whether he wants to withdraw his motion before we proceed any further, because I am not aware of any unionist who is still being threatened with a fine or expulsion.

Mr. Dean Brown: I know of three unions that have imposed fines.

Mr. ABBOTT: I imagine that the honourable member would have such information. He will say that he knows of unionists who have been threatened in this manner, because he is a union basher. If any other Opposition member had moved the motion, he could easily be excused, because of the lack of knowledge of industrial affairs and the lack of understanding of the provisions of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act exhibited by members opposite is well known. In my opinion, the mover is out to mislead the House deliberately, because, as shadow Minister of Labour and Industry, he is perfectly aware of the full legal remedies unionists can take, at no expense to themselves, under the Commonwealth Act.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about the State Act?

Mr. ABBOTT: If the law or the rules are being broken by any union, under section 141 of the Act the court may, upon a complaint by any member of an organisation and after giving any person against whom an order is sought an opportunity of being heard, make an order giving directions for the performance or observance of any of the rules of an organisation by any person who is under an obligation to perform or observe those rules. Further, a person shall not fail to comply with a direction or order of the court under that section. A penalty of $400 is imposed. As the mover asked about the State Act, for his information I point out that most trade unions in South Australia are registered federally as well as in the State, and the Commonwealth Act applies to all those members who work under Federal awards.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about those under State awards?

Mr. ABBOTT: I thought I had just answered that question. If the honourable member could not understand what I said, I shall be pleased to discuss it with him outside the Chamber.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You answered it very well.

Mr. ABBOTT: The member for Davenport knows that financial assistance is available to unionists in proceedings under section 141A of the Commonwealth Act, and in respect of certain respondents on account of hardship under section 141B. So that members will know what section 141A provides, I will quote it for their benefit, as follows:

141A. (1) In this section, unless the contrary intention appears—

"proceedings" means proceedings instituted, whether before or after the commencement of this section, under either of the last two preceding sections;

"the applicant", in relation to proceedings, includes the complainant in proceedings under the last preceding section.

(2) Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, where a rule has been granted in proceedings by the court or a judge calling upon a person or organisation to show cause why an order should not be made under either of the last two preceding sections in relation to that person or organisation, the applicant in the proceedings may apply to the Attorney-General for financial assistance by the Commonwealth in respect of the costs or expenses that the applicant has paid, has become liable to pay or may become liable to pay in connexion with the proceedings.

(3) Where an application is so made and the Attorney-General is satisfied that it is likely that hardship would be caused to the applicant if assistance were not given by the Commonwealth in respect of the costs or expenses that he has paid, has become liable to pay or may become liable to pay in connexion with the proceedings, the Attorney-General may, subject to the next succeeding sub-section, authorise payment by the Commonwealth to or on behalf of the applicant of such amount as is, or such amounts as are from time to time, determined—

(*a*) by the Attorney-General; or

(*b*) in accordance with a direction given, or directions from time to time given, by the Attorney-General,

in respect of those costs or expenses.

(4) The Attorney-General may refuse an application under this section in respect of proceedings if he is satisfied that—

(*a*) the order sought in the proceedings is the same or substantially the same as an order obtained or sought in other relevant proceedings and the proceedings involve the determination of the same or substantially the same questions of fact or law or mixed fact and law as were or are involved in the determination of the other proceedings; or

(*b*) it would be contrary to the interests of justice to grant financial assistance to the applicant in connexion with the proceedings.

(5) For the purpose of the last preceding subsection, "other relevant proceedings" means proceedings that—

(*a*) were instituted before the proceedings in respect of which the application under this section was made; and

(*b*) have been heard and determined by, or are pending before, the court.

(6) Nothing in this section authorises a payment in respect of fees of more than one counsel appearing for the applicant in proceedings unless two or more counsel appeared, or are to appear, for another party to, or an intervener in, the proceedings.

(7) The Attorney-General may authorise under this section payment to be made by the Commonwealth in respect of proceedings either before or after the proceedings have been heard and determined by the court, but shall not authorise payment by the Commonwealth in respect of proceedings that were heard and determined by the court before April 24, 1972.

It is extremely difficult to understand why the member for Davenport wants this House to urge the State Government to supply free legal assistance when he knows of these provisions. He stated that his advice to individuals who had received letters imposing fines on them or threatening fines (and there were not any) was to ignore the action of the union, as the law was on their side. The honourable member admits that the law exists and that there is

a remedy, but he wants the State Government to supply free legal assistance. The honourable member is deliberately misleading the House, because when moving his motion on September 22 he stated:

The Labor Government paid the fines and costs of Mr. Jim Dunford and his union during the Kangaroo Island dispute, when the law was broken by Mr. Dunford and that union. The Premier defended Mr. Dunford and paid his court costs and fines.

For the honourable member's information (and I suppose he has been told this many times), the State Government did not pay Mr. Dunford's costs and fines. First, Mr. Dunford was not fined: there was not an award of damages against him. It was purely a civil matter heard before Mr. Justice Wells in the Supreme Court, and Mr. Dunford paid his own costs, which were more than $5 000. What the Government did pay were the costs incurred by the Kangaroo Island farmer who took Mr. Dunford to court.

Dr. Eastick: Whom were those costs given against? Who in law was required to pay that money?

Mr. ABBOTT: The honourable member is aware of whom the costs were awarded against, and I do not have to reply to that question. The governing body of most trade unions is the Federal Council, and the functions of that council are to administer the rules of the federation or association for the general benefit of its members, and also to try to carry out the objects of the organisation. The council and executives, whether State or Federal, must and do have a certain amount of power. Provided the proper procedure is followed, most rules give the managing committees the power to deal with such matters as unfinancial members and the recovery of dues, etc. The rules give the committees the power to impose fines for an offence against any member who violates any rule; who works in contravention of any award, order or agreement; for giving misleading information to an officer of a union; for refusing to give information to any officer of a union in regard to union business or matters; for members who make any untrue statement where such statement is likely to injure the union or the reputation of any member; and for distributing in any way or posting in any place any report of the business of a union or branch, unless such report has been issued by and with the authority of the Federal Council or of the committee of management and is authenticated by the seal of the organisation.

Those rules are registered with the State and Federal Industrial Registrars, and I am certain that everyone is aware that, if a rule is contrary to or conflicts in any way with the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, there is no way that it can be registered. It is important for unions to have those powers, because without them there would be utter chaos and, whilst that would probably suit Opposition members concerning trade unions, they will find that every organisation's rules and constitution that cover membership have similar disciplinary rules of control. I am convinced that the member for Davenport is trying to stir up industrial trouble, so that he can later claim that South Australia has a poor industrial record. It hurts Opposition members that South Australia has the best industrial record of any State, and it would please them immensely if they could reverse that situation. I challenge the member for Davenport, and ask him whether he will agree to union executives having the power to fine members who go on strike against the direction of the executive. This is often the case, and it cuts both ways.

Mr. Dean Brown: You call this a challenge?

Mr. ABBOTT: If the honourable member is so busy reading the *News* and not listening to what is being said, he can follow the challenge in *Hansard*. According to the member for Torrens the motion contains two major points: the first referring to the opportunity for legal assistance to be given if so desired and, secondly, the point he emphasised, that the motion does not interfere in any way with the internal affairs and workings of any trade union. I think I have made clear on the first point that full legal remedies are already available, and on the second point, if the member for Torrens would like to lead a trade union without the disciplinary rules and measures to which I have referred, he is welcome to do so. The action of the A.C.T.U. and the Trades and Labor Council on July 12 was perfectly justified.

The condemnation comes from those who see their vested interests challenged by community involvement in society's decision-making processes and who see their sacred right to rule and decide what is best for the community undermined by a more enlightened community stirred into action. Trade unions have a legitimate right to defend the workers and their families against poor wages and conditions, and when unions take action on political or social issues they are acting in the best interests of the majority. We need only consider the trade union involvement in the Vietnam war.

The Fraser Government made pre-election promises to support Medibank, but these promises have been shattered. The trade union action against the destruction of Medibank is both political and industrial in character, and is an attack on a politically dishonest Government, which is trying to produce a two-class system of health care. It was a defence of the wage standards of workers, because the Federal Government is taking up to $8 and more a week from workers' pay packets, an amount they can ill afford. That is why the A.C.T.U. and the Trades and Labor Council took the action they took on July 12. I will quote a decision of the special conference of affiliated trade unions held on July 5 and 6, 1976, in Sydney. This conference of Federal unions was held under the auspices of the A.C.T.U., and the decision of that conference was as follows:

The A.C.T.U. is confronted with a Federal Government that has broken promise after promise made to the Australian people. No broken promise is more significant in terms of an attack upon an accepted concept vital to the welfare of those people than the Government's abandonment of a fair and equitable Medibank scheme. With an acute sense of our responsibility not only to our direct membership but to the people as a whole, we have attempted rationally and objectively to discuss and negotiate this issue with the Government. In those discussions there has been no denial from Government that the proposals of the A.C.T.U. would provide a more equitable and more efficient scheme of medical and hospital insurance. We know that such insurance can never, anywhere, be provided free of cost. The questions are: what is the fairest way of funding such a scheme, how can its operation be made most efficient, and whose interests should be paramount in coming to decisions on these matters?

There is no room for doubt on what are the correct answers to these questions, nor that the Fraser Government has deliberately chosen to give the wrong answers. First, the funding of the scheme should be on the basis that the burden should be distributed progressively in terms of relative capacity to pay. The Government's scheme means that in relative terms the high income person will pay less for standard medical and hospital cover than the lower and middle income earner, and in absolute terms would pay less for additional hospital cover. Secondly, a levy without ceiling, without the provision for opting out, means simple, efficient and universal coverage. The Government's proposed scheme will be cumbersome and will run directly counter to its alleged concern for efficiency in administration. Thirdly, the interests of the ordinary people should be paramount. On the Government's own admission, the proposed scheme is concerned to give the A.M.A. what it wants.

The 2·5 per cent levy has been set to serve the interests of doctors at the expense of low and middle income earners.

A lower levy would involve higher disposable income for wage and salary earners and meet the original objective of imposing a levy. The Government has no mandate from the people for its proposals. The opposite is the case. It has deliberately decided to reject the processes of negotiation. It has slammed the door on those processes. In these circumstances we recommend that affiliated unions should call upon members to cease work for 24 hours from midnight on Sunday, July 11. We ask State Branches of the A.C.T.U., in conjunction with the affiliated unions, to organise those exemptions which are necessary to maintain services which are essential for public safety and health. We request the A.C.T.U. Executive and officers to continue the organisation of the campaign against the Government's Medibank proposals, including the use of pamphlets and the media. This campaign shall be under the direction of the A.C.T.U. and its State branches. Affiliated unions are required to use their resources within and in support of this campaign.

That decision was adopted overwhelmingly by the South Australian Branch of the Trades and Labor Council. I have several other resolutions that have been passed from time to time by the A.C.T.U., the South Australian trade unions, and the Trades and Labor Council, but I will not read them now. I am certain that the Government has no intention of supplying free legal assistance in these circumstances, particularly when it is available to trade unionists under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, the relevant section of which I have quoted. Therefore, I oppose the motion.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): In my estimation and belief the word "free" as contained in this motion is used in the literal sense that the assistance is free to the person who will receive the benefit. Obviously, the provision of legal assistance can never be totally free, and I think that point needs to be clearly understood. I am firmly convinced that many people in the community have been intimidated and fear the loss of their employment and the possible consequences of union activity as a result of their having worked legally and legitimately on the day of the so-called Medibank strike. This intimidation has to be viewed in several ways.

It must be recognised that many of the people involved are aged persons and the very fact of being called to task in the manner they have been is a problem to them, causing them duress. I have before me a ccopy of a letter sent by the Australian Workers Union to a gentleman aged 62 years. I know from his family that he was upset to the point of losing sleep over some nights because of the tenor of this letter. The letter states:

I have been informed that you failed to observe a decision made by the Executive Council of the Australian Workers Union on July 7, 1976, of which I enclose a copy together with a further instruction which was circulated to all reps. on that date and received by them no later than July 9, 1976, also objects of the Australian Workers Union as set out in constitution and general rule. I am enclosing a copy of rule 10 of the constitution and general rule and rule 16 of the constitution and general rules of the Australian Workers Union and, in your failure to observe the decision of Executive Council, you are in breach of rule 10 and, therefore, are subject to the penalty as set out in rule 16.

So much for the comment from the Minister of Labour and Industry a short time ago that there had been no penalties incurred by these people. That is a threat to a person that can be read in one way and one way only. I will refer to another more direct case in a moment. The letter continues:

You are advised that your failure to answer the charge made against you, in writing, within 21 days, will result in the matter being referred to the Branch Executive for a penalty to be imposed. The maximum fine for this offence is $40.

These are not my words, but the words contained in this letter from the Australian Workers Union, signed by Alan S. Begg, Branch Secretary, and dated August 19, 1976. The letter continues:

Further, you may request to appear before the Branch Executive to state your case at a date to be set.

Mr. Evans: He's being fined $40 for obeying the law?

Dr. EASTICK: The sum of $40 for undertaking a legitimate work pattern.

Mr. Abbott: That is $40 maximum.

Dr. EASTICK: If it was one cent—

Mr. Abbott: It might only be a warning.

Dr. EASTICK: We will come to that in a moment. If it was 1c, it would be against the best interests of the community; it is certainly against the best interests of the trade union movement (as it has learnt to its regret since that date). It was out on its own, and it is quite obvious that the people of Australia will not accept that sort of domineering, dogmatic approach from the trade union movement and they have said so in so many words; they have said it with the numbers that turned up for work on that occasion. Certainly, many people wanted to work but, out of respect for the company that employed them, did not turn up for work because of the fear of the consequences to their company, which had been threatened in all sorts of ways as to what would happen to it and its supplies if it opened its doors to its workers. I have here a list of rules which, under "Objects", states:

To promote the general and material welfare of the members.

I would have thought one of the first prerequisites of fulfilling that objective would be to ensure that the person was happy in his employment and not under duress which must affect his productivity, as it would affect his mental health, or indeed his physical health. Members opposite will know that actions of the union hierarchy had this serious effect on many workers in the community. Object 3 (*e*) states:

To endeavour by political action to secure social justice.

I am not opposed to that objective, which is proper. Members will recall that last week I said that I believed in a strong union movement. I object to the manner in which some unions conduct themselves when trying to assist workers. The way they have behaved lately does not assist workers, because the unions have often acted against the best interests of the workers and of Australia. These rules include reference to the duties of a member. I wonder how many workers in how many unions have received a book of rules outlining the requirements of the union, their requirements and all other matters pertaining to union membership.

Mr. Olson: They are there for those who ask for them.

Dr. EASTICK: I contend that a person, having been signed up as a member of a union, should be handed a copy of the rules and regulations of that union so that he knows what he can expect.

Mr. Olson: As many as want to ask for them receive a copy.

Dr. EASTICK: They should not have to ask for one; it should be handed to them as a right. Many unions fail to make available even at the place of employment, let alone to the individual member, a copy of the union rule book. Copies are not available in libraries, and occasionally they have not been available in the union office. Rule 10 (*a*) states:

Every member shall observe, abide by and carry out each of the rules of the union applicable to him whether as a member or as an officer.

If he has not received a copy of the rule book, how can he possibly fulfil the first requirement of his duties?

Mr. Olson: Every shop steward has a copy of the rule book; they only have to walk five metres.

Dr. EASTICK: Not every member of a union is a shop steward. It is the right of every individual to have a copy. Rule 10 continues:

(*b*) A member shall not knowingly fail to observe any resolution of the Convention, Executive Council, Branch Executive, or the Management Committee of the Mining Division of the Westralian Branch.

(*c*) Every member, after having been reasonably requested to do so, shall give any information of which he is aware as to any industrial matter which is the concern of the union, to the Convention, Executive Council, or a Branch Executive who makes such request (or to any person who is authorised to that end by any of the said bodies).

(*d*) A member shall not obstruct, interfere with or delay any officer in the execution of his duties or any of the Convention, Executive Council, Branch Executive, or other body of the union in the performance of any of its functions.

(*e*) A member shall not act in any disorderly, offensive or disruptive manner at any meeting in the union.

I think a few union members, shop stewards and union representatives who attend meetings at Trades Hall should read and reread that provision. That would overcome some of the thump activities that happen on South Terrace.

Mr. Olson: What sort of activities?

Dr. EASTICK: Thump, punch-up activities. The honourable member can read the *Advertiser* to get the details he requires on that situation. He has seen television reports of what has happened in other States. Rule 10 (*f*) states:

Any officer who has become aware of or believes that any grave breach of the rules has occurred or that there has been grave abuse of trust or authority by any officer or that any officer has acted in grave breach of the rules, shall immediately inform the General Secretary in writing of the facts and circumstances known to the officer concerning such matter.

Even the Federal General Secretary has not fulfilled his obligation to his union members in many instances in relation to that requirement, as I pointed out last week. Rule 10 continues:

(*g*) A member shall not allow his union ticket or any part thereof to pass out of his possession except when the same is required by an auditor or an officer or other person who requires it for some proper purpose under the rules or other lawful reason.

(*h*) A member shall not aid or encourage any member in doing or omitting to do anything contrary to this rule.

The hierarchy could well have considered that rule during the Medibank strike. Rule 10 (*i*) states:

A member who commits any breach of this rule shall be deemed guilty of misconduct.

In other words, the 62-year-old gentleman to whom I referred was charged with a misconduct which was not, in any stretch of the imagination, a misconduct. He was working legitimately on the occasion of an illegitimate strike, and therefore the charge against him of having undertaken a misconduct is obviously against the interests of natural justice. Misconduct is defined in the rules. Fortunately, that gentleman wrote to the union and at Friday last week he had heard no more about the matter. Another constituent of mine received the following letter dated August 16, 1976, from Mr. J. L. Scott, State Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union:

The State Council have instructed that you be summonsed to attend a special meeting of State Council to be held on Tuesday, September 7, 1976, at 5.30 p.m. at 264 Halifax Street, Adelaide, to answer a complaint made against you, in that you failed to stop work during the National Stoppage on July 12, 1976. State Council, acting under rule 38, Complaints and Appeals, advise you of your position. You may submit a rebuttal of the complaint and may bring members as your witnesses.

I am to advise that the complaints made against you will be dealt with by State Council on Tuesday, September 7, 1976, and should you be unable to attend you may submit a written rebuttal and name any witnesses. Failure to attend or submit a written rebuttal will not stop the State Council determining the matter unless you are unable to attend through sickness or other good reasons, the same to be satisfactorily proven. Please find enclosed: complaint, copy of relevant rule, return stamped envelope should you require it.

This person took the opportunity of replying to the union in the following terms:

In reply to your letter dated August 16, 1976, requiring me to attend a special meeting on Tuesday, September 7, 1976, to answer the complaint against me, I will be unable to attend owing to the fact that it is my annual leave and plans were made, so I will be on holidays in Whyalla at the time. Due to financial difficulties at the time I was unable to have the day off.

How many people legitimately went to work because of financial difficulties that meant that they could not afford to have the day off? Now they are having further financial difficulties placed on them. What reply did this person receive from the union? In a letter dated September 10 (three days after the meeting of the State Council) it was stated:

The State council of the A.M.W.U. in South Australia received your correspondence at its meeting held September 7, 1976. The content of your reply was discussed, and State council determined that, in view of the fact that you did not rebut the complaint made against you, State Council determined that you be fined $15. I would advise that the rules provide that such fines must be paid within 14 weeks.

Mr. Dean Brown: Didn't the Minister just say that no-one has had a fine place on him?

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister was in fantasy land. He certainly did not have his feet on the ground and he certainly has been debunked by this reply and by other replies that I know members could bring to his attention.

Mr. Dean Brown: The member for Spence said the same thing: no fines had been imposed.

Dr. EASTICK: The member for Spence said that the Government had paid money for Mr. Dunford, but he did not wish to outline why the Government had paid that money. The member for Spence wanted to leave that matter in limbo. He suggested that Mr. Dunford had paid his own costs and was not in error and that he, or the union to which he belonged, was therefore not duty bound to pay the $11 000-odd. However, members will have the opportunity of reading about that in *Hansard* tomorrow. The letter continues:

I would further point out that there is provision for appeal where a member is not satisfied with a decision.

Mr. Keneally: That's perfectly democratic.

Dr. EASTICK: This person was asked to attend from a country district at 5.30 p.m. He was required to leave his place of employment early to attend the original hearing, let alone a subsequent appeal. The letter continues:

It may be of interest to you to know that other members dealt with on similar complaints agreed to accept the decision of State Council.

People who elected to abide by the decision of State Council were intimidated into paying out money that they were not legitimately required to pay. That money was taken from them on a false premise.

Mr. Olson: Rubbish!

Dr. EASTICK: It is not rubbish. It was clearly shown not to be a legitimate strike, so they were at work legitimately. Taking any money from them by way of

a fine of this nature was taking funds from them illegally. The State has a duty to these people to assist them with legal aid. I have made the point about how I view the word "free" in this context. I believe every member in the House should support the motion. The confusion that exists in the minds of members of the community is nothing compared to the confusion that exists in the minds of members of the A.M.W.U. Shop stewards came to see me because they were concerned about the amount of "bumf" (the term they used) that was being given to them almost daily by the union.

Mr. Keneally: Shop stewards came to see you?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, because many shop stewards are becoming more and more concerned about the lack of interest and concern being shown by members opposite for their genuine wellbeing. They are coming to people from whom they know they will get assistance and advice.

Mr. Keneally: I'm sorry, I thought you said that they came to you.

Dr. EASTICK: I lay claim to being a person who gives assistance. Without going into much detail, I believe that the special supplement, which was sent out by the A.M.W.U., headed "Why the A.M.W.U. reversed its decision for a national strike in defence of Medibank on June 30" indicates the tremendous sum of workers' money that has been dissipated unwisely against the best interests of workers. The supplement states:

Because it was believed that this could result in the A.M.W.U. being forced to "go it alone", the matter was resubmitted to conference, Saturday 26, and the resolution set out was carried.

The A.M.W.U. and its hierarchy, in the organisational sense, have isolated themselves from many people in the community, not the least of whom are their own workers. I believe quite sincerely that workers have already begun to show their concern and that they will take an opportunity through the ballot-boxes at the next possible opportunity action that will advance and assist the people of Australia. I support them in every way, and I certainly support them in the provision of these funds.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I have always believed that Wednesday afternoon in this House was private members' day. I can honestly say that, in the past month or so, I have renamed it "union bashing day". The member for Davenport would be the main ham actor in that union bashing. I have just heard a speech which, for a while, I must confess I thought was about the interests of the working class. I was moved by what the member for Light said. Suddenly, however, I woke up. It is a terrible pity that members such as the member for Light, the member for Rocky River, the member for Davenport, the member for Eyre, and a few others talk so much about the under-dog that they are not out blaming the Federal Government about its decision to fleece $8 a week from the little man's wage packet. Why were they not doing that if they were so interested in the plight of the little man? The member for Light said that people were coming to him for assistance. I take it that those people did not have lame dogs or broken-down horses, but that they were coming to him for assistance. God help them!

Mr. Venning: Talk a bit of common sense.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am quite serious in making that statement. In the message he was trying to get to us this afternoon, the member for Light said in his opening remarks that the only point he had in opposition to this dynamic motion of the member for Davenport was that the word "free" should be taken out.

Dr. Eastick: That's not correct.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is the only constructive criticism he had to make. I do not know what we are talking about—

Mr. Venning: I know you don't.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I said "we"; the member for Rocky River never knows what he is talking about. This motion is so much hogwash; it is so ill-informed that it is not funny. As the member for Torrens would know very well, there already exists in the arbitration system provision for free legal advice. The member for Light said that workers have lived in fear of reprisals by the trade union movement. I have never seen a worker in Whyalla who has lived in fear of me. They are living with a situation of reprisal by the Federal Government with the $8 a week I have mentioned, and I wonder whether there is some fear in that. The member for Light read out the rules of the Australian Workers Union. All I can say is that he is a slashing reader. The rules are registered with the Arbitration Commission. Every Government member is aware of the rules; we have probably acted within the rules of unions so many times that we have lost count.

He also read from some correspondence, and the member for Fisher commented that a member could be fined $40 for abiding by the law. Unfortunately, over the years workers have not always been able to achieve a good standard of living by abiding by the law. I can recall, as I am sure other Government members can recall, the penal provisions of the arbitration system which were law under the Menzies Government. If we had lived under that without opposition, I wonder what would have happened to the trade union movement and the working-class people today. As reported on the front page of today's *News*, even the police are taking action against the so-called law. If a law is brought in by a Government involving anti-working class penalties, I must say openly that that Government, whatever its political persuasion, can expect reprisals, and that will be against the law.

The member for Light talked about receiving a book of rules. To my knowledge, it is general practice that members are given copies of rule books, but in some instances members of certain unions have not displayed great interest in the rules, and, for that reason, they have not pursued the avenues open to them under the rules. I remind the member for Light that the dispute which is the subject of this motion was also the subject of a majority decision. If a minority disagrees with such a decision, I believe that the minority should go along with the majority decision, even though it voices its opposition to that decision.

I shall not deal at length with the remarks of the member for Davenport, because I may get angry. In my experience of that member in this House, he never ceases to take an opportunity to prop himself up in the public eye as the champion of the under-dog. Looking through his history, we find that he has been on television, and has failed badly, having no image at all.

Mr. Coumbe: He has been pretty good.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am not quoting my opinion. I am talking of the telephone calls that followed his appearance, which went down badly. Whether or not members opposite believe it, I can assure them that strike action within the trade union movement is the only positive action a worker can take against people, organisations, or Governments, as in this case, that work against his best interests. If the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Chamber of Manufactures, employer groups, and Governments, such as the L.C.L. Fraser Government, persist in attacking the living

standards of the workers, I say quite categorically that the workers will defend those living standards by strike action. I say that advisedly, because it is exactly what has happened; it is a part of the system, unfortunately, under which we live. Strike action is a weapon that in many cases is used after much consideration. I would go so far as to say that, in most cases, considerable discussion is involved.

Mr. Rodda: How much did they give on the Medibank strike?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Who?

Mr. Rodda: The union.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The same consideration as they usually give. This is not uncommon. Meetings and conferences are called, discussions are held, and the decision is made. In my humble opinion, in moving this motion the member for Davenport (although he probably does not know it, but the member for Florey would recall it) is going back to the issues of the Hursey case, because that is what it was all about. It is a wellknown case. The member for Glenelg does not even know who I am talking about; that is how much he knows about it.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the Hursey case?

Mr. MAX BROWN: It was a world renowned industrial dispute, a political dispute.

Mr. Mathwin: It was not the only one.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Of course not. I am not denying that. It is a classic example of what the member for Davenport is moving in this motion.

Mr. Mathwin: The Hurseys, father and son, were stood over by the union.

Mr. MAX BROWN: What a load of rubbish! I emphatically deny that statement.

Mr. Mathwin: Of course they were, and you know it.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The history of the Hursey case was that the union was upheld in that dispute. How could the member for Glenelg make such a stupid remark as that? I do not say he is telling lies, but he is fabricating some untruths from across the Chamber.

Mr. Mathwin: It's all in the evidence.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The evidence is clear. I could understand the member for Florey becoming agitated over this matter, because he was there, but where was the member for Glenelg when all this was taking place?

Mr. Mathwin: I read it all.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am pointing out that the effect of the motion is much in line with the Hursey case, which was purely and simply a political dispute. The member for Glenelg may say what he likes, but that was the cold, hard fact of the matter. In that instance, the union was upheld by the court. What are we really talking about? The mover and the member for Rocky River have talked absolute rubbish. I also point out (and this is also factual) that the rules and regulations, adequately spoken about by the member for Light, have been registered in the Arbitration Commission.

Mr. Venning: He knows more about it than you do.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is a matter of opinion, and I do not take the honourable member's opinion very well. I point out again for the benefit of the member for Glenelg (and I am sure that I would be supported by my colleagues, who are well aware of this matter, in what I say) that processes in the arbitration system allow for free legal advice to be given to union members. The Hursey case is a classic example. What a lot of rubbish it was to move such a motion; it could be put down as another union-bashing move.

It is not uncommon for unions to be criticised and attacked by the Opposition, because of their constitution, their method of balloting, their financial position, etc. We are so used to this practice that it no longer matters. When the Opposition is criticising the trade union movement, it is a terrible pity that it does not get its facts straight. If I wanted to criticise the member for Victoria over the rural industry, I would obtain expert advice, but the Opposition does not observe such a practice. I say for the benefit of the mover, who has just resumed his seat, that, if the workers' living standards are attacked, and the Fraser Government is doing exactly that with its Medibank levy—

Mr. Mathwin: Rubbish!

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Fraser Government is depriving the worker of $8 a week from his pay packet. If that is not depriving the worker of part of his living standard, then what is? The Opposition may not like my saying it, but if the Fraser Government is going to deprive workers of money from their pay packets, it will be attacked. Opposition members may laugh if they wish, but I am giving them sound advice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAX BROWN: Although I am normally a peaceful man, the Opposition is certainly provoking me.

Mr. Coumbe: Are we annoying you?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes. In my humble opinion, the strike on July 12 was fully justified, and it was overwhelmingly supported by the workers. I believe that any future attack by the Fraser Government will also be overwhelmingly opposed by the workers.

Mr. Mathwin: You admit that it was a political strike.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Of course it was, and I am not running away from that question. The member for Glenelg may call it what he likes to call it.

Mr. Chapman: Do you agree that your Party supported such a strike?

Mr. MAX BROWN: If a Government attacks the standard of living of the working class, it must expect retaliation, and anyone who wishes may interpret that as a political dispute. The motion is a complete farce, trumped up by the member for Davenport, who is a union basher, in an attempt to obtain public sympathy for being the champion of the under-dog. The dispute arising over the Fraser Government's alteration to Medibank has been a complete fiasco. In conclusion, I wonder what legal action can be taken against doctors, for example, who have fleeced the Medibank scheme. It is known that a doctor who has visited Whyalla has defrauded Medibank of about $200 000. I wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition would quote the rules of the A.M.A. in this instance, and whether the doctor will be brought before its executive.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is now referring to a matter that I understand is *sub judice*. I stand to be corrected, but I believe charges are proceeding and therefore it would be improper for the honourable member to refer to this matter whilst it is before the court.

The SPEAKER: I am not sure whether the matter is before the court or not, but I suggest to the honourable member for Whyalla that he should return to the discussion associated with the motion.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Government members have heard about nothing but rules and regulations of trade unions, as though they were something new. The reason for this

motion was the Medibank strike, but I wonder what part doctors played in that. There have been many allegations of defrauding of Medibank funds by doctors. What part will the A.M.A. and its rules play in that matter? When a doctor or group of doctors deprive Commonwealth funds of money by defrauding, that is more serious than a situation in which a poor worker strikes to obtain justice because he has been deprived of about $8 a week from his pay packet. I am convinced of the member for Davenport's role as a union basher, and I strongly oppose the motion.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Davenport, who has made out a strong case, and I am surprised that Government members have not supported him. Workers of this State should have the support of all members and not only of Opposition members, because we know of the strong-arm tactics used by some sections of the trade union movement. Much has been said about rules. I understand that the member for Semaphore said that a shop steward always had a copy of the rules, so that it does not matter if members do not have a copy.

Mr. Olson: That's better than not having a copy available, which you are saying is the position.

Mr. MATHWIN: Recently, after I had raised a question about trade union rule books, the Parliamentary Librarian tried to obtain copies but we have only one set of rules, and that is from the Australian Building Construction Employees and Builders Labourers Federation. Rule (*c*) of the objects of that organisation provides:

To assist in the movement for the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

Rule (*e*) states:

To assist by federation or otherwise in upholding the rights and privileges of workers.

However, it is well known that this trade union is imposing a fine on its members who did not comply with its instruction about the political strike on Medibank. The member for Whyalla agrees that it was a political strike. Unions have stated that their members must toe the line or they will be punished. The member for Whyalla referred to money being taken from the pay packets of members of unions to pay the Medibank levy, but he did not say that money is taken from the pay packet in order to pay a Labor Party levy. Workers have not given permission for that money to be taken from their pay and be given to the Labor Party for a political fight. The poor worker, if he does not want to pay, must see the Secretary and tell him: obviously, the Labor Party is interfering with the pay packet of its members without their permission.

Mr. Whitten: The members agree to the rules of the organisation.

Mr. MATHWIN: How can they agree, when they do not have the chance to see a rule book? I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This short Bill makes several machinery amendments to the Brands Act, 1933-1969, the principal Act. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "the department", and making certain other consequential amendments. Clause 4 repeals sections 17 and 18 of the principal Act and inserts in their place a new section 17, the effect of which is to allow free use of brands consisting of a numeral or any brand on the near or off ribs of cattle.

Clause 5 amends section 53 of the principal Act, and recognises the fact that *The Stock and Station Journal* is no longer published. Clause 6 amends section 54 of the principal Act by removing a reference to a register that is no longer required to be kept. Clause 7 re-enacts section 62 of the principal Act in much the same form as it previously existed, with the exception that special provision is now made for branding cattle vaccinated against brucellosis. Clause 8 is formal and self-explanatory. Clause 9 is consequential on the amendments made by clause 4, as are the amendments made by clauses 10 and 11.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill amends the principal Act, the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1974, and is to some extent consequential on the amendments effected to the Stock Diseases Act. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by changing the definition of "disease" to accord with that inserted in the Stock Diseases Act. Clause 4 is consequential on the amendments made by clause 3. Clause 5 enacts a new section 4b in the principal Act which will recognise a practice that has existed for some time in the computation of stamp duty, that is, the practice of "averaging".

Clause 6 amends section 5 of the principal Act so as to ensure that, in appropriate cases, cattle destroyed under the new powers conferred on inspectors under the Stock Diseases Act will attract compensation under this Act. Clause 7 is consequential on this. Clause 8 amends section 11 of the principal Act by recognising that the fund established under the principal Act may receive subventions from the Commonwealth.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The purpose of this short Bill is to make certain amendments to the principal Act, the Stock Diseases Act, 1934-1968, to enable the disease brucellosis to be dealt with more effectively.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the long title to the principal Act to recognise its slightly wider coverage. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act, the interpretation section: (*a*) by striking out the definition of "disease" and substituting a somewhat wider definition; and (*b*) by inserting a definition of "the department" expressed in more general terms.

Clause 5 amends section 6 of the principal Act, and the amendment set forth in paragraph (*a*) of that clause is in aid of the definition of "the department", and the amendment set out in paragraph (*b*) of that clause is consequential on the amendment to "disease" in section 5. Clause 6 amends section 11 of the principal Act by somewhat widening the powers of the inspector to order stock into quarantine. It is not necessary that the inspector should be satisfied that the stock proposed to be placed into quarantine are "diseased or infected". There may well be circumstances when he will wish to quarantine the stock in order to determine whether they are diseased or infected.

Clause 7 repeals and re-enacts section 18 of the principal Act, and the attention of members is specifically directed to this re-enactment which gives a wide power for the destruction of stock, a destruction that will of course attract compensation under the Cattle Compensation Act. Clause 8 is consequential on the definition of "the department".

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION BILL

(Continued from October 12. Page 1452.)

Bill recommitted.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Dr. EASTICK: Although I realise that the Minister of Community Welfare is handling this Bill for a Minister in another place, it would advantage the Committee if it was given some indication of the intended programme to implement the measure. This assumes the Bill's relatively speedy passage through this Chamber and another place. Assuming that the Bill is passed soon, can the Minister say when its provisions will be implemented?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): Although I am not able to prognosticate regarding what may happen in another place, where the Bill must take its chances, I understand that progress is expected in the matter early in the new year.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Objects of this Act."

Dr. EASTICK: This is an entirely new provision, which parallels action that was taken earlier in relation to the Juvenile Courts Act, wherein the opportunity was taken to include a statement of intention and of objects. Members on the Select Committee were concerned to ensure that a measure of that kind was included in this Bill so that there could be no misconception regarding the intention of the legislation. Not only does the clause give a clear indication of the objects but also it highlights and lauds, in effect, many activities that currently take place in the community. I refer to paragraph (*e*) of this clause, which relates to the continued participation of voluntary organisations and local government authorities in the provision of health care, both aspects being important. Certainly, the local government aspect is important, as it is close to the point of delivery of many health care matters, particularly those directly associated with public health.

Regarding the continued participation of voluntary organisations, it was the view of most people who appeared before the committee (and I believe it would be the view of all members, because of their direct knowledge of the activities that are carried on in their districts) that, if voluntary assistance to organisations such as hospitals or community health centres, which are just coming on to the scene, were to be lost, the cost to the State would be tremendous. Indeed, the genuine and real personal involvement, which is such an important part of health care, could be lost.

Members recognise the importance of the sums of money which have been raised voluntarily in the past and which will need to be raised in the future for all health activities and for the ancillary functions that augment health care in the community. In this respect, I refer to Meals on Wheels, the Royal District Nursing Society, the Royal Flying Doctor Service, St. John Ambulance, and certainly the St. John Corps. Although that is not an exhaustive list, it is in this area that voluntary effort has been meaningful in the past, and it is important that this continue in the future.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Government is anxious to see the continuation of voluntary participation in the health field. The member for Light would agree that, as Chairman of the Select Committee, I was instrumental in ensuring that this council was included in the Bill.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Interpretation."

Dr. EASTICK: The interpretation clause caused considerable concern in the community, as evidenced by the number of witnesses who drew attention to the definitions of "health centre" and "health service". The simple definitions of "health centre" and "health service" cannot be isolated from the use of those terms in the other clauses of the Bill. Although it was strongly recommended that these definitions be altered, after considering the influence of those definitions on the later clauses I think they are not disadvantageous to the community. Taken in that context, there can be no fear about them. The definition of "incorporated health centre" defines more narrowly those areas where the service will be under the direction of the commission more positively, and opportunity will exist for the community to see that it is not disadvantaged.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Constitution of commission."

Dr. EASTICK: Last evening, it was said that representations made by the Northern Metropolitan Regional Organisation were to the effect that the commissioners would not retire until the age of 68 years. That is a misconception. It is clearly stated that the age of 68 years for retirement will apply only to those persons who are part-time commissioners. That was made clear, so that a person who had been a full-time commissioner could continue in the service of the State after the age of 65, if that was the desire of the Minister of the day. Full-time commissioners, who will be playing a major role, will be required to retire at the age of 65. As regards the constitution of the commission, considerable evidence was taken on who the commissioners should be. There were upwards of 35 nominations for people to become commissioners. It is obvious we cannot expect the commissioners, either full-time or part-time, when elected necessarily to have a direct contact with all the organisations in the community that are involved.

I look forward to those persons who are eventually nominated as commissioners being prepared to put their shoulders to the wheel, because a major job is to be undertaken in the overall reorganisation if the health service in this State is not to suffer as it appears to have suffered in New South Wales by the arrangement of a health commission scheme which, unfortunately, had not been thought right through and which left some deficiencies at the time of transfer. The evidence that will be available to the commissioners, whoever they may be, will give them an opportunity of overcoming possible difficulties in this area; there will be a meaningful transfer arrangement, which will mean that the people of South Australia will not be disadvantaged in health care.

Also, unlike the provisions of the original Bill, the provisions of the Bill as it is now before us make clear that the eight commissioners (three full-time and five part-time) will be elected on the one day and that the commission, when it sits, will sit as a total body and not as a fragmented group that acquires additional commissioners as time passes. It is important that the commission when it first meets should meet in its entirety. I am in full accord with the recommendation now made to the Committee.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I support those remarks. I am sure the honourable member would agree that this was the unanimous view of the Select Committee at the time. Probably one of the major fears of those people who came before it with respect to the three full-time and five part-time commissioners was in relation to how many commissioners needed to be appointed at the one time. It is now clear that the total complement will be appointed on the day decided on.

Mr. ALLISON: Many people who appeared before the Select Committee recommended that they have a member on the commission attached to their own organisations, and it becomes increasingly obvious that the sheer capacity of the members of the commission, both organisational and administrative, is far more important than that they be attached to any organisations desiring direct representation on the commission.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Disclosure of interest."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In case the Committee has not noticed, I draw to its attention that the penalty was increased from the original amount. It was thought by the Select Committee that the original amount specified was too low, in view of inflation, and that the current penalty now before members is more in keeping with the seriousness of the offence that may be committed.

Clause passed.

Clause 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Functions of the commission."

Dr. EASTICK: I draw attention to the way in which this clause is now phrased. If we refer back to Bill No. 26 on the Bill file, which was the original measure, we find that clause 15 (1) states:

The function of the commission is to promote the health—

and then there is a group of paragraphs, (*a*) to (*n*), and then there is a second subclause.

Paragraph (*l*) of the original Bill provided:

Generally to promote the health and well-being of the people of this State;

Clause 16 (1) of the new Bill provides:

The function of the commission is to promote the health and well-being of the people of this State and, in particular:

Then several paragraphs are listed. Doctor M. W. Dunstone and Dr. D. P. Finnegan, who represented the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, should receive due regard for this amendment. Their suggestion and the resulting amendment is a clear indication of how people in the field see their purpose in life. When the Bill was first presented it was designed to promote the health and well being of the people of the State, yet that major point was buried in the measure that was before us. The important issue has now been spelt out. I, along with all other members of the Select Committee, thank Dr. Dunstone and Dr. Finnegan in this case, and all other witnesses for the representations they made.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I support those remarks. The original Bill as presented had a number of horses before the cart. I believe that the equine animal and the vehicle are now in their correct order.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—"Incorporation, etc."

Dr. EASTICK: I draw members' attention to the important amendments that have been made to this clause. A major fear expressed to members of the Select Committee was that which was expressed in this Chamber when the Bill was first before us and which related to the centralised involvement in determining staffing of hospitals and health centres. The original measure would have meant that all senior executive members of all hospitals in the State would have been appointed by direction of the commission in Adelaide. Obviously that was not the Government's intention. The only officers to be so appointed now will be the senior executive officers of Government hospitals or health centres. At last count I believe they totalled only about five people. The fear expressed by several hospital boards in letters and representations about not controlling the destiny of their own hospital has now been removed from the Bill. Representations made to me since the original report of the Select Committee was presented are that this feature is now well recognised by hospitals and the action taken is certainly appreciated by the people involved.

Mr. BLACKER: I thank the member for Light for his explanation. I received representations from Cowell District Hospital as well as personal representations from other hospitals that were concerned that the rights of their boards to hire and fire were in jeopardy. The honourable member's explanation puts at rest much of the concern that was expressed in the community.

Clause passed.

Clauses 27 to 37 passed.

Clause 38—"Fixing of fees."

Dr. EASTICK: Concern was expressed that the commission may become a price-fixing organisation. After thorough investigation of all aspects of the Bill, it was clear that that would not be the case. This clause is included so that bed fees will be determined as an integral part of the provision of a health care service. I see no difficulty with the retention of this provision.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I confirm the honourable member's remarks that the matter was discussed with Dr. Shea and that what the honourable member has said is the intention of the clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 39—"Power of commission to require contribution."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not pleased about this clause. Representations were made to me long before this Bill saw the light of day. Councils in my district were unhappy that they were compelled to make compulsory contributions to hospitals. Politics are not involved in this matter, but the practice goes back many years. There has been much dissatisfaction from at least some councils about this provision whereby they have been required in the past to make compulsory contributions to hospitals. That dissatisfaction has gathered momentum in the past week or two and, therefore, I cannot agree to the clause.

Mr. VANDEPEER: As revenue obtained from ratepayers by local councils is a capital tax, the 3 per cent levy is iniquitous, and its removal would make the position easier for many councils. Although the Bill originally provided for more than 3 per cent, and the Select Committee has recommended 3 per cent, councils have been complaining about that figure for a long time. In my area the Local Government Association had decided to refuse to pay the levy.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: But it did pay it.

Mr. VANDEPEER: True, but this shows the feeling in the area when such a decision is made.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I am not critical of it. I accept that.

Mr. VANDEPEER: The association finally paid the levy because it was realised that refusal meant breaking the law and that, as councils represent communities, they should not break laws.

Mr. Arnold: They paid it under sufferance.

Mr. VANDEPEER: True, but the councils hung out as long as they could before paying the levy. Councils have been virtually threatened by the Government that, if they did not pay it, a similar amount would be removed from Government grants and contributions. If this happened, councils would not know from year to year what their total grants and contributions would be. Would the Government reduce its contributions to make an example of councils refusing to pay the levy? Such a situation was foreseen.

Why should only ratepayers contribute to local hospital funds? Hospital finance should come from general tax revenue. Although councils originally merely constructed roads, they now encompass a wider area of community interest. However, I believe that to ask councils to contribute 3 per cent of their rate revenue is iniquitous, especially as the Government requires councils to pay another 3 per cent of their rate revenue to the Pest Plants Commission. Therefore, 6 per cent of council rate revenue goes to these two bodies. The District Council of Lacepede referred to the expenditure of $15 000 before it even started paying its own accounts.

Also, I have obtained information from the local hospital board that, as funds are available through Medibank, the board is finding that, even if its committees do not successfully raise money, if the hospital wants a certain item it need wait only six months to obtain it. As a result of Medibank and the Health Commission, apathy has developed amongst the board and the people in the area concerning the raising of funds, and the hospital will rely completely on Government funding, which is not good for the community. This results from the actions of the Government.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It is the Federal Liberal Government which is operating Medibank, isn't it?

Mr. VANDEPEER: We know who introduced Medibank and forced it upon us.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It is there now and you will find that more than 50 per cent of the population was in favour of it.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I am talking about Medibank and the effects on local hospitals.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Well, it's a Federal—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Millicent has the floor.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I refer to the position obtaining in other States, where no local government contributions to hospitals are asked for. The Commonwealth Grants Commission in its first report on the grants to councils noted that South Australia was the only State in which councils contributed to hospitals. The commission noted that this was a disadvantage to South Australian councils. Did the commission take that into account in making its allocation to South Australia, or will local councils have to rely on the South Australian Grants Commission to take that into account? The true position cannot be ascertained. Local councils will never know how much consideration the State Grants Commission will give to this disadvantage. I hope the Government will reconsider this matter in the future.

Mr. McRAE: The committee paid considerable regard to this matter and heard much evidence. The levy has been in existence for more than 50 years, and was operated by the Playford Government and other Liberal Governments before it.

Mr. Boundy: The councils have been objecting for 50 years, haven't they?

Mr. McRAE: Like all taxes, it has never been accepted happily. Evidence from reputable bodies before the committee was two-fold, and I think it was summed up well by the member for Light. Local government bodies said they wanted a degree of autonomy for what will be referred to under this legislation as incorporated hospitals, and the Government bent over backwards to see that that autonomy would be given. There is, first, a recognition of district hospitals in a way that recognition has never been given previously: full autonomy, full incorporation, recognition under this Act for all purposes, and full discretion in the local hospital boards to run their own affairs.

The constitutions of local district hospitals in almost all cases are such that local government has representation on the hospital board, and of course it has a considerable interest in seeing that the hospital facility is available for people in the area. If that sort of autonomy and discretion is to be vested under the Act in an incorporated hospital, it seems reasonable that some small contribution should be asked for.

The second complaint hinged about this contribution. Originally, the Bill was open-ended and the fear was that an unreasonable levy would be placed on local government.

That fear was dispelled. I am surprised to have heard the many speeches on this topic, and I was also surprised to receive correspondence from Mr. Hullick, because he appeared before the committee. Every opportunity was there, and all committee members know that every opportunity was given for these points to be made. At the conclusion of 73 witnesses, 25 meetings, and more than 700 pages of evidence, all committee members felt confident that, provided the levy was pegged at 3 per cent and the autonomy and discretion of the local and district hospitals were maintained, there would be no great complaint. I do not say that people are happy to be levied to pay any tax; they are not, but the evidence was massive and overwhelming, and I was amazed to receive a complete about-turn in Mr. Hullick's letter, because his evidence is totally to the contrary. That is evident from the transcript.

Mr. Vandepeer: Mr. Hullick has changed his coat.

Mr. McRAE: He seems to have done that.

Mr. Vandepeer: He has changed his job. He is working for another body.

Mr. McRAE: That may be so, but one would have hoped that he would not change his evidence so markedly.

Mr. Vandepeer: He is under instructions from the new organisation.

Mr. McRAE: He was supposed to be giving evidence truthfully to a Parliamentary committee, and I am sure he was a sufficiently intelligent man to be aware of that. I hope there is some explanation other than that he did not tell the committee the truth.

Mr. Vandepeer: I am not suggesting that he did not tell the truth.

Mr. McRAE: I should hope not. I have summarised the evidence. All committee members are aware that what I say is correct, and there will not be one of them who can refute what I have said. I agree with the member for Kavel and other members that, if this were an ideal situation, I am sure the Government would be delighted to lift the 3 per cent levy and make everyone happier. At the moment, however, as advised by Dr. Shea, the Government would not be in a position to do that. The clause is soundly based on the evidence before the Select Committee.

Mr. ALLISON: During the day I have been in telephone communication with various councils in the South-East. Two in particular, the Mount Gambier City Council and the Mount Gambier District Council, have asked me to state that they have long opposed and still oppose this contribution towards the hospitals, and that they request the member to oppose this inclusion in the Bill. I asked why they had earlier resolved not to pay the levy (that was in April or May of this year) and had subsequently decided (in June) to pay it. The Mount Gambier District Council Clerk, Mr. Peter Roach, said that on June 10, 1976, the South-East Local Government Association decided to pay the levy because, within the terms of the Local Government Act, it was obviously illegal not to do so; in any case, there was certainly the threat that Government grants could be withheld for non-payment of the levy.

As a result, the councils did pay their levy. I think the Mount Gambier City Council would have been the first to pay, but the councils wrote to the Director-General of Medical Services (Dr. Shea) and said that they were paying under protest. They also wrote to the Federal Minister for Health with the plaint that South Australia was the only State paying this levy and that they believed, with the advent of Medibank, plus the fact that State lottery profits were supposed to remove a deal of the responsibility from councils back to the Government with regard to hospital payments, that this tax, which was a selective tax, an additional tax in that only ratepayers paid it and not the entire community, should be opposed. They appreciated the logic of my argument last night in defence of the committee; nevertheless, they felt that the Local Government Association had poorly represented councils with the point of view put forward by the then Secretary, who said that this clause, in his opinion, was a non-substantive clause and therefore was not worthy of contention at that stage, whereas the councils believe that it is very substantive and could be the single most important clause, in their view, in the legislation.

Being a member of the Select Committee, I studiously avoided discussing the matter with any councils in the South-East, on the assumption that matters within such a committee should not be disclosed, and there was some risk of that happening. As a result, I may be uninformed on opinions from the South-East councils, but I think that morally I have some justification, and at least I am bringing forward their point of view now, for what it is worth.

Mr. BOUNDY: As the member for Playford has said, councils have paid contributions to hospitals for 50 years. In my area, the main bone of contention and the main resistance to paying contributions to hospitals in the past has been more particularly from those councils that have not had a hospital in their own area, but were called on to contribute to a hospital in another council area, or were called on to contribute proportionately to two hospitals in two adjoining council areas. That has always been the case in my area. I received a telegram today from an individual council in my area, as well as from the Chairman of Region 6 of Local Government on Yorke Peninsula, which embraces hospitals in the Goyder District and the Gouger District. The basis of concern regarding the Bill at the outset was the concern of councils about and their desire for the continued involvement of local government in the health concerns of their own community. They believe that decisions regarding the health of the community rest rightly at local government level. The telegram states:

Twelve councils this region want compulsory hospital contributions abolished. Request you act to remove from health Bill.

(Signed) Sheriff, Chairman Region 6 Yorke Peninsula

I have also received the following telegram from the Minlaton council:

Consider compulsory hospital contributions iniquitous. Request removal from health Bill.

The Minlaton council is a special case, because it is one of the few councils in the State which, as a body, acts as the hospital board for the district. So, there can be no doubt that the view expressed by the Minlaton council is also the view of the hospital board. I dispute the Minister's inference of "No pay, no say"—that if local government, through its regions, is going to have some say, it ought to pay. Councils are paying, and to impose this compulsory levy on ratepayers is indeed imposing a selective tax. Hospital contributions ought to be borne by way of an income tax levy on the entire community. The member for Playford said that this system had been imposed for 50 years, so it is no different now from what it was in Playford's day. However, there is one essential difference now from what things were like in Playford's day.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Yes: we're over here.

Mr. BOUNDY: That may well be so, but today we have a State lottery, which was instituted for the purpose of helping to support our hospitals.

Mr. Allison: We have Medibank, too.

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes. The revenue for hospital purposes is different now, because it comes from different sources.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: The costs have stayed the same.

Mr. BOUNDY: No, they have not. We have Medibank for better or for worse, but that does not promote thrift in the running of our hospitals. Local government has long had a reputation for the good management of its affairs.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How long do you think Mal will keep that up?

Mr. BOUNDY: If he continues to demonstrate his good management as he has done so far, he will not allow that kind of inefficiency to continue for long. In the light of the evidence submitted to me today in these telegrams and in conversations I have had with the Clerks of the District Councils of Maitland, Balaklava, and Owen, I have no alternative but to oppose the compulsory imposition of contributions from local government. Indeed, the Owen council did not oppose outright the paying of contributions to hospitals by local government but would like to reserve the right to make a voluntary contribution if and when necessary. I believe that the compulsory contribution provision should be deleted from the Bill.

Mr. RUSSACK: Today, I received telegrams from Region 6, which embraces councils on Yorke Peninsula, and from Bute District Council, Kadina District Council, and Moonta Corporation. I have spoken on the telephone with the Clerks of the Owen District Council, Balaklava District Council, Riverton District Council, Snowtown District Council, and the Secretary of the Mid-Northern Region of Local Government. In all cases, with the exception of the Owen council, which is somewhat divided on the matter, they have expressed direct opposition to the compulsory contribution to hospitals from council revenue. I have also received information from the Secretary of the Mid-Northern Region concerning a survey, conducted under the auspices of the Local Government Association within the past two months, of all local government bodies in the State. The member for Playford referred to a witness who appeared before the Select Committee and who is now the association's Secretary. Undoubtly, the survey result could have had a bearing on his present attitude.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is that how he got the job?

Mr. RUSSACK: I do not know. Councils were asked to answer five questions concerning compulsory hospital contributions. Question No. 1 asked them to indicate whether they were in favour of their being abolished. Question No. 2 asked whether they should be retained. Question No. 3 asked whether they should be reduced. Question No. 4 asked whether they should be made voluntary, and Question No. 5 asked for any suggestion councils might like to submit. A total of 92 per cent of councils acknowledged the questionnaire, and 78 per cent of councils indicated that they wanted the contribution abolished. An additional 16 per cent of councils would like it abolished or, if this could not be done, expressed their wish for some kind of voluntary contribution. A total of 94 per cent of councils replied. Therefore, only 6 per cent of answers were divided among the other questions, such as, "retained", "reduced" or "had suggestions". As a result of this reaction, I oppose the clause. The source of my information about the survey was from a secretary of a local government region, and not from the Local Government Office.

Mr. RODDA: The member for Playford said that he was surprised at the opposition to it, but perhaps he is not aware that councils have many problems in balancing their budgets. In my district much discussion has been generated about the rate to be charged, especially if the council has to maintain roads and highways and provide other services. Any increase in the council rate will mean an increase in this levy. Councils in the South-East have suggested that they should not pay the levy, but they know that the Government has power to obtain this contribution. With the advent of Medibank, circumstances have changed.

When I was a member of the board of Naracoorte Hospital, we had many difficulties, and the financial position went up and down like a yo-yo, as it depended on bed occupancy. Obviously, many people will now be hospitalised for trifling reasons because of Medibank. It may be argued that a levy should be imposed, but many councils find themselves in financial difficulty. I can say to the Minister that he will receive many protests from local government concerning this levy, and I oppose this clause.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Section 38 (1) of the Hospitals Act and section 285 of the Local Government Act both provide that councils must contribute to this fund, although it has been suggested that some councils have threatened to withhold their contribution. I recognise that councils have difficulty in raising finances in accordance with their needs, and that it is difficult and embarrassing for councils in rural areas to increase the rates, especially where the capacity to pay increased rates is a problem. However, I cannot agree that councils should escape the responsibility of contributing to hospital facilities that service their districts. Therefore, I cannot accept that this clause should be deleted, but I will seek to amend it in a way that I believe is fair, reasonable, and responsible. I believe councils should contribute to a hospital fund and that it be a specific and identified fund not concerned with the general operation of hospitals.

There are several valid reasons why contributions have been and should continue to be made, one of which is to fund the capital expenditure programme of the hospital. By continuing to rate the district equitably, a council ensures that each ratepayer contributes towards the hospital. This cultivates an involvement at the local level, which is paramount in the ordinary running of the hospital. This therefore binds to the hospital the financial, and accordingly the vested, interests of all concerned.

In the past there have been several avenues from which a hospital board can raise funds to enable it to conduct, for example, a subsidised hospital. One has been the contribution through council rates; another has been from liberal donations made by local residents; yet another has been from various forms of fund raising. Collectively, those systems of raising revenue have maintained a vital participation and involvement of all concerned. Indeed, this type of involvement and participation should be maintained in the interests of good management and operation of the hospital and its administration. I do not agree, however, that future council contributions should be paid into the general maintenance or working fund of any subsidised or Government hospital. Such contributions made through the rate revenue system should be directed into a capital fund and used solely for that purpose.

The Medibank system under which we in this State operate does two things at the local level. Prior to the introduction of Medibank, there was an opportunity for a hospital board to make a profit and so build up its capital fund. Under Medibank, there is no opportunity for a board to accumulate funds through its internal revenue system,

as the Medibank requirements at the subsidised hospital level are such that it picks up the tab for the deficit or (if there is one) the profit. As that avenue has been closed to hospital boards, they can furnish themselves with funds for capital purposes from voluntary contributions only or from contributions received from what I would describe as the most equitable system.

I am obliged, quite apart from my own personal understanding and appreciation of this subject, to raise another matter. Again, it is in support of retaining the system of local government contributions to hospital funds. On Friday, August 27, 1976, in company with the Kangaroo Island general hospital board Chairman and its Secretary, I attended a deputation that waited on the Minister of Health. The deputation asked the Minister to support its earlier request for about $700 000 for extensions to the hospital. As members may realise, it has been and will continue to be necessary to contribute towards Government funding for such capital expenditure, and the Minister made that very clear also. At no time should a hospital have to run to its ratepayers for voluntary donations in order to honour its responsibility to contribute towards such Government investment. Furthermore, if we are to be fair about this excercise, and wish to maintain local representation at board level, it is fair enough also that some contribution should be made locally.

Later in the debate, I will move the amendment standing in my name. In the meantime, I indicate my general support for maintaining local government contributions, which should be earmarked for capital expenditure and not be put into general revenue, which relates to the daily or monthly expenditure of the hospital concerned.

Mr. BLACKER: My constituents have indicated that they are opposed to compulsory contributions, which have arisen, it is fair to say, because many country areas would not now have a hospital unless it had been decided at the local level to strike a rate to finance that hospital. Many subsidised hospitals in the country have been established solely because the local people considered it desirable that the council strike a rate for that specific purpose.

The Bill has been amended in the Select Committee to impose a limit of 3 per cent. That is desirable, except that I oppose compulsory contribution to it. Should that fail, I would support the member for Alexandra in his endeavours. However, can the Minister say whether the district council or local government authority has a right of appeal, or is the contribution mandatory? If the amount of the contribution is subject to negotiation, what is the procedure to be adopted? In other words, can the local government authority, because of its financial situation, negotiate with the commission on the amount that shall be paid, or will the commission stipulate it and the council have deducted from its funds and allocations the appropriate amount?

Mr. EVANS: I oppose the proposal although I see some merit in the member for Alexandra's comments. Where he falls down is that he is asking for fairness in the council contribution in one area but is forgetting another area where a council may be disadvantaged. The 3 per cent will come from the ratepayer's pocket but in some areas the hospital is used to a greater extent by people from outside the area than is a hospital in another area. Where there are recreation parks and a major freeway, many costs are pushed back on to the local community hospital because of accidents and mishaps that occur there that would not occur in some other area; so that local community hospital has to bear a greater work-load from people outside the area than some other community hospitals do. For instance, in the Hills, large tracts of land owned by the Government produce no rates, which is an extra burden on that community, and any hospital contribution through rate revenue is a further burden on it. When we reach the stage where, on an average, people are paying $200 to $250 a year in rates, we must be conscious of any further financial demands we make on them. This contribution is to be paid by the people, not by local government. Accepting the argument that this money is meant to be used for only capital works, do we say that the hospitals have continually to expand by erecting new buildings and spending capital in that direction?

We should all be concerned when we realise that, within the next 12 months, or by Christmas of 1977, hospitalisation could cost a patient $200 a day. I would support this recommendation if we were fair in all aspects of legislation about local government, but we are not. If we are not fair in other directions, I am not prepared to accept what may appear on the surface to be a reasonable proposition in this case. We should not say to a council, "We will bleed you of one-third or more of your rate revenue; on the other hand, we shall expect you to pay the hospital contribution even though you may claim it is a bigger burden on you because of all your recreation areas where people may sustain injuries and you have to help in respect of these people patronising those areas." I do not support this clause at present.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Most members who have spoken so far have been thoughtful and have put forward views that can be supported. The Select Committee was composed of members of nearly all shades of opinion. Earlier, it recommended to this Chamber that its recommendations be at least considered; and that is the proposition before us. It is really whether we should ratify a practice of long standing. The argument that one could produce to change such a practice could be explained as follows. First, it may be argued that it does not happen anywhere else and it is time to change the practice in this State. My answer to that is the one often adopted by the member for Rocky River—that in this case we are faced with the problem of providing hospital and health care for South Australia.

Secondly, prior to what is proposed in this Bill, there was no real limit, although there was some custom about what was actually charged. The Government has seen fit to heed the call from local government that there must be a limit in these matters. It has heeded this call by the Select Committee and has specified "shall not exceed 3 per cent". I do not suggest it is unlikely that the 3 per cent would not be charged and that something like 1·8 per cent would be charged. That would be unrealistic, but a specified maximum will now be charged and, in order for that to be varied, the Parliament of the time will scrutinise any change. That is an improvement, from the point of view of local government.

I commend the member for Alexandra, although seldom have we agreed on matters, for the stand he has taken in Committee this evening, where he has said that, if local government wants to be recognised, to stand on its own two feet, and to be able to be heard as a voice in matters generally, it must come out and say, "This is an area in which we should be involved and, being involved in representation on boards, we should be carrying part of the load."

The member for Alexandra correctly summed up the situation with which we are faced. Members who oppose the clause should consider seriously what he has put forward. As far as I am concerned, he was the only member representing a rural district who did not sell his folk short. Other members were so anxious to suggest a reduction

or the abolition of the sum that is required to be paid that they sold short the people they represent, as did members who argued that Medibank will eliminate thrift. What they have said really means that people with a history of representing voluntary organisations, boards, or auxiliaries will change their character and will no longer be the people they were a day before. I do not accept that, nor do I believe that the members who put forward that suggestion believe it.

When I meet the people concerned, my impression is not that they are shallow, flimsy people, as members opposite would seem to suggest, but that they are solid citizens and will not change their way of thinking. It was suggested that there was no need for finance under this measure, because Medibank is a bottomless bag out of which everything will come. I am surprised to hear that suggestion, because the present Federal Government has gone to great pains to stress to the Australian community that Medibank does not finance itself as a kind of self-generating revenue producer but that funds must be obtained from somewhere to finance the large sums that are required because hospital costs and the cost of providing hospital care are increasing.

The member for Fisher said that costs could inflate to even $200 a day. I will not give an opinion on that matter, but it would appear that members who suggest that councils should not contribute anything are being unrealistic. Members opposite who were members of the Select Committee should be commended for their effort on the committee. Unfortunately, one of those members is not here.

Mr. Gunn: He never is here.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am not suggesting that he did not display the same degree of effort on the committee.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Did he turn up?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Most times he did. At other times he was appearing before the Ranger Inquiry—a serious matter. He attended more than three-quarters of the meetings. All members of the committee were conscious that large sums are required to finance health care, that the present proposition is not unreasonable since it will not exceed 3 per cent, and that auxilliary benefits will accrue to contributors.

The member for Mount Gambier illustrated that the South-East Local Government Association considered acting unlawfully, but I never had any doubts that such a responsible body would continue in that course of action. The structure of local government depends on the continuing collection of money from ratepayers. Whether or not ratepayers pay their rates is a function of law, and councils depend on law abiding behaviour for their continuation. On reflection, I am sure the association concerned would be realistic and would accept that, as it requires its ratepayers to abide by the law, it should do the same.

The member for Gouger referred to a poll in which five questions were asked, the most popular question asking whether anything should be paid. Only 92 per cent said that nothing should be paid! Had I voted I would have opted not to pay anything and still get the service provided. An examination of the result of the poll suggests that it does not have the weight that one might normally attach to such a result. The member for Alexandra said that discussions had been held between Kangaroo Island Hospital Incorporated and the Minister about a sum of $700 000. That sum would not escape the notice of the committee. It is not realistic to believe that there is a bag marked "Medibank" into which we can keep digging for funds. That is not how things are financed. The member for Alexandra suggested that he would move a certain amendment, which I have perused. I understand the spirit in which it will be put forward.

The member for Flinders would see, on reflection, that his was not a feasible proposition for the Government and/or the commission to give a different deal to different areas of the State in the way that he suggested. In the terms of the clause, as hard a pill as it may be to swallow, it is something that can be looked at by local government bodies, and allowance can be made having regard to the figure of 3 per cent stipulated. Financially, it will not be easy, as it is not easy at any level of government. We have heard several pronouncements since 1975 on this matter by the Federal Government to the effect that everyone involved with government financing throughout Australia must be prudent and must accept their responsibilities in these matters. I have tried reasonably to cover the matters that have been raised, and I hope I have been able to persuade at least some members opposite to reconsider their position on this clause.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I thank the Minister for his comments. The first question asked of the deputation by the Minister of Health on August 27 was, "What contribution can your board make towards the request for funding of the proposed extensions?" As a member of that deputation, I shared its embarrassment knowing that the board had only $65 000 and ordinarily the board would have been called on to meet one-third of the cost. True, special circumstances apply in respect of, say, the Ceduna hospital regarding the contribution required because a national need for a health service may exist, but otherwise the local community is required to make a large contribution. Unless there is an assured source of income for hospital boards, they will go out the window. The commission, under its Government banner, will direct the sort of representation that shall apply at local government level. I have not and cannot support that principle. It is of paramount importance that local representation on such boards be recognised. Local knowledge should be seriously considered. I support the retention of the principle embodied in this clause so that hospital capital funds can be accumulated and invested at the discretion of the local community, represented by board members.

Mr. COUMBE: Although I appreciate the proper concern expressed by several members on this matter, I have examined the situation as a member for a metropolitan district. In the original Bill there was no upper limit as to the local government levy, the provision being open-ended. The Select Committee has wisely set a definite upper limit, and I do not believe that we will reach the 3 per cent maximum for some time. Metropolitan councils have complained annually about their contributions towards Royal Adelaide Hospital. Accepting that one has to pay for any services received, can the Minister say what is the position in regard to community hospitals? Is the Royal Adelaide Hospital regarded as an incorporated hospital, to serve part of a council area? I understand that the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and others will be incorporated hospitals. They are now public hospitals, as opposed to private or community hospitals. The provisions of subclause (2) (*a*) and (*b*) should be spelt out by the Minister to remove any doubt from the minds of members. Questions are sure to be raised by local government bodies in areas served by public hospitals.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Minister had virtually convinced me of the need for the clause, but then he commented that members on this side had sold local government short regarding the provision of finance for hospitals. I do not think members on this side have done that; I think it is the Minister who has done it. I have the utmost faith in the councils in my area to make the necessary contributions to capital improvements in hospitals in areas under their control. I have no fear that they will shirk that responsibility. In enforcing clause 39, the Minister is selling local government short. He believes it is necessary to provide by Statute that this contribution is made on an annual basis, whether or not it is required by the hospitals every year. I have more faith in the integrity of council members than has the Minister. The Minister said, "No pay, no say," yet recently with regard to local government and full franchise the Government expounded the opposite view. I have gleaned two points from the remarks of the Minister which lead me to believe that the clause should be deleted.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister is suggesting that, because no ceiling was applied to the contributions previously, some big deal in the Bill limits the contribution to 3 per cent. The Bill merely enshrines, probably for all time, what has been happening in the past. There is no concession in the proposals to alleviate this practice. All the Minister can justifiably claim is that fears that the contribution may escalate are overcome by spelling out the benefit.

The practice in the past has caused dissension and now, when health care services are under review, is the appropriate time to delete anomalies and practices which have caused dissension. I refute the suggestion that we are doing country people a disservice with regard to their not paying this levy. I am sure the interest of country people in their local hospitals will not diminish. It is unfortunate that deficit funding could lead to a diminution of local interest. One of the most valuable contributions in this area is made by local voluntary effort. A tremendous infusion of Commonwealth funds for health care has occurred in South Australia. The additional money that has come as the result of the Medibank agreement has been acknowledged in the Budget papers. This is the appropriate time to delete this compulsory contribution from local government, which believes it should be autonomous. I oppose the clause.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The member for Torrens would appreciate that the hospitals listed in the second schedule are included because they are Government-run hospitals and it is expected that they will become incorporated hospitals under the new legislation. Such a hospital would meet the terms specified by the honourable member when he referred to certain portions of the clause. What is likely to happen would not be different from what has happened to date.

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

Page 16, after line 47, insert: (4) Any sum or sums constituted pursuant to this section shall be applied to defray expenses of a capital nature and for no other purpose.

Inserting the new subclause would identify the contribution to board management from local government rate revenue and would ensure that the contribution would be earmarked for capital or structural extension purposes. The member for Fisher said that he thought there should be a ceiling. I point out that, since the introduction of Medibank, there has been a steep increase in the call and requirement at hospital level throughout the State. I refer to a hospital (and I know of others) where the bed average has almost doubled since the introduction of the Medibank financing system. While that system continues to be a free flow encouraging a system for patients and patient care at the hospital level, there will continue to be a growth factor in the call and requirement at such hospitals. In any event, I believe that we now at last have the opportunity to provide proper hospitalisation facilities for the community and, indeed, to many communities in the remote areas of the State that have not enjoyed high-class services in the past.

Any effort to restrict the extension or expansion of hospital facilities where there is an established need would be a retrograde attitude to adopt. Therefore, I cannot agree with the view expressed by the honourable member in that regard. I call on the Committee seriously to consider preserving the principle embodied in the Bill whereby there shall be a contribution from local government on an equitable and fairly shared basis so that all people in the community make a reasonable contribution to the community asset and facility and so that there is no duck-shoving from the responsibility at that level, so that the money will not in any circumstances go into the ordinary daily fund for administration and work purposes but will be clearly identified for the capital works purposes to which I have referred.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I regret, particularly as the logic and reasoning put forward were not totally unsound, that at this stage, bearing in mind that we have had a long and diligent Select Committee hearing, as the representing Minister I am unable to accept the amendment. However, I undertake to represent to my colleague in another place the mover's viewpoint.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I thank the Minister for the remarks he has made and appreciate the position he is in, as the representative of the Minister of Health. I accept in the tone he has expressed his assurance that he has no authority to accept the amendment, but the undertaking that he will convey the amendment to the Minister with the strongest representation on the Committee's behalf.

Amendment negatived.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Connelly, Corcoran, Coumbe, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Mathwin, McRae, Olson, Payne (teller), Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer (teller), Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan, Broomhill, and Jennings. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Becker, and Gunn.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 40 to 59 passed.

Clause 60—"Recognised organisations."

Mr. COUMBE: What is the position if one of the recognised organisations ceases to represent the workers involved? There is no provision for this contingency.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Select Committee intended to ensure that organisations charged with representing their members could continue to enjoy their present position. I will ensure that this matter is considered by the Minister of Health.

Clause passed.

Clauses 61 to 64 passed.

Clause 65—"Regulations."

Dr. EASTICK: Those who are interested in this measure will consider closely any decisions made concerning regulations. However, I am sure that any regulations introduced will allow the proper management of the commission, and that when regulations are laid on the table they will receive close scrutiny.

Clause passed.

Schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I refer to swimming pool contractors, and especially to one instance that has been brought to my attention, and I ask the Premier to introduce controls over the operations of this section of industry. I believe that they fall into a category similar to that of builders. We have taken some action in that direction. Although it was not necessarily the best move, it is one which has been put into operation and which controls builders to some extent.

I refer now to the case of a person, in the southern area of Adelaide, who came to see me after I had made certain comments in the House about a swimming pool company. The complaint which I make tonight, and which I believe is a serious one, is against the same company. The person who approached me went to the swimming pool contractor and asked whether he could have a pool constructed and what would be its price. In reply, the contractor said that, if the client paid cash (and the interpretation was cash in bank notes), he could have built for him, on a level site, any pool in the company's catalogue for $3 900. However, there would be no signed contract. The client agreed to this, and subsequently made the necessary arrangements with the swimming pool company.

It was agreed that $1 200 be paid when the hole had been dug and, if any rock was encountered, an extra charge would be made for removing it. At the time that the rods were tied and the concrete poured a balance of $2 800 would have to be paid, and the total cost, including $200 for tiles on the steps and $100 for a light, would be $4 200. I am led to believe that this price is under the price agreed by the Swimming Pool Contractors Association for building that type of pool.

Realising the circumstances, the client went to A.G.C. to borrow the money, and was asked there to produce a contract. On going to the swimming pool company, the client was given a copy of the contract, which showed a price of $4 220. The manager of the company was not there at the time, he having returned to England because one of his family was ill. However, his wife produced a contract, which was shown to the finance company and which had to be returned to the swimming pool contractor. It was stated that the extra $20 did not count, as the contract was being used only as a method of proving to the finance company that a pool was to be constructed.

It was stated in this discussion that the money was needed quickly, as the swimming pool company had bought into a spaghetti factory. Subsequently, the site was levelled by the client at his own expense, the hole was dug, and rock was encountered. The client has not disputed the cost incurred in removing that rock. Thereafter, a card was left under his door stating that $1 200 had to be paid. That sum was taken in banknotes to the firm by a member of the client's staff. A receipt was given for it in the maiden name of the person who collected the money and who was married. When that aspect was queried, the person delivering the money was told not to be concerned about it because it was her maiden name.

Subsequently, the rods were tied and the concrete was poured. The $2 800 was not asked for, although it was asked thereafter why the money had not been paid. The client said that he had not been asked for the money, but that he would deliver it. It was delivered in cash by the person concerned and, again, a receipt (not necessarily a company receipt but a small receipt) was signed by the same person, using the maiden name. No work was done for five weeks and, when the client asked why, he was told that he had not paid for the extras. He made the point that he had not been given an account for the extras; he had not been told about the extras. He was told that an account had been sent to him; there was a discussion about that, and then the company admitted that it had not been posted, an error had been made and the account had not gone out.

When it arrived, it was for $961·50 in total—$640 for extra rock to be removed; $100-plus for extra concrete, which was never part of any agreement; $70 for extra steel; $30 for fitting extra steel, plus 15 per cent for late payment. The person had never received an account, so how could he have a late payment? It was the first account he had received, and he is being asked for 15 per cent for late payment. The client agreed to pay the $640 for the removal of the rock, but the contractors said they would not go on with the work. On returning home from an interview at that time with a co-director of the firm, he found at the pool that the contractors were working with the tiles. Immediately they learned what had happened, they started to take the tiles off the property.

The client and the business associate attempted to keep some of the tiles because they claimed they had paid for them—$4 000—and a lot of the work had not been done. This ended up in a punch-up, which is the subject of another action, about which I can say no more. However, the person makes the claim that the contractor never shored up the work, but just filled in the concave areas in the excavated hole behind the wall with concrete instead of shoring up, and charged the person for the extra concrete. The client is placed in the position of having to get another contractor to put a price on the job to complete it and taking court action to attempt to salvage some of his money. Certainly, he will not salvage all his money.

It is the second time I have raised the matter; I telephoned the manager and asked him whether he would like to comment without telling him the complaints because I knew he was aware of them, and whether he would like to send a letter to me explaining the position. He promised he would send it last week. I gave him until today, a reasonable thing to do, but I have received no communication. Subsequently, a letter has been passed on through solicitors to the client claiming that an extra $495 is involved, including the pool light, the step, opal light and insert rails—matters that were not raised before or included in the original account as a claim for extras.

I have asked specifically that the Premier, and not the Attorney-General, investigate this matter, because I do not wish to place the Attorney-General in an embarrassing situation, as I have learnt that since the last time I asked

the question the solicitors acting for the company are Cocks, Duncan and Company. So I ask the Premier, and not the Attorney-General, whether he will carry out the investigation, because there could be a conflict of interest. I believe it is necessary to take action in this area and to provide for some control over swimming pool contractors similar to what we have in the building industry.

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): For 24 years from 1950, the trade union movement endeavoured to have reintroduced quarterly cost of living adjustments based on what was considered to be a more equitable way of retaining the purchasing power of wages. They were refused by the Menzies Government on the basis that the economy of the country was such that it could no longer afford to have quarterly cost of living adjustments. The trade union movement argues rightly that, had quarterly cost of living adjustments been maintained, we would not find ourselves confronted with the growth of inflation that we have today. With the retention of quarterly cost of living adjustments unions would have been required to convince the Arbitration Court, as it was then constituted, that increases in wages could only be justified or sustained by proving added qualifications for its members or adjustments through technological change, making them eligible for work value increases.

However, during 1975 the scene changed when the unions finally convinced the Arbitration Commission that wage indexation was justified, and adjustments in accordance with the consumer price index were granted. Even the Prime Minister accepted that a system of adjustment was an equitable system. He indicated in his policy speech that such a system would be recognised as an appropriate way to adjust workers' salaries and wages. That policy continued until full wage indexation extended beyond 6 per cent. Immediately it reached 6·4 per cent, during February, 1976, the Prime Minister (as he did with all his other election promises) repudiated full wage indexation. What has transpired since 1975? On September 18, 1975, full wage indexation was accepted but was thrown overboard two adjustments later and plateau indexation was introduced.

Dr. Tonkin: What was the first guideline laid down by the commission? Will you quote it?

Mr. OLSON: It is interesting to note that, on September 18, 1975, indexation at the rate of 3·5 per cent was granted and an adjustment to the minimum wage—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. OLSON: —was increased to $2·80. On February 17, 1976, an adjustment of 6·4 per cent was granted and the minimum wage was increased by $5. Following plateau indexation, from May 28, 1976—

Dr. Tonkin: Was that based on the first or second guideline?

Mr. OLSON: —a 3 per cent increase was granted to the average wage of $125, and the minimum wage was increased by $3·80.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. OLSON: On August 12, 1976, an increase of 2·5 per cent was granted on an average wage of $166, and above $166 a grand increase of 1·5 per cent was granted! All this took place on the basis that granting full wage indexation would bring about added inflation and, consequently, a curtailment of company profits. To sustain that argument I draw members' attention to the following report appearing in the *Business Age* of Friday, October 1, 1976:

Profits a record $730 000 000! Earnings rise faster than the rate of inflation. Australia's public companies had a record shattering year for profits in 1975-76. The rate or profit increase nearly doubled the inflation rate. This is shown in a special *Business Age* analysis of all company profit reports for the year to June 30. There was a flood of reports yesterday—the last day of the quarter. Another surge is expected today, but they will not change the outlook since more than 90 per cent of companies have reported. The major findings from our preliminary figures are that companies boosted their profits through an onslaught on costs, and that they had a bad second half year. Up to yesterday about 470 companies had reported their June 30 results. Their figures show that the average company profit jumped by 21·2 per cent, compared with the inflation rate of 12·5 per cent;

Mr. Mathwin: It makes your mouth water, doesn't it?

Mr. OLSON: It will, when the honourable member hears what I say in a minute. The report continues:

The total of profit reported was $730 000 000 against $602 000 000 made by the same companies in 1974-75; a total 78 per cent of companies lifted profits for the year, while almost two-thirds beat the inflation rate; shareholders shared the benefits: 43 per cent of all companies raised their dividends, 36 per cent held them while 7 per cent cut them; slightly more than 4 per cent made free share issues.

Members interjecting:

Mr. OLSON: It would be best if I read the remainder of the report so that the information might sink into the minds of honourable members opposite.

Mr. Mathwin: Why don't you have the remainder of the report incorporated in *Hansard* without reading it?

Mr. OLSON: If I did that, the information would be passed over by honourable members opposite in the same way as they ignore employees, trying to reduce their salaries and thereby reduce their standard of living. Opposition members should note that while I am a member of this House I will do my best to help them learn and assimilate such information. What will be the position confronting workers in the future? They will be expected to take another cut. I tell honourable members opposite that that is not just on. I tell you that it would be a profitable venture—

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask you to rule on the point that the honourable member has referred to honourable members on this side as "you". That is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. The member for Semaphore must refer to members as "honourable members".

Mr. OLSON: Thank you, Sir, I will refer to members opposite as "honourable members" if it pleases them. Honourable members opposite would be well advised to go back to their supporters in the Chamber of Manufactures and the Chamber of Commerce and convey the message from the trade union movement that, if they want wage indexation to continue, the profits that are being made should be taken into consideration and a percentage of profits should flow into pay packets of those who are instrumental in obtaining those profits. Unless employers accept that, I assure honourable members opposite that wage indexation will go out the door so far as the trade union movement is concerned.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have listened to the ridiculous tirade of the member for Semaphore, and I refer to the first wage indexation guideline laid down by the commission, as follows:

(1) The commission will adjust its award wages and salaries each quarter in relation to the most recent movement of the six-capitals consumer price index unless it is persuaded to the contrary by those seeking to oppose the adjustment.

If the honourable member had taken the trouble to read the guidelines and understand them, he would realise they justified the Commonwealth Government's approach to the commission when he accuses it of backing-off, and he makes absolute nonsense of the rest of his remarks. I hope that he will take a lesson from it.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: My purpose this evening is to correct some most serious allegations made by the Premier in the media outside of this House last week. These allegations, serious in the extreme, were made even more significant in their emphasis because they were reported fully, whilst comments the Opposition had been able to make were neglected. I take this opportunity to put the record straight, so that the people of South Australia may know the position. The Premier publicly accused the Opposition of deliberately holding up the proceedings in this House, particularly in relation to the Budget.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We agree with that.

Dr. TONKIN: If the Minister associates himself with that sort of accusation, it is unworthy of him and he is putting himself into the same class of hypocritical and spineless—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Nothing of the sort.

Dr. TONKIN: Words fail me. I am surprised at the Minister. The matter can be distilled simply to this: the Premier accused the Opposition of asking repetitious questions. We did ask repetitious questions, because we did not get any answers. I will use two examples. It took five separate questions of the Premier to get any sort of details from him on the staffing of his department. He dodged the answer as much as possible, and finally got around to giving bare figures and nothing else in response to individual questions on individual sections.

The Minister of Community Welfare was in the same situation in referring to the report of the inquiry being conducted into the McNally Training Centre. It was necessary to ask him four times whether the report was to be made public and whether the inquiry was to be a public inquiry. Four times he refused to answer. He took four or five minutes each time in refusing to answer the question. The Premier has the gall to accuse the Opposition, outside this House, of being repetitious. It was a farrago of rubbish that the Premier was talking.

For the first part of this session, since the beginning of June, the House has not been considering Government business later than 10 p.m. We have followed the recommendations of the Standing Orders that were brought in in the time of this Government, and we were adjourning at about 10.30 p.m. Suddenly, when the Budget was in, it became necessary—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: —to sit into the small hours of the morning. I do not know what this has got to do with the Budget, but obviously it is connected with the fact that the Budget is the most significant document to come into this House. The Opposition has a duty to examine it most carefully, and it has exercised that duty. It was hampered by the evasiveness of the Ministers, but nevertheless the Opposition spent 36¼ hours in all considering the Budget. I am complaining because we spent the majority of that time sitting until 4 a.m. on Wednesday and 4.45 a.m. on Thursday, as all members here well know. However, 36¼ hours is nothing compared with the period of more than 48 hours spent in two successive years, 1968 and 1969, by the Australian Labor Party when it was in Opposition. This is a matter the Premier carefully did not mention.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When there were no time limits on speeches.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not care whether or not there were time limits. The Minister has shown quite clearly what an inhibiting influence the time limits have been. I repeat: 48 hours plus in 1968 and 1969, and the Opposition on this occasion spent 36¼ hours. The Premier brushed aside the suggestion of a reporter that an excessive amount of time had been spent by the Labor Party when it was in Opposition by saying that those were exceptional circumstances. Of course, they were exceptional circumstances from his point of view—the exceptional circumstances were that the Labor Party was in Opposition. The Labor Party had rights, when in Opposition, that were respected by the Liberal Government of the day, unlike the present situation, which was summed up clearly a little over a year ago by the member for Spence when, by way of interjection, he called across the Chamber "You have no rights: you are the Opposition," and he will never live that down or forget it. The exceptional circumstances were that the Labor Opposition was accorded rights by the Liberal Government of the day, whereas this Opposition is given no consideration and no rights at all. To complain about 36¼ hours, when the Labor Party spent 48 hours—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections from honourable members on both sides of the House. The honourable Leader.

Dr. TONKIN: —in two successive years is hypocritical in the extreme.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader is being very provocative when he fails to mention the time limits introduced by—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The honourable Leader.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister can try to waste my time if he wishes. The second major point is that it is the Government which decides the sittings of the House, and no-one else. If the business is not going through as fast as the Government wants it to go through, we could sit more frequently. This is the twenty-eighth day of sitting of the session. We sat in the first week in June, and we did not come back until the last week in July. We had two weeks off for the show. We have had another week off, and we had an evening off for a birthday party. We could have been sitting every week since the first week in June if we had wished to and, in that way, there would have been no necessity for the long hours spent on the Budget, and we could have been keeping hours according to Standing Orders. The Government did not choose to sit

for more than a proportion of the available days and, in doing so, it has deprived the Opposition of Question Time, private members' time, and of grievance time, all of which are dependent on one day's sitting. In this way, the Government has restricted the Opposition's freedom of speech in almost exactly the same way as if it had applied the guillotine.

The business of the House could have been speeded up if the Government had chosen to sit more frequently. Again, it is hypocritical in the extreme to accuse the Opposition of holding up business. The Government has not chosen to sit. The Government has no regard for the rights of the Opposition and, in having no regard for those rights, it has no regard for the rights of private members or for the entire system of Parliamentary democracy. It is an arrogant and hypocritical Government, which is deliberately misleading the people. It does not deserve to govern in this State, and I sincerely trust that the people will wake up to the con job being pulled on them.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 14, at 2 p.m.