HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 3, 1972

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

OMBUDSMAN BILL

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

QUESTIONS

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what action the Government has taken to ensure the future of the shipbuilding industry in this State, particularly that part of it based at Whyalla? At the launching at Whyalla last Friday of the most recent ship built there, some doubts were expressed about the future of the shipbuilding industry in Australia, more particularly as a result of Westernport, in Victoria, having been suggested or promoted as an alternative shipbuilding site. I have mentioned Whyalla particularly because already a ship of 78,000 tons capacity has been built there and, obviously, the advancement of the industry has greater potential at Whyalla than at Birkenhead. It has also been stated that it is difficult to maintain the order books of the shipbuilding industry in Australia, and, of course, that includes the industry at the two sites in South Australia. As an announcement has been made that Commonwealth Government funds and subsidies will be made available to the shipbuilding industry, I ask the Premier whether he can say what action the Government has taken in respect of this industry, which is vital to the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has constantly made representations to the Commonwealth Government on behalf of the shipbuilding industry in South Australia. For a long time the Commonwealth Government has failed to release the Tariff Board's report, and we have not had proposed from the Commonwealth Government the kind of assistance to the shipbuilding industry in Australia that we certainly need. South Australia, with 40 per cent of the Australian shipbuilding capacity, is in need of marked assistance of a kind that has not been offered. I have investigated the proposals that have been reported in the press relating to some prospect of development at Westernport, in Victoria, but it seems to me that there is no official basis for this kind of proposal. Some consultants in the shipbuilding industry have tried to promote the project and have a feasibility study made of the Westernport development, supported by Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, the State Government of Victoria, and the Commonwealth Government, but so far they have not been able to do that. The economics of the shipbuilding industry in Australia would not justify it on any national basis, and the press announcement seems to be a certain amount of kite flying by the consultants, who would like to be paid for a feasibility study on development in the area. I do not think the proposal at present amounts to anything more than that.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry state what is the Government's policy and what action, if any, he has taken or intends to take concerning the present industrial dispute involving officials of the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation going on to building sites where foundations are being poured, and stopping this work unless the men employed join that union? In some cases police have been called in to prevent possible violence. Does the Minister, in his official capacity, approve of this action by this union and, if he does not, can he say what action he intends to take to allow this portion of the house-building industry to proceed?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Concerning my taking precautions against violence, I believe that that matter is in the hands of the Police Force and, no doubt, any breaches would be brought to its attention. Details of the industrial dispute have not come to my notice, and I have not been asked to do anything about it. However, I will obtain a report.

COMMONWEALTH GRANT

Mr. RYAN: As a result of the behind-the-scene hand-out of $15,000,000 to the New South Wales Liberal Government by the McMahon Government, can the Premier say whether representations are to be made to call a Premiers' Conference so that this matter can be discussed at top level and a decision made about what action is to be taken by the other States?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premiers of the Labor-governed States have asked repeatedly for a Premiers' Conference, because of the difficult situation facing all States on

employment and budgetary matters. A conference has been refused by the Prime Minister, and the proposal has not been supported by Premiers of the Liberal-governed States. The Prime Minister refuses (or at least has not answered) our request for assistance to provide employment in urban areas, and he has not replied to our proposals for a Premiers' Conference. However, despite the representations made to him at the last Premiers' Conference about the budgetary situation facing the States, he has now announced that he will give a $15,000,000 grant (or at least it is a loan, but it will be on a deferred interest basis) to New South Wales because of that State's budgetary situation. The budgetary situation in New South Wales is no different from the budgetary situation here, other than that its Budget is brought in a little closer to the date of the Commonwealth election. It is extraordinary that the Prime Minister should be prepared to advance $15,000,000 to New South Wales, while simply not replying to any request for a much smaller proportionate sum to assist a grave and urgent need in South Australia.

Mr. Hopgood: There are lots of marginal seats around Sydney.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That may well be the reason. At present, we have no reply from Canberra, despite repeated requests to meet us.

HILLS SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works clarify the position with regard to subdivision in the Hills area? Last week, the Minister said in this House that he did not believe any alteration had been made to the 20-acre subdivision limit, yet I have evidence that his department has refused permission for a subdivision of 20 acres because that would be against the new policy of the Government. In view of this action by his department since he made his statement last week, will the Minister clarify the position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member can point to a specific case in which the department has refused permission for subdivision, where the allotments have not been smaller than the 20-acre limit, I shall be interested to learn about this from him. If there was a refusal, there must have been a reason for it other than that it was on the basis of general policy. I state categorically that there has been no change in policy in relation to subdivision in the catchment area with regard to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Last week, the member for Kavel referred to a statement of the Minister of Environment and Conservation about foreshadowed amendments to the Planning and Development Act that involved a provision that subdivided allotments must be no smaller than, I think, 74 acres. At the time, I said that I knew nothing about these foreshadowed amendments, and that was the truth. Since then my colleague has told me that he has been considering amendments to the Planning and Development Act in this respect, but they are with regard to rural areas. I make it clear that this does not affect the policy of the E. & W.S. Department in relation to subdivision in the water catchment area.

Mr. McAnaney: I'll give you the evidence.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not merely a question of giving me the evidence. If an application has been refused, there must be some special circumstance, because no refusal will have been made on the basis of Government policy. I make that perfectly clear, and I hope the honourable member understands it. I want to spell out for the honourable member that the amendments to which the Minister of Environment and Conservation has referred have no effect on the policy of the Government with regard to the water catchment area. Even if the foreshadowed amendments were incorporated in the Planning and Development Act, it would still be competent for the E. & W.S. Department to issue certificates allowing subdivision in the watershed area of allotments that were not smaller than 20 acres. I shall be interested to receive from the honourable member details of this specific case, which I will examine. I will let him have a report on the matter as soon as possible.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport seen the report in yesterday's *News* attributed to Mr. C. T. Daddow (South Australian President, National Safety Council) which purports to show that South Australian schoolchildren are prevented from receiving instruction in road safety principles, and will he say whether there is any truth in that report?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have seen the report. Briefly stated, the claims made by Mr. Daddow are completely untrue. I am concerned that a person holding a position such as that held by Mr. Daddow should make statements of this nature. The Road

Safety Council is concerned that such irresponsible statements can be made, especially considering the kind of work it undertakes. I believe it desirable to give the House background information on this question in the light of the claims made by Mr. Daddow in yesterday's press report, as follows:

Mr. Daddow said the council prepared a safety programme in 1968 and referred it to the State and Federal Governments. The then Attorney-General, Mr. Millhouse, agreed with certain points in the programme and said nothing should stand in its way.

The article then goes on. Since the former Labor Government established the Road Safety Council in 1965, much attention has been given to road safety education in schools. As early as 1968, with the approval of the then Director-General of Education a special joint planning committee was set up by the council and the Education Department. This committee included education experts from the Education Department and the Kindergarten Union. In 1969 a comprehensive report was submitted embodying wide changes to road safety education in schools. The most significant feature of the recommendations was that road safety instruction must be embodied in the school curriculum at all levels: preschool, kindergarten, primary and secondary. The syllabuses were drawn up covering programmes of instruction on a progressive basis in three broad areas namely: first, the protective area, pre-school and primary; secondly, the disciplinary or early responsible area, middle and upper primary; and thirdly, the responsible area, lower and higher secondary. The inherent feature of this programme was its progressive character leading through to extra-curricular driver-training courses at the 16-year-old driver licensing age.

In 1969, the then Director-General of Education announced his acceptance of the report in full; road safety instruction was to be incorporated in the curriculum and pilot courses for the introduction of the syllabus for the secondary level were to be introduced. In less than three years a comprehensive co-ordinated road safety education syllabus covering kindergarten through to secondary school level on a progressive basis became an accepted part of the school curriculum. Thus, South Australia was the first State in the Commonwealth to introduce a policy of school education in road safety. Much co-ordinated effort by the council and the Education Department has been necessary to ensure that the programme was accepted by headmasters and that the content was practical, positive and up-to-date. Following a series of specially organized pilot courses, special inservice conferences of secondary teachers have been held each year. Carefully prepared road safety literature was distributed to all schools in the State at all levels, whether Government or private. In addition, the essential ingredient of experienced, trained lecturers was met by council field staff, all of whom are specially trained. In the financial year ended June 30, 427 visits were made in schools throughout the State by the field staff. In addition, they attended and instructed at the children's road safety school established at Millicent in the South-East.

Mr. Hall: Is this a reply or a speech?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that the member for Gouger is not greatly interested in road safety but, fortunately, most of the people of South Australia are interested in it. He and Mr. Daddow probably fit into a category together.

Mr. Hall: That's an insulting remark. What about obeying Standing Orders and stop giving a speech!

Mr. Mathwin: He's had a nasty weekend again.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think the member for Glenelg should enter into this, either. He may learn something if he sits and listens quietly.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Further support to the programme was given by the Police Department at the children's road safety instruction centre at Thebarton, where 14,000 children have attended. The Road Safety Instruction Centre due to be opened later this month at Oaklands Park will cater for courses for children at all levels of education by practical courses which have been designed to meet the requirements of the curriculum. Perhaps the member for Gouger and the member for Glenelg will grace us with their presence and see at first hand what has been done and what is being done. They have already been invited to do so.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Similar centres for children are being planned by service clubs at Elizabeth, Whyalla and Port Pirie. These are being designed by the Road Safety Council and will be manned by field staff. The foregoing facts are crystal clear evidence that a workable and positive programme of road safety instruction for all schools in South Australia is, in fact, operating as part of the general curriculum. No charge whatever is imposed

for this. The fact of the matter is that, in place of a haphazard and unorganized method of road safety instruction, particularly in the lower secondary levels, an efficient system employing modern techniques and traffic skills is now uniformly applied. It is worth repeating—

Mr. Hall: Oh, no.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —that South Australia, far from being backward in this sphere, let alone "preventing children of their right to learn self-preservation on our roads", leads the way in the Commonwealth in its endeavours to educate school students on the following three objectives: (1) the need to obey road rules and understand the meaning of these rules; (2) to prevent accidents; and (3) to develop the correct attitude of mind when using the road by the acceptance of responsibility of correct road usage. It is incredible that a person purporting to hold a responsible position can make such grossly incorrect and misleading allegations.

Mr. McAnaney: You're doing it all the time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is evident that he knows little of the subject. Not only are his statements untrue but also they are disturbingly mischievous. The inescapable conclusion is that Mr. Daddow, like the members for Gouger, Heysen, and Glenelg, does not know what he is talking about.

SECONDHAND CAR SALES

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked last week about secondhand car dealers opening their business premises and trading on Sundays?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Government has twice this year introduced amendments to the Industrial Code to extend the definition of a shop to include a used car yard. Some time ago, when my department sought to institute proceedings against a used car dealer for trading on Sunday, the Crown Solicitor advised that the definition of a shop did not appear to be wide enough to make it an offence for vehicles to be sold from a yard, although it is an offence to sell motor vehicles or any other non-exempt goods from a shop that is within a building. It is therefore not an offence for used cars to be sold outside shop trading hours if they are sold from a yard as distinct from within a building. On both occasions that the Government attempted to solve the present problem the Bill was not accepted by the Legislative Council and accordingly lapsed. Inspectors of the Labour and Industry Department are aware of the practice which has recently developed of used car lots trading on Sundays but they can do nothing to prevent it unless the Act is amended.

STEELWORKS WATER RATE

Mr. BROWN: Can the Minister of Works say whether a conference has taken place between the Government and Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited about the proposed increase in charges for water used at the Whyalla steelworks? If such a conference has taken place, what were the results? Under the Indenture Act, agreement between the Government and the company must be reached if the Government wishes to increase water rates.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In late 1970, I conferred in Melbourne with Sir Ian McLennan, and the company accepted an increase in the charge for water supplied to the Whyalla plant from 20 c to 35c a thousand gallons, which was then the ruling rate. Since then, I have contacted the company because the price of rebate water has been increased from 35c to 40c. The company has now agreed to accept an increase in the price paid to the Government for water delivered to Whyalla to 40c a thousand gallons, provided that the Government assumes responsibility for a reticulated water supply at Iron Knob (or at least carries out a feasibility study on the project). I have agreed to do this, so from November 1 the charge for water used at the Whyalla plant of the company will be 40c a thousand gallons.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say what is the current position regarding Government involvement in drought relief schemes in South Australia? It must be obvious to the Premier, as it is to all members, that the season has worsened dramatically during the last few weeks and that whether or not rain falls in the immediate future some rural producers will incur serious losses. I received a note yesterday from a constituent who is one of the few people who has a fine standing crop which he is contemplating cutting for hay, but the person who wishes to buy it would have to receive some form of drought assistance, possibly similar to the assistance given in 1967-68 when loans, I understand, were made by the Government for the purchase of fodder. My constituent wants to know

whether the Government plans to make available to prospective purchasers loan moneys in the same way as loan moneys were made available on the previous occasion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have not initiated any new drought relief proposals. The Commonwealth Government has put limitations on what it will spend on drought relief, requiring this State to spend more than what would be a proportionate amount before it gives any relief. Certainly, the situation regarding the wheat crop has become worrying in the past few weeks because, as most of the seeding was done late in the season, the crop now needs rain which normally does not fall early in October and which in other years with earlier seeding would have damaged the crops. We will be watching the position closely. If there are difficulties facing specific farmers and if members give us the information, we shall be able to assess the position and act accordingly. If there is a need for further special drought relief measures in South Australia, naturally the Government will take those measures.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he supports compulsory unionism? I refer to the recent unrest in which the builders labourers union and other unions have been involved, with union officials forcing on workers at certain building sites the option of either their joining the union or having the job declared black. These men are left with the choice of either being forced to join a union or losing their livelihood, their job. I ask the Minister whether he agrees with this method of enforcing compulsory unionism.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I think I have replied already to a similar question by the member for Torrens earlier this afternoon. I pointed out then that I did not agree with violence and I said that anyone who committed an offence, an assault on another person, would be dealt with by the police. I think the honourable member and his colleagues are well aware that the Government's policy in relation to unionists is one of preference to unionists. I have not had a communication from any union involved in the matters mentioned or from any member of such a union. However, I have promised to obtain a report on the matter for the member for Torrens, and I will do likewise for the member for Glenelg.

DOG REGISTRATION

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question about the reason for the grant to the Woomera Board for dog registration and control?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The sum provided in the Estimates of Expenditure under "Woomera Board for dog registration and control" is a provision for a grant to the Woomera Board to help that body maintain and operate a pound at Woomera.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say which Minister or department is responsible or will be responsible for liaising with the new Commonwealth Minister for Decentralization and Regional Development? About two weeks ago it was announced that there would be a conference with the Prime Minister regarding decentralization and regional development. The national press today reports that a portfolio covering this important issue will be allotted soon.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am interested in this belated election-eve attitude of the Commonwealth Government, after I have listed matters of urban and regional development for Premiers' Conferences for many years without being able to get any sort of dialogue with the Commonwealth Government. The Leader has asked who will be dealing with the present Commonwealth Government in the short remaining period that it is in office. I point out to the Leader that the press statement is, perhaps, not atypical of the Liberal Party at present: half the time that Party's right hand does not seem to know what the left hand is doing. The Prime Minister asked me to meet in Premiers' Conference about this, and I agreed. The Prime Minister has said that the Premiers will meet about this matter, that a joint secretariat will be established, and that officers will then meet with officers of the Comonwealth Government. I have agreed to that proposal. If the honourable member is suggesting that we must have some new Ministerial conjoint arrangement, this suggestion doubtless comes from an announcement by Mr. Chipp. I do not know whether Mr. Chipp has consulted the Prime Minister about the matter, because most of this exercise by the Commonwealth Government seems to have been done fairly hurriedly. However, if something at Ministerial level is involved, obviously the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who is in charge of the State Planning

Authority and responsible directly and administratively for regional planning in South Australia and who also is the Minister assisting me in the development field—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And doing a good job.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He is doing an excellent job. The Minister of Environment and Conservation will be dealing with whichever Commonwealth Minister is ever appointed if the Prime Minister has developed some new initiative of the kind that Mr. Chipp is talking about. I do not know about that yet, having had only the suggestion of the Premiers' Conference from the Prime Minister.

NORTH ADELAIDE RESERVOIR

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on the extent of the work now proceeding at the North Adelaide reservoir and on the trunk main that apparently is about to be laid down Barton Terrace, North Adelaide, for which the pipes are *in situ?*

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Certainly, and I will bring it down as soon as possible.

DOMICILIARY CARE

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Works, in the temporary absence of the Attorney-General, ask the Minister of Health whether he will consider making available a limited sum to the Royal Adelaide Hospital to provide domiciliary care for aged persons? I understand that social workers at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the past have been able to provide limited assistance from various benevolent and other funds, but these funds are becoming exhausted. Providing finance on a temporary basis, pending the Bright committee's report on community health becoming available, would be a great help to some elderly patients.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague to investigate this request, and to obtain a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

MURRAY RIVER SYSTEM

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on water available in the Murray River system this year? During past years sufficient water has not been retained in Lake Alexandrina, with the result that, at the end of summer in dry years, the level of the lake has been lower than it should be. At present, the level of the lake is considerably lower than the level at which it should be maintained, and people living in the area are concerned about the possible level of the lake later in the season. I am sure that a reassurance by the Minister on this matter would be of great benefit to them.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

GEPPS CROSS ABATTOIR

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he is aware of the crisis that has developed in the rate of damage caused by careless workers at the Gepps Cross abattoir when skinning sheep and lambs, and whether he is aware of the economic consequences of this damage? I have been told by members of the skin trade that the increasing incidence of damage to skins at the abattoir has reached a crisis point and, during a recent three-week assessment, the damage to sheep and lamb skins varied from a low point of 52 per cent to a high point of 75 per cent. Estimated on a skin basis, that is 28c for every sheep skin and 56c for every lamb skin, a loss for 12 months caused by carelessness of about $133,000 for sheep and about $470,000 for lambs, a total of more than $600,000. I remind the Minister that the amount of average damage caused at private works is less than 50 per cent, so that the incidence of damage to skins is heavily weighted unfavourably against the Gepps Cross abattoir operations. This situation represents a real loss to producers throughout the State who have sheep and lambs treated at the metropolitan works. I hope that the Minister will take urgent action to have this damage at least reduced to the level obtaining at private killing works in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague to obtain a report from the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, and I will also ask him to seek ways and means of reducing this damage, which is obviously serious.

HAWTHORNDENE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Works say what plans the Engineering and Water Supply Department has to upgrade the water supply available for Hawthorndene, Belair, and surrounding districts? I have received seven telephone calls in the past 24 hours from people who are complaining about this situation, and I should like to quote from a letter written to me by a constituent, as follows:

In October 1964 or thereabouts we were connected to the E. & W.S. mains water supply from a tank on Foote Hill, just east of Hawthorndene. At that time there were few

houses served and we had a good, though very hard, supply. In 1970 and 1971, as more houses were built, the supply failed on a very few hot days in summer, as the tank ran empty, and recovered quickly. Yesterday, October 1, the first warm Sunday of 1972, the water supply failed at 1 p.m., and until 10.30 p.m. we got alternate supplies of mud, froth and air, with now and then some water. It is apparent that demand upon the supply tank has the capability of outrunning the pumps which fill it. Would you be able to ascertain whether the E. & W.S. has any plans to increase the service.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can forward the letter to the Minister.

Mr. Evans: That is the explanation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: From memory, I think a sum was voted to build two new 2,000,000-gall. storage tanks, but as I am not certain where they were to be built, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

HOME UNIT RATING

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has considered (or is considering) an equitable system of rating for home units? I think I may claim confidently that more home units have been established or are being built in my district than in any part of the metropolitan area. I am fully aware that the Waterworks Act contains provisions that make legal the imposition of rating on home units as single residences, but it is common knowledge that, where once one single residence occupied a building block, today the block contains as many as four, six, eight, or even more home units, each rated as a single residence. As a result, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and councils are really gathering in the shekels. Many middle-aged couples, thinking that they would reduce their outgoings, have sold their property and invested in a home unit. I wonder how many land agents told their clients that they would probably pay as much in rates as, if not more than, they paid in respect of the home they occupied previously. Today, I have received a letter from a resident in a home unit in which he states:

As you can see by my address, I occupy a home unit. There are three other units on this block apart from mine and we are all expected to pay in the vicinity of $100 a year rates. My rebate allowance is 131,000 gall., and I presume the others are about the same, making a total of over 520,000 gall. There is only one meter on the block, so you can see how silly the whole thing is. I would venture to say that we will not use 80,000gall. for the year. I can understand that we have all got to pay separate sewer rates, but why not proportion the water rates on a more realistic basis? My wife and I are aged pensioners, and this is quite a blow to us as we sold up our home and put the money into a home unit so that, amongst other things, we thought we would cut our expenses down but, to our dismay, they are higher than when we were keeping a house going. As there are virtually hundreds of units in this district, they are probably all in the same position. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is being allowed to get away with this imposition to the tune of thousands of dollars because unit occupants are paying for something which they are not receiving.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Much thought has been given to this matter. I think that the honourable member will appreciate that it has concerned not only this Government but also several previous Governments, because home units have now been established in South Australia for a considerable time. What the honourable member has referred to applies to other cases as well as to home units. For instance, a person who owns a vacant block can say that he is paying rates for something from which he receives no benefit. However, the fact that these services are available does add value to the block if it is ever used to build on. The honourable member will be aware that the Sangster committee's report, which has now been with the Government for almost 18 months, contains—

Mr. Coumbe: The honourable member wouldn't be aware of that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would be aware that the Sangster committee was appointed by her Government. I have told the House several times that its report was received in November, 1970.

Mr. Coumbe: She wouldn't be aware of its contents.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, but I intended to refer to a matter it touched on. I think that the member for Davenport can appreciate, too, that we cannot treat home units as an isolated case. Any move to do something in this direction will have vast and far-reaching ramifications. In other words, if any change is made in this area, the whole system will have to be changed.

Mrs. Steele: That's what I think people are after.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the sort of change that these people contemplate were made with regard to charges for water used, unfortunately they might get a shock. I do not honestly believe that these people have

considered what would happen, for instance, in the case of the square mile of the city of Adelaide. As a result of a change, it could be that people would have to pay more for the water they used than they are paying currently under the present system. The Government must be particularly careful about these factors. As I appreciate the honourable member's question, I do not want her to think that I am angry with her for asking it, because I am not. Our difficulty is explaining to people the problems we have with regard to the matter. Although the evaluation of this report has been going on for so long, no result has yet been received by me; this shows how difficult and complicated the problem is, as senior officers of the E. & W.S. Department have been working on this constantly. The report involves not only the metropolitan and township supplies: it also covers country district water supplies. If and when I receive the results of the evaluation of the report, I will have to submit them to the Treasury, which will have to examine them; then the matter will have to go before Cabinet. At this stage, I can only say that we are well aware of what appears to be an injustice. However, I ask the honourable member and other honourable members to bear with us in trying to solve this extremely complicated problem. Although I sympathize with owners of home units, owners of shops in groups of shops, and other people who are affected, I should like these people to appreciate the problems we face in trying to arrive at an equitable and just system to replace the present system. That is all I can tell the honourable member at this stage.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Local Government report on progress made in investigating the possible revision of local government boundaries and, in particular, can he indicate whether the investigators will consider the expansion of the metropolitan area and its effect on local government? In my district, the expansion of the metropolitan area has meant that the council districts of Meadows and Noarlunga have areas that are extensively built up. In addition, farther to the south large rural tracts are being built on. I imagine that a similar situation would apply, say, in the Munno Para council area in the District of Salisbury and possibly in the Tea Tree Gully District, and perhaps the city of Tea Tree Gully will be facing a similar situation. As this development creates budgetary and administrative problems for these councils, one would think that in any future amalgamations the realistic boundary of the metropolitan area should be considered.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is too early at this stage to give specific information of the type required by the honourable member. The first step to be taken in this matter is to determine the present attitude of councils. I have often said that the Government is willing to institute a boundaries commission to review local government boundaries generally throughout the State, subject to this move's being supported by councils. At present it is the object of officers of the Local Government Office to visit each of the 137 councils, explain the problems involved, answer any questions associated with the scheme, and seek the views of councils. When that task is completed, the decision will be made whether or not such a commission will be instituted. If the commission is appointed, I think that the question raised by the member for Mawson becomes most relevant. A decision will have to be made on the point he has raised, because the first job will be to write the terms of reference of the commission and then, subsequently, to appoint the commission. I deeply appreciate the problems the expanding metropolis has caused many district councils which now meet the status requirements in the Act relating to cities. Therefore, they have the choice of becoming cities but, for reasons best known to themselves, some of them do not wish to become cities. I think that they are waiting for the outcome of the consideration of complete redistribution.

The other important point about this is that in several areas, if redistribution does not occur, the future can be described only as extremely bleak. Many council areas within the State are simply not economically viable units. The only solution that I can see to the problem is to deal with it in its entirety rather than try to tackle it in a piecemeal way. I sincerely hope that the former course is taken. I can only repeat that, if the councils that are being consulted support this point of view, the point raised by the honourable member will certainly be considered.

ABORIGINAL EMBASSY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say what instructions, if any, have been given to the police about what is known as the Aboriginal embassy in Brougham Place, North Adelaide? Last Friday, when I was asked publicly to express an opinion on the

Aboriginal embassy, I said, amongst other things, that I was not in favour of the removal of the embassy simply for the sake of its removal but that, if any of those concerned with the embassy committed offences, they should be dealt with by the police in the ordinary way. Since I said that, several people have been in touch with me to the effect that several offences have been committed and are continuing to be committed by those concerned with the embassy or by those who are thereabouts, but that the hands of the police officers are tied because they have been told by the Premier that no action should be taken. I ask this question of the Premier so that this matter may be cleared up one way or the other.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The statement that the policemen's hands are tied in this matter and that they have been told anything by me that would run counter to the normal exercise of their police duties is completely untrue and baseless.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you said anything to anyone?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, except that, in response to complaints that were received (complaints made not by people at the embassy but by persons complaining about it), a report was asked for from the Commissioner of Police about the kind of attention the police were paying to ensure that the law was enforced normally in that area as it is elsewhere. Those are the only communications that have passed between the Government and the police on the matter. The Government has received reports about the attention the police have paid to ensure that offences were not committed. However, no instruction has otherwise been given to the police. The police are expected to carry out their normal law-enforcement duties in that area as in any other. The statement that the hands of the police are in some ways tied or that an instruction has been given by the Government is completely baseless and a complete untruth.

LAND BROKERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to proceed with its legislation on land brokerage in South Australia? It has been suggested that the Government intends to introduce legislation to compel land brokerage transactions to take place in other than land agents offices and that substantial changes are to be made to the present system of land conveyancing. It is reported in today's *Advertiser* that Dr. P. R. Wilson (Acting Head of the Sociology Department of the Queensland University), who has been investigating this matter, strongly opposes any change along the lines foreshadowed by the Government, and that he intends to report that he believes the South Australian system is by far the most satisfactory system operating in Australia at present.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to this morning's report in which Dr. Wilson makes the following statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked the Premier a question and then he goes on to read from the newspaper an alleged report of a statement made by some person from another State. That is not an explanation of a question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has discussed over a considerable period the provisions of an agency Bill which would relate to the proper activities of persons in various classes of business activity in South Australia as part of our total consumer protection legislation. The proposals that have been discussed in no way alter land transfer transactions in South Australia to the situation existing in other States, where such transactions are performed by solicitors and based on a sliding scale of charges related to the value of the property transferred. That has been made clear from the outset and, as is proper in all such matters, the Government has discussed various draft proposals with the professional bodies concerned in order to get their views. The proposal put by the Government to the Real Estate Institute was a proposal of the Land Agents Board resulting from its investigation of land transfer transactions in South Australia. The suggestion of the Land Agents Board, which is the statutory body responsible for advising the Government on these matters and other matters arising from complaints dealt with before it, was that the original situation of land brokerage should be enforced in South Australia: that a land broker dealing with the preparation of documents in real property transactions should be independent of parties interested in the transaction and should be able to give independent advice without any financial involvement personally. That was the proposition discussed. At this stage no such measures have been introduced. What happened

then was that, those concerned having been informed of the proposal of the Land Agents Board, one of the most despicable, untruthful and misrepresenting campaigns that has ever been put before the South Australian public was initiated by a certain group of land agents in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: That's too strong.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN, It is true. It was a complete misrepresentation of the proposals, and a complete misrepresentation of what they had been told had been put forward by the Land Agents Board. They deliberately desired to misrepresent the position to the public, on the basis of trying to tell the South Australian public that there was some advantage in having land brokers employed by the land agents who were seeking to involve the public in certain land transactions. The statements made in the press and in the campaign were improperly and deliberately designed to mislead the public about the nature of the proposals. None of the things said to result from the proposals was in fact the case and the people who initiated the campaign were well aware of that fact.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They were lies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They were lies.

Mr. Millhouse: You say that deliberately?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Millhouse: You believe there have been deliberate untruths?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe there have been deliberate untruths in this matter. The honourable member knows that the proposals initiated by the Land Agents Board in no way involve a proposition—

Mr. Millhouse: I asked that they be made public and you refused—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. It is about time he learned to observe the Standing Orders of this House and to conduct himself in a proper manner. The interjections are not to be dealt with. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The suggestion that the Government has proposed to hand over the preparation of Real Property Act documents to the legal profession in South Australia is completely false, completely untrue, and deliberately so. The proposition that we had a proposal for altering the nature of charges on land transfer transactions to one involving a sliding scale of fees comparable with that existing in other States is also completely and deliberately untrue.

Mr. Goldsworthy: So they're liars?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member draws the inference.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I'm not saying it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is saying it.

Mr. Millhouse: You're the one who's saying it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have said clearly that what has happened here is that there has been a deliberate campaign of misrepresentation by people who knew that those two statements that the Government was proposing to transfer land transactions—

Dr. Eastick: How did they know?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The people concerned were involved in discussions concerning the draft proposals as a result of the Land Agents Board's recommendations to the Government. That is how they knew, and they were clearly told the nature of the proposal from the outset. It was made perfectly clear from the outset that there was no proposition whatever to transfer land transactions to the legal profession; nor was there any proposal whatever to provide any sliding scale of Real Property Act charges. Therefore, the two propositions that have been put forward to the public under this campaign (that there would be the same scale of charges as those that exist in other States, and that the matter would be handled entirely by the legal profession) were untrue and were known to be untrue by those who put them forward.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, you could get over this by publicizing the proposal—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: —in precise terms, so that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is apparently deliberately setting out to cause a disruption in this House, and I have previously warned him that I will not tolerate it. I again warn the honourable member. He knows full well what Standing Orders provide, because he is a member of the Standing Orders Committee, and he should conduct himself in a proper manner. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the position in the matter; at this stage, the Government has not introduced a measure. The campaign undertaken by the Real Estate Institute was undertaken as a result of discussions with it about the Land Agents Board's proposals. We had come to no final conclusions at that stage of proceedings, but a certain group of land agents, who saw that they were going to lose the profit from land brokers' transactions in their own offices if there were independent land brokerage in South Australia in accordance with the original intention of the proposals under the Torrens titles system, decided to set out on this campaign to beat the gun before there was any publication of the Government's final proposals after our final discussions with all parties involved.

Dr. Eastick: Are you sure of that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Goldsworthy: You know what the Attorney-General said about that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A certain section of land agents is involved here, and the people concerned do not by any means represent all land agents in South Australia. I have been contacted by land agents in South Australia who protest that the campaign, undertaken by a small group of members of the Real Estate Institute has been completely contrary to the views of many people involved in the profession in South Australia.

Dr. Eastick: How small a group?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a majority of a committee of the Real Estate Institute, without a general meeting. No genera] meeting on this matter has been held. The people concerned have, as a result of a committee meeting, set out on a campaign which has completely misrepresented the position put to them; they know it, and I believe the member for Mitcham knows it very well, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a question of the Premier.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You beaut!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham should ask his question instead of trying to provoke interjections across the Chamber, and I ask him to take his seat.

Mr. Millhouse: The Minister interjected.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the most unruly conduct I have seen by members of the Opposition, and it is about time they behaved themselves. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really cannot understand why you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. Millhouse: What! I have not asked my question yet.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member was supposed to ask it.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, let me ask it now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I had the call. I take a point of order.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point of order is that you gave me the call to ask a question. The moment I got up and said I wanted to ask a question of the Premier, the Minister of Works interjected.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I did not. I was talking to the Minister of Roads and Transport. It had nothing to do with you.

The SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is that I had the call and that I should be given the call in the circumstances, and I ask you to give me the call.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the honourable member's point of order. He had the call; he was deliberately breaching Standing Orders and trying to provoke a discussion across the Chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I called on the honourable member and he started to comment on my action, so I withdrew his right to continue and called on the honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. COUMBE: On a point of order, may I ask why, when on your call the member for Mitcham rose to his feet, you called him to order, instead of the interjector on the other side?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I didn't interject.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the interjection.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are interjections all over the Chamber, and it is just not possible to hear all of them. I had called on the honourable member for Mitcham

and, naturally, when a member has the call he should show courtesy to the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I greatly resent what you have said about me, namely, that I deliberately tried to provoke conversation across the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask you to withdraw the statement you have made about me and prove that you are a fair Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must resume his seat.

Mr. Millhouse: I did not try to provoke conversation across the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has not got the call and he is not continually going to interrupt the business of this House.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, I ask for my rights.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not continually going to interrupt the business of this House. If he does, I will name him.

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

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Dr. TONKIN: My point of order is that if you did not hear the interjection on which you have based your ruling that the honourable member for Mitcham deliberately provoked conversation across the Chamber, how could you make that ruling?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. It is a hypothetical question.

Dr. TONKIN: It is not a hypothetical question, and I think it deserves an answer, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bragg is entitled to his opinion. I have expressed mine: there is no point of order.

Mr. Millhouse: You are utterly unfair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker. What determines your rulings regarding newspaper quotations in explanation of questions? In explaining a question to the Premier a short while ago, I attempted to quote an authoritative opinion from today's *Advertiser* to make clear the point about which I was questioning the Premier. You saw fit to rule me out of order, yet on other occasions in this House we have heard the member for Ross Smith quoting for up to half an hour from newspapers without being challenged by you.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order 124 provides:

In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

The Speaker is the arbiter of the Standing Orders.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Read Standing Order 125.

The SPEAKER: The Speaker is the arbiter on the matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Read Standing Order 125.

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you put that into effect occasionally?

WEST LAKES SCHEME

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question on the West Lakes scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Most of the sewer pipes at West Lakes are being laid below the existing water table. This means that the trenches must be dewatered prior to the pipes being laid. However, this was expected before the project began and is no different from any other low-lying area in Adelaide which has been sewered. In fact, it quite often used to happen in Millicent. The saline effect of the soil and the high water table on plant growth was always recognized as a serious problem at West Lakes. Considerable research has been carried out by the company to combat its effects. One possible solution being tried is the mounding of soil in areas where larger trees and shrubs are to be grown, thus providing a much greater depth of soil above the water table. It was also known that the range of plants which could be expected to be grown at West Lakes was limited, but no more so than in similar swampy areas which occur elsewhere along the coastal fringe.

MARALINGA SITE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier say whether his Government has decided yet to accept the generous offer of the Commonwealth Government to make available to this Government for its own use the old Maralinga council site? Recently, the Commonwealth Minister for Supply (Mr. Garland) announced that the authorities had redrawn the boundaries of a large restricted area of South Australia and that under the new boundaries the Maralinga township had been excluded. It was also announced that this area had been offered to the South Australian Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have been asked to accept the Maralinga town site on some basis which we will put to the Commonwealth Government after investigation. We

are investigating some means of using the site economically. I point out to the honourable member that there are some valuable installations in the area, including valuable buildings, but their maintenance will cost the South Australian Government much money, and we have to find an effective use of the area which will be a viable and economic one. Simply to take over responsibility for the site without having any special activity to put there which will make the town a viable one will involve much maintenance cost and not much else. Therefore, we are investigating an economic and viable use of the site and, as soon as investigations are completed, we will put a proposition to the Commonwealth Government.

NATIONAL ROUTE No. 1

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question concerning National Route No. 1?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The actual routes of the national route system of Australia are determined by the National Association of Australian State Road Authorities (N.A.A.S.R.A.). This ensures uniformity, particularly where more than one State is involved. Accordingly, I will have this question of relocating National Route No. 1 via Port Lincoln raised by the Commissioner of Highways at the next meeting of N.A.A.S.R.A., scheduled for October, 1972.

LAND BROKERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall now try again to ask a question of the Premier concerning land brokers. In view of the accusations against certain land agents which the Premier has made in this House this afternoon, will he now allow the detailed proposals of the Government on this matter to be made public so that the public of South Australia may judge for itself what the rights and wrongs of the matter may be? In the last few months there has been much controversy about what the Government intends to do with regard to legislation on land brokers and, until it is known what those intentions are, the controversy is ill informed and in the dark. This afternoon, in answer to the member for Kavel, the Premier has made the strongest allegations of impropriety I have ever heard—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting; he is not explaining his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —against any person. I ask therefore that the proposals be made public before the Bill is introduced in the House so that this matter may be disposed of and so that we may know the rights and wrongs of the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The proposal of the Land Agents Board was—

Mr. Millhouse: What is the Government's proposal?

The SPEAKER: Order! One question at a time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have made quite clear to the honourable member that the Government received from the Land Agents Board a proposal which it then proceeded to discuss with the professional bodies involved. That proposal was that land brokers should not prepare or certify Real Property Act documents when they were employed by the land agent who was seeking to promote the transaction. Discussion has taken place with the various professional bodies involved. Before the Government made any decision on the matter finally (and that decision can only presage the introduction of measures to this House), a certain section of the land agents' profession in South Australia (people who were involved in employing land brokers themselves to prepare their documents—so that in fact clients did not receive independent advice) promoted a campaign to misrepresent the proposals of the Land Agents Board and to try to beat the gun about anything which the Government might do in consequence of the proposal made to it by the Land Agents Board and the discussions it had subsequently. When the Government has made a final decision about this matter the measure will be introduced to the House and explained appropriately here.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you made a final decision?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, at this stage no final decision has been made by the Government. What I do say (and I repeat this to the honourable member, although he knows it very well) is that the Land Agents Board is the statutory body required to make representations to the Government on how the dealings of land agents in relation to Real Property Act documents should be proceeded with for the protection of the public, and it was its recommendation that the Government discussed with the Real Estate Institute.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Have you been talking to the Attorney-General lately?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I always talk to the Attorney-General.

Mr. Venning: Have you spoken to Dr. Wilson?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I realize that members opposite often do not speak to one another, for reasons that have become obvious. It is well known that members opposite have exchanges in the Chamber. The Attorney-General and I are on a quite different footing and we discuss matters of this kind from time to time. I know perfectly well what the Attorney-General's position on this matter has been.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's back-pedalling quickly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The Attorney-General has proceeded with consumer protection measures in South Australia that have, in all areas, put this State ahead of any other part of the world, and he has done that with the support of the people throughout the State. His motives in discussing the proposals not of the Law Society but of the Land Agents Board have been beyond reproach, and it is extraordinary that a professional group, having asked over a period for discussion with it about proposals, has then decided, for reasons of interest, not the public interest, to carry out a campaign that utterly misrepresents the Land Agents Board's proposals that it was invited to discuss with the Government. That is the position, and the honourable member cannot put it otherwise. If the Government makes a decision about this matter after full discussion, the Bill will be introduced in the House and explained.

Mr. Millhouse: I'll bet we won't see the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a gambling den. The honourable member for Mitcham is not going to lower the standard of this Chamber by betting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have heard of the honourable member's bets on other occasions about electoral matters, and they do not go too well.

MEDICAL REFEREES

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my question about the Workmen's Compensation Act and provision made in the Estimates of Expenditure for medical referees?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1971, and regulations thereunder provide for the appointment of medical referees, medical boards, and boards of review. Medical referees and members of boards are entitled to payment of fees set by regulation on performance of duties connected with their appointment. The total of such fees paid each year is dependent on the number of claims referred to medical referees and medical boards, and how long it takes for the medical referees to render their accounts. None of these is predictable. Actual payments in 1969-70 were $2,250 and, for 1970-71, $2,428.

ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about road maintenance tax?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Road maintenance tax is levied to cover additional wear and tear caused to public roads by commercial goods vehicles that have a load capacity in excess of eight tons. The wear and tear caused to roads is the same irrespective of whether the vehicle is used in the farming industry or in any other commercial industry, and there is, therefore, no logical reason why they should be treated differently. Many commercial industries for various reasons have parts of their undertakings located many miles apart and, if an exemption is granted to farmers for carriage of goods on public roads in conjunction with the operation of their farm, there is equal justification for extending the exemption to industry and commerce for this purpose. It is therefore not proposed to make further extensions to the present exemptions.

GLENELG ESPLANADE

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of September 19 regarding completion of work on the Glenelg esplanade?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The original contractor for the repair work at North Esplanade, Glenelg, has not been able to complete the contract, and action has been taken by the Glenelg council to formally terminate the contract. Accordingly, action is now being taken for the Engineering and Water Supply Department to complete the balance of work in this area. Plans and specifications have been examined by that department, and, subject to formal advice being communicated to it that the original contract has been terminated, the Engineering and Water Supply Department could be in a position to commence work within two or three weeks, after completion of works near Chetwynd Street, at Henley Beach.

LAND TRANSACTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Attorney-General take up with the Land Agents Board a transaction that took place only four days ago regarding the sale of a house in my district? I tell the Attorney confidently that this transaction is not typical of all transactions in which all land agents are involved, but it is a case in which a smart salesman has "conned" a young couple in the greatest deal they will make in their life, without considering their well-being.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the honourable member gives the particulars to me, I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the Land Agents Board.

WINDY POINT ROAD

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have a guard rail erected on the outside curve of the sharp bend of the road immediately below the Dogs Rescue Home at Mitcham? The curve immediately below the home is extremely sharp and owners of houses on the northern side of that curve have motor vehicles trespassing on their property at all hours of the night. They fear that, if a restaurant is built at Windy Point, traffic using the corners will increase and, perhaps, drivers who have taken alcoholic liquor will be unable to negotiate the bend. The curve immediately below the one in question has a guard rail.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to ask the Road Traffic Board to consider the matter, although I do not know whether this is a matter for the member for Fisher: I thought that area was in the Mitcham District.

Mr. Millhouse: It used to be.

The Hon. G. T VIRGO: I assume that the area is still being looked after in the same way, so I will ask the Road Traffic Board to consider the matter.

SPALDING RESERVE

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Acting Minister of Lands what information his colleague can give the House on a reserve comprising about 20 square miles that I understand is planned in the Spalding council area, in the hundred of Yackamoorundie? Two constituents from the northern part of my district who own land in the planning area of this reserve have approached me, expressing concern about the future tenure of that land and about whether it will be acquired from them. I understand that the matter is being dealt with locally by the Braddon Land Acquisition Investigating Committee, which is investigating on behalf of landowners who may be affected by this planned reserve. Therefore, I put the question to the Minister, hoping he will be able to tell the House of the future planning, thus relieving the anxiety of local landholders.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague for a report.

ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when he now expects that the Jordan report will be released to this House?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I expect it to be released within the next two or three weeks. I admit to the honourable member that recently I said I expected that the report would be completed and finalized by now. I remind Opposition members, who seem to be amused, that, as Minister responsible for releasing the report, I believe it was proper for me to assess when the report would be available. I am not in control of all circumstances associated with preparing and releasing such a report, and I think Opposition members should appreciate that, first, the committee took longer than it expected to finalize this report and have it ready for the printer, and secondly, the printing can be done only in accordance with the time table of the Government Printer. Another factor was the requirement of the committee that it needed extra time.

Mr. Millhouse: You didn't make the estimate long enough.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Once the report is in my hand I will inform the member for Mitcham.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is not to reply to the interjection by the honourable member for Mitcham, and he will not continue in that strain. He has to reply to the question asked: if he has finished he resumes his seat, but he must not continue to reply to interjections.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I regret, Sir, that I was diverted from the question: I cannot give any assurance about the activities of the Government Printer at this stage, but I expect that it will be two or three weeks before the report is available.

MAIN ROAD No. 46

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what progress has been made on investigating the design of the Clare-Blyth section of Main Road No. 46, which passes in

front of the Clare High School? Today, I received a letter from the District Council of Clare seeking this information. The letter stated that some time ago an approach was made by the district council and the council of the high school to ascertain what could be done to make the road more safe in front of the high school. These organizations wish to know what has happened concerning this investigation and any report that was to be made, because it seems that the matter has become bogged down. Will the Minister obtain a report for me?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should have expected the Clare council to act more responsibly than to write a letter to the honourable member. I should have expected it to write to the Highways Department, but, as it has decided to write to the honourable member to enable him to make political capital out of the matter (I am not sure what), I will do what the council should have done and direct the matter to the Highways Department. On receiving a reply I will give it to the honourable member who, in turn, will be able to give it to the council. This procedure will take three times as long as it would have taken if it had been done correctly.

SHEARERS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry consider reviewing the Shearers Accommodation Act? Does the Minister realize that Mr. Heinrich (an inspector) is travelling across the State and working strictly according to the law, even though it is generally considered that some clauses of the Act are regarded as being ridiculous and ambiguous? One owner was expected to spend $6,000 within three weeks, and others have asked why the expense of an inspector is necessary when the unsatisfied shearers apply to their union or to the police.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What shearers are there in Glenelg?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The reply is "No".

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 14 about the keyline system of cultivation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In regard to the keyline system, the Director of Agriculture has informed the Minister of Agriculture that this method of cultivation was developed about 1950. Chisel cultivation on approximate contour is considered a useful technique, in some conditions, to absorb rainfall more readily, and to improve pasture. However, the special claims made for the keyline system, based on cultivation parallel to a particular contour selected according to its position in the landscape, do not, in the opinion of the Director, stand up under close scrutiny.

This system was thoroughly examined here and in other States, especially in New South Wales where it was developed in the mid-1950's, and the basic premises on which it was based were found to be unsound. In areas where cultivation on a contour system is advantageous in retaining moisture, the use of surveyed contours is superior to any so-called keyline system of cultivation.

GARDEN REFUSE

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, ascertain whether an arrangement for collecting garden refuse from the metropolitan area for treatment at a central composting depot, or a similar system, has been considered by the Government? It is becoming increasingly apparent that householders cannot continue to burn leaves and other garden refuse. Not only the question of air pollution but also the need for recycling must be considered so that the organic matter that is otherwise destroyed is returned to the ground. Systems are available now by which garden refuse can be collected and mulched or composted, and returned for use as garden fertilizer.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer the matter to my colleague for his attention.

WEEDS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government intends to set up weeds boards in order to control the weeds problem in this State? Various vague reports on this matter have been circulated in the press and elsewhere, indicating that weeds boards will involve the amalgamation of councils, which will be represented on the boards. As there seems to be some controversy about this matter, will the Minister ascertain what the Government intends to do?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I will discuss the matter with my colleague, I understand that a conference was held in Adelaide yesterday between officers of the department (and probably the Minister was also

present) and representatives of councils throughout the State. They were to discuss the proposition to set up a regional board on which councils would be represented, and I think the proposition involved the Government's contributing $100,000 for the operation of these boards. However, so that the honourable member will know what the exact situation is, I will obtain a detailed report.

RUNDLE STREET MALL

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Local Government discuss with members of the Adelaide City Council the feasibility of converting Rundle Street into a shopping mall? I think that members noticed the letter from Mr. Albert Simpson in the *Advertiser* yesterday in which he suggested that this action be taken. This is the latest of many suggestions that have been made to convert Rundle Street into a shopping mall, and having seen conditions in Munich, Cologne, Cassel, Vienna and many other oversea cities, I have no doubt that this would provide most satisfactory conditions for shoppers and traders. I believe there is a strong demand for this move in the community and I think the Minister could well take the initial step to bring it about.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is unnecessary for me to take the initial step, because I think I did that probably about two years ago. One of my first acts after I became Minister was to make this very suggestion. Although that comment no doubt meets with the approval of the member for Bragg, I know that the next comment will not meet with his approval: the suggestion fell on stony ground.

Dr. Tonkin: Could you reopen the matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Rundle Street traders, for reasons best known to themselves, believe that the busy, congested nature of traffic in Rundle Street is conducive to trade. Although I cannot argue with them on that point, I do not accept their view, but I do not know that I am capable of arguing with the people who actually trade in the street.

Mr. Mathwin: They're wrong, you know.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am delighted to have the backing of Opposition members, because I know that some of them are undoubted experts in their fields but I am trying to be humble and say that I am not. I should like to see Rundle Street converted into a mall. I go even further: I should like to see Jetty Road, Glenelg, converted into a mall.

Mr. Mathwin: You'd get my full support.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is not getting my support with his interjections. As the honourable member for Bragg has asked the question, he deserves the courtesy of being able to hear the reply. The honourable member for Glenelg should not interject and try to take over the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On every possible occasion I raise the question of the desirability of Rundle Street's becoming a shopping mall. Although I believe that it will become a shopping mall, I cannot say just when, but the sooner it comes the better.

PAROLE BOARD

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to accept the nomination, by the Trades and Labor Council, of Mr. J. E. Dunford to the Parole Board? As you may know, Mr. Speaker, under section 42a (2) (*e*) the council has to nominate two persons, one of whom shall be a man and one a woman, for selection by the Government for appointment to the board. I understand from reports that have been circulated in the last few days that the council has declined, or at least omitted, to nominate a woman and has sent forward only the name of Mr. Dunford for that position. I also remind the Premier that Mr. Dunford, within the last few weeks, has openly defied an order of the Supreme Court and said that he would not pay the costs—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am reminding the Premier of what I suggest is a relevant fact.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member obtained leave to explain his question, and reminding the Premier of something is contrary to Standing Orders. The honourable member's procedure is contrary to Standing Orders, as he must know. As he obtained leave to explain his question, he must confine his comments to that explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps I may say that it is part of my explanation as to the fitness of Mr. Dunford for appointment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not debate the fitness of individuals during Question Time; he must not continue in that strain. Has the honourable member finished his explanation?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I have not. I was merely explaining why I have asked the question: this was part of my explanation.

The SPEAKER: I do not accept it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was reminding you, Mr. Speaker, of the actions of Mr. Dunford in defying the law.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows full well that this matter has been debated fully in the House. I rule any further comment out of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be improper for me, before the Government makes a recommendation to His Excellency the Governor in accordance with the provisions of the Act, to comment in the House on the nominations that have been received. I point out that the nominations received must be in accordance with the provisions of the Act; that requires the council to nominate a man and a woman. If it does so, in due course the Government will consider the nominations and be able to make recommendations to His Excellency. After His Excellency has considered the recommendations and a decision has been made by Executive Council, an announcement will be made.

FIRE BRIGADE CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary what was the result of the deputation taken by the member for Ross Smith and me to him regarding the fire brigade contributions of several councils in our districts? The councils of Walkerville, Prospect and Enfield are concerned at the fire brigade contributions that have been levied on them. The Prospect council's contribution has been increased by about $9,000, or 195 per cent over last year; the Walkerville council's contribution has been increased by $4,600; and the Enfield council's contribution has been increased by $27,000. At the deputation the Chief Secretary undertook to investigate this matter as it concerned all councils and the whole rating system regarding the fire brigade. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether any decision has been made since the undertaking was given? If I need to add force to my argument, I point out that all these councils are great North Adelaide supporters (especially after last Saturday) and that the Chief Secretary is an official of that club.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know whether the comment at the end of the question disqualifies the Chief Secretary, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

BLACKWOOD LAND

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works treat the reply to a question I asked on July 25 as urgent and obtain it for me within the next fortnight, if possible? My question was about an area of land known as the Agricultural Experimental Orchard, at Coromandel Valley, and of the future use that would be made of that land. At present, pine plantations are being established on the property, which is worth about $8,000 an acre. I believe it is the wrong approach for growing pines. However, I will not comment further.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague to ascertain where the reply is and obtain it for the honourable member as soon as possible.

ADVERTISING

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the cost to each Government department and State instrumentality for advertising for the financial year, 1971-72?
2. How much is it estimated will be spent on advertising by each in 1972-73?
3. Which advertising agencies were employed and when were they appointed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1 to 3. The question is too vague to give any clear answer. Much advertising by way of public notice and the like is undertaken without work by advertising agencies, and it would be a costly and time-consuming exercise to collate the vouchers of every separate department and instrumentality. The honourable member should redefine his question.

CATTLE TESTS

Mr. Evans, for Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many cattle were tuberculin tested in this State in the financial year 1971-72?
2. How many cattle were inoculated for contagious abortion infection?
3. What amount of State funds was expended on both programmes?
4. What is the total of Commonwealth funds made available for these campaigns?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 247,204.
2. 117,964.
3. $106,800 (including $25,000 from cattle compensation).
4. $177,000.

MOUNT CRAWFORD FOREST

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What companies or individuals have a fixed allocation of timber from the Mount Crawford forest?

2. What have been the allocations in each of the financial years from June 30, 1967 to 1972 inclusive?

3. What have been the actual deliveries for the Same period of time?

4. If allocations have been increased for any allottee, on what basis have the increases been made?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1.

South Australian Plywoods Limited.
Shepherdson and Mewett, Williamstown.
Softwood Holdings:
Williams and Roads Division;
W. B. James Division;
R. B. Crick Division.
James Case Company.
D. W. Evans Limited.
V. G. Scrimshaw.
Radiata Pine Milling Company.
Softwood Holdings, Treatment Division.
Timber Preservation Company Proprietary Limited.
Woodtex Manufacturing Proprietary Limited.

2.

	Super ft.	
South Australian Plywoods Limited	3,000,000	
Shepherdson and Mewett	1,700,000	
Williams and Roads	1,600,000	Softwood Holdings (Williams and Roads Division) from August 30, 1968.
W. B. James	500,000	Softwood Holdings (W. B. James Division) from January 1, 1971.
R. B. Crick	600,000	Softwood Holdings (R. B. Crick Division) from January 1, 1971.
James Case Company	500,000	
D. W. Evans Limited	150,000	
V. G. Scrimshaw	100,000	
Radiata Pine Milling Company	1,000,000	
Softwood Holdings (Treatment Division)	700,000	
Timber Preservation Company	300,000	
Woodtex Manufacturing Company	500,000	

3.

	1967-68 Super ft.	1968-69 Super ft.	1969-70 Super ft.	1970-71 Super ft.	1971-72 Super ft.
South Australian Plywoods	2,941,706	2,994,753	3,211,245	3,318,987	3,098,254
Shepherdson and Mewett	1,876,386	1,935,986	2,037,737	1,975,756	2,009,932
Williams and Roads (Softwood Holdings from August 30, 1968)	1,406,476	1,581,876	1,656,877	1,330,704	1,763,864
W. B. James (Softwood Holdings from January 1, 1971)	599,632	333,601	496,934	412,376	432,390
R. B. Crick (Softwood Holdings from January 1, 1971)	518,353	525,328	474,946	574,431	434,514
James Case Company .	508,508	423,427	553,710	525,694	555,389
D. W. Evans Limited	175,837	137,996	161,977	170,569	171,175
V. G. Scrimshaw	190,662	157,376	72,360	169,769	149,429
Radiata Pine Milling Company	262,019	188,784	77,669	596,518	963,518
Softwood Holdings Treatment Division .	706,352	721,694	1,124,759	970,441	886,959
Timber Preservation Company	368,148	216,581	303,333	381,005	499,148
Woodtex Manufacturing Company	283,988	497,267	361,647	522,616	674,846

4. None.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Long Service Leave Act, 1967-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It gives effect to an undertaking made by the Premier in his policy speech before the last election in which this Government was returned to office. At that time the Premier said, "In accordance with our policy of granting workers adequate long service leave entitlements the Labor Government will legislate for three months long service leave after 10 years service." The first real statutory recognition of an employee's right to a substantial period of leave after a substantial period of continuous service was the Long Service Leave Act of 1967. However, even before the enactment of that measure, a number of industrial agreements had been entered into between employers and employees giving effect to this right in one form or another.

Honourable members who were members of this House at the time will recall that in that measure it was proposed that the quantum of leave would be 13 weeks (or three months) after 10 years service. In the event, the measure did not become law in this form; while the quantum remained at three months, the period of qualifying service was increased to 15 years. In the Government's view, its return to office provides a clear mandate for the reintroduction of the measure proposed. It is not intended that the new and shorter service requirement will have absolute retrospective operation, but that it should, in all the circumstances, have retrospective operation to January 1 this year.

At present the Act provides that an employee will acquire an entitlement to pro rata long service leave if his services are terminated after seven years continuous service, unless his services are terminated on the grounds of his serious misconduct. The present limitation in relation to the seven-year pro rata period, that at least five years must be served as an adult, is now intended to be removed. There seems no good reason for the differentiation in this regard between service as an adult and service before attaining adulthood. In addition, in this measure, opportunity has been taken to make certain amendments of a formal and procedural nature consequent on the proposal to repeal substantially the Industrial Code and replace it by new industrial conciliation and arbitration legislation.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 amends the interpretation section of the principal Act by bringing certain definitions into harmony with the new industrial legislation, by striking out unnecessary definitions, and by inserting in the principal Act a definition of "regular part-time employment" which is intended to make it clear that the provisions of the Act extend to persons in such employment. Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act which sets out the rights to long service leave, and the substantial effect of these amendments is to reduce the entitlement period from 15 years to 10 years. Clause 5 repeals and re-enacts subsection (8) of section 5 of the principal Act and, in effect, provides that only service which occurred after January 1 this year will attract long service leave at the rate set out in this Bill.

Clause 6 amends section 11 of the principal Act, which provided that the existence of a scheme, providing for long service leave in circumstances not less favourable to the employee than the leave provided by the principal Act, would entitle the relevant employer to be granted an exemption from the provisions of the Act. It is of course quite clear that current exemptions will have to be reviewed in the light of the improved entitlements contained in this measure. Accordingly, by proposed new subsection (5) all existing exemptions will expire six months after the new provisions come into operation. In appropriate cases this will afford employers time to make fresh applications for exemptions.

Subsection (6) is of a transitional nature and merely preserves existing rights and obligations in the event of a cessation of operation of an exemption. Clause 7 repeals and re-enacts section 12 of the principal Act which relates to claims in respect of a failure of an employer to grant long service leave, and brings the principal Act into harmony with the new industrial legislation.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): It is rather typical of the work the Minister does or does not do in this House that he has given no consideration whatever—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Gouger wishes to continue his remarks on the second reading, he

will have to seek leave to have Standing Orders suspended, otherwise he must ask for the debate to be adjourned.

Mr. HALL: Things have changed since I last did this. I move:

That this debate be now adjourned.

Motion carried; debate adjourned.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

METHODIST CHURCH (S.A.) PROPERTY TRUST BILL

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

That the time for bringing up the Select Committee's report be extended to Tuesday, October 17.

The committee is still engaged in taking evidence and unfortunately is not in a position to bring up its report today, but hopes to be able to do so by the date mentioned in the motion.

Motion carried.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 1651.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Bill is virtually one the content of which has been proposed by the industry (more particularly by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board) over a long period. It has brought to fruition a number of points made by that organization, I am led to believe, and it embodies statements made to the Minister by the consultant (Mr. Gray). The comments of the Minister in the first few sentences of his second reading explanation cannot, I suggest, be substantiated. The Minister said that the first benefit that will be obtained from such a rationalization is an improvement in the quality and wholesomeness of meat offered for sale for human consumption. I do not see how the Minister can justify such a statement when the requirements of an export abattoir are far more stringent than those laid down over many years regarding local consumption. The inference one can draw is that by some miraculous means a new management will alter the wholesomeness and quality of the meat for human consumption. I deny such a possibility.

Over a considerable time, the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board has been responsible for a high standard of hygiene, of control, and of effectiveness for the benefit of the industry in South Australia. The fact that it has not had access to large sums of money to implement a number of necessary alterations (alterations which, I suggest, would have financed themselves in a short period) has been reflected in no way in the wholesomeness and the quality of the product. The standard has been exemplary, and it is recognized as such throughout the Commonwealth. It is recognized, also, that, on the basis of overall throughput of the total kill, the Gepps Cross abattoir is the largest in the Commonwealth of Australia.

The Minister went on to say that the creation of soundly based commercially viable abattoirs effectively serving the needs of all sections of the community was the other benefit which would accrue from the introduction of the provisions of this Bill. I do not think anyone can dispute that. Subsequently, he said that the Government has been concerned that large numbers of cattle are leaving this State to be slaughtered at establishments in other States, either for sale in or export from those States or, indeed, in some cases for subsequent sale in this State. He said that the fact that such movements are economically feasible points out the need for a critical examination of our facilities here. I dispute this claim by the Minister. Many of our cattle have been sent to other States for slaughtering in recent times because we have not had sufficient slaughtering capacity. We have not had adequate killing capacity in the beef section in the total of the abattoirs available to this State. The situation will not be improved by the passage of this Bill unless some quite rapid action takes place to permit increases in the killing capacities of the beef chains of all the abattoirs in South Australia or, for that matter, unless a new abattoir is developed, if that be the end result, which concentrates in the first instance on the beef killing capacity.

It is unfortunate that so much of our beef has gone to other States, but it is a fact of life concerning many of our rural products at present, because shipping facilities for their export or transportation are available only in ports outside of South Australia. During recent months discussions have taken place in relation to the transport of beef, oil seeds, and particularly wool; indeed, if some of our oat, hay, chaff, and lucerne seed manufacturers are to stay in business they must be able to

arrange effective transportation to the Victorian wharves to permit export of their commodities. The passing of this Bill will not necessarily mean that that situation will obtain, or that the present situation will change in any short period.

One does not dispute the next statement made by the Minister when he said, "The effect of this Bill is to enable the board to operate as a financially viable business". Difficulties over many years have prevented the abattoir system here, particularly that operating at Gepps Cross, from competing favourably with private enterprise organizations, more particularly because it is and always has been a service abattoir principally involved in the killing or the processing of the product for local consumption, with a subsidiary involvement in export. To a great extent the killing for export at the Gepps Cross abattoir has been conducted on an overtime basis, yet those involved have paid only the basic fee for killing which applies ordinarily throughout the week. The board has been responsible for making overtime payments and, consequently, for making its export operation less viable and certainly often less profitable compared to the operations of other organizations.

I find the suggestion that the membership of the board be reduced, and that it become an entirely different organization known as the South Australian Meat Corporation, difficult to follow, because of the numbers involved. It has long been held by those associated with the industry that the greatest advantage would apply if the existing board of eight members were reduced to a board with a maximum of three members. However, the provisions of this Bill decrease the overall number by two members only, so that there will be a six-member body. The past situation applying of board members involved in the industry making representations to the board on behalf of their respective organizations will go, and the Minister does not clearly state when we can expect to see a consultative authority that will make use of the experience of these people representing outside organizations. The Minister in his second reading explanation states:

> In fact, it is intended that many of the interests at present represented on the board will secure representation on a proposed authority that will ultimately have wide powers in relation to the meat industry as a whole.

However, he does not indicate how long it will be before we see the creation of this authority. We are given no indication about what responsibility the authority will have or how it will exert any major influence on the new-look corporation. The Minister does say:

> However, it is considered that the "new-look corporation" will necessarily have to be more streamlined and perhaps more "commercially orientated", . . .

It may be that the term "commercially orientated" is used to allow the new-look corporation to obtain outside funds and that, when the corporation is able to do that, as other organizations in private enterprise can go to the money market and obtain funds virtually at will (subject only to collateral and to providing the lending organization with the necessary details), there will not be the frustration that has existed in the past whereby the board has had to go cap in hand to successive Governments (I do not pinpoint any one Government) to obtain additional funds for vital works. The difficulty in obtaining funds has been outlined in this House recently during Question Time. Recently a considerable sum (I think about $256,000) had to be made available to the board because of the back-dating of wages.

I have been told that, immediately that money was made available, about $30,000 of it became surplus to needs, because of the degree of absenteeism involved in the initial computation. Absenteeism has been one of the major problems in the establishment, and 30 per cent of the total work force absent on certain days of the week is apparently not unusual. As a result of ample overtime opportunities, many members of the work force have seen fit to take days off during the week to prepare themselves for work undertaken at the weekend. This situation does not benefit the organization, and it may well be one of the things the Minister was considering when he indicated that the establishment could be expected to become more commercially orientated in the sense that it would involve normal working conditions and effectively reduce the excessive overtime costs now incurred. Time alone will tell whether the new provisions will correct the situation.

One of the things causing a lack of funds within the organization over a long period has been the necessity to limit certain operations within the whole complex. The overpayments made would have been sufficient to carry out many of the alterations. I cite as an example the calf chain, which is out of commission because it was impossible for the board to obtain about $100,000 to bring it up to

present-day standards required in connection with killing procedures. This meant that calves had to be killed on either the beef chain or the sheep chain. The larger calves are put through on the beef chain and, whilst they are recognized as a single unit for tally purposes in relation to the overall day-to-day operation, in actual fact the amount recouped by the board as a result of the killing of calves on the beef chain was on the basis of the normal cost for each pound. The result is that the board has had to subsidize considerably the salaries and wages paid in respect of calf killing, and it has not been able to recoup this through the slaughter rate. The smaller calves have had to be put through the sheep chain, one calf equivalent to three sheep being processed.

Again, problems have been experienced regarding the tally being maintained at the normal sheep tally number, and the returns to the board have not been in keeping with the tally. Figures supplied to me by people closely associated with the industry show a loss to the present board of about $100,000 for a full year's operation, which is almost exactly what would have been needed to update and upgrade the calf chain. I do not blame any particular person for this problem, realizing as I do that this Government and other Governments of different persuasions have for many years had to find from revenue and Loan funds the money required for updating the abattoirs. It is most unfortunate that an organization such as the Gepps Cross abattoir, with a capital involvement of about $32,500,000, has not been able to obtain on the open market sufficient funds to enable it effectively to put into immediate or early operation the requirements of a modern abattoir.

One realizes the difficulties that exist regarding the beef chain, which should have been duplicated a long time ago. However, because of insufficient funds this has not been possible. One realizes, too, that it is intended to increase the present three-lamb chain to a five-lamb chain, and that it has not been possible in the past to increase the number of chains. Therefore, we still have the situation that unfolded in this State as recently as last week, when people were told to keep their sheep and lambs on their properties because killing space was not available to them.

It has been suggested to people who have for a long time followed the industry and considered the reports made by authorities and information supplied to producer organizations that the number of stock available in this State would probably warrant the service of only one additional abattoir. Therefore, the suggestion that is made from time to time regarding the setting up of additional regional abattoirs must be considered in the light of additional killing requirements. We have in recent years witnessed the creation of the Peterborough abattoir, which has had to close down for considerable periods of the year because of its inability to obtain sufficient stock for processing. Although it is advantageous to have an abattoir of the Peterborough type available to the industry, it is expensive to have it lying idle for a long time. It is also difficult to obtain the necessary itinerant staff.

This situation applies in northern areas and involves not only this industry but also the fruitgrowing and sugar cane industries. Workers in the slaughtering industry travel from site to site, and it has not been easy to remedy the situation existing in South Australia. Unless we are able to show that a viable killing works can be maintained the whole year round, a regional abattoir can be placed at a considerable disadvantage. Such an abattoir would not be as financially viable as some people would have us believe and, in the long term, the producer would be disadvantaged.

The Bill provides for a reduction in the number of members necessary to form a quorum at a meeting of the corporation. Previously, four of the eight members of the board had to be present to conduct business. It has been suggested that, with the reduction in the number of members of the corporation from eight to six, the quorum should be reduced to three members. Although this is consistent with the earlier situation that applied, I ask the Minister whether it is in the best interests of revitalizing and updating the industry (I think "streamlining" was the word used) to permit the corporation's business to be proceeded with when only half its members are present. I suggest that the House consider removing from the Bill the provision reducing the quorum, thereby maintaining the previous quorum of four members.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you want to increase the membership from six back to eight members?

Dr. EASTICK: No, I would have been happy to see the overall corporation representation reduced to three with a quorum of not less than two members. However, as the Minister has seen fit to provide for a corporation of six members, which is perhaps the figure suggested

by the industry and the present board, there would be an advantage, in the interests of streamlining the procedure and of making this commercially-orientated organization viable, to have a quorum of four members instead of three members.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why don't you make it five members?

Dr. EASTICK: I am happy to have five members. Some members have a predetermined idea in this regard, and I will test the feeling in due course. If membership of the corporation is increased from five members to six members, as the Minister has suggested, it would preclude some members from going to other States or overseas on corporation business. I am happy to leave the representation at four members. I note that the provision giving the organization the right to promote a Bill before Parliament is to be repealed. I take it that this is in keeping with the organization's being made more responsible to the Minister than has been the case in the past. I still believe that members of Parliament should be able to obtain the greatest amount of information possible from the corporation in relation to any amendments before Parliament. Even if this opportunity is denied the corporation through the repeal of section 37, I trust that the corporation will not be stopped from making its requirements known to Parliament. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Clause 44 is an amendment of substantial and far-reaching importance. In effect, it removes from the principal Act all the board's old borrowing powers together with the inhibiting controls on its expenditure, and replaces them with: *(a)* a power to borrow from the Treasurer (and with his consent, from any other person) for any purposes; and *(b)* a right for the Treasurer to guarantee the repayment of outside borrowings by the corporation.

I have already mentioned in passing that I believe that this will be a considerable advantage to the organization's operations and, as the Minister said, it will be of far-reaching importance. I wonder, though, whether the most important clause of all is not clause 57, which amends section 82 of the principal Act. That clause makes clear that the corporation has a right to charge fees for other services rendered by it in addition to slaughtering; at present the whole of the charges for distribution from the abattoirs has to be included in the slaughtering fee. Under clause 57 the corporation can look at all aspects of its functioning, consider each aspect on its merits, and make charges accordingly.

I suspect that, if there is to be no rationalization of delivery charges or if delivery is to be charged on a mileage basis, there may be a considerable amount of argument in the community, because the prices of the commodity will be different in different areas, particularly in the suburbs. I hope the corporation will consider a rationalized delivery charge that allows the product virtually to go on to the market in every part of the metropolitan area at the same price, or at least on a similar basis to that applying in the bread industry, where there is a small variation between the inner metropolitan area and the outer metropolitan area. The creation of regional price variations would not be in the interest of the industry and would have considerable repercussions in the community. Clause 83, as far as possible, gives the corporation power to fix all fees by resolution as an alternative to fixing them by regulation. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

I make it clear that the purpose of this provision is to place the corporation in a competitive position, in that its charging structure can be rendered much more flexible by this means. It is intended to be a vehicle for encouraging the slaughtering of stock at the abattoir, not discouraging it.

Can the Minister say whether the resolutions will be countersigned or whether they will be tabled in Parliament, so that those members who are constantly questioned about the organization by constituents will have some reference point, without having constantly to question the Minister to obtain the necessary information? Clause 85 removes the provision that the corporation's regulations require the approval of the Central Board of Health as well as confirmation by the Governor. I wonder whether the by-passing of the Central Board of Health will create any problems with countries with which we hope to deal. I do not deny that the Government has the opportunity to be well advised prior to taking the matter for confirmation by the Governor. Will some of the countries that import from Australia require evidence of the approval of the Central Board of Health? In connection with quarantine requirements for imports and exports, although one authority can be shown to be as competent as the other, we must consider what is required on the documents accompanying the exports. It has not been possible to check this matter with the responsible authority, but the provision, while perhaps valuable in streamlining the operation, may cause problems for exporters in the future. The Minister concluded his second reading explanation as follows:

All that is proposed here is the minimum number of amendments, in the Government's view, sufficient to enable the corporation, as reconstructed, to commence its new tasks armed with a sufficiency of powers and financial resources.

One wonders whether there will, in fact, be sufficient power in the Bill. The Opposition, not knowing Mr. Gray's recommendations to the Government, can only accept the statement in the second reading explanation that the provisions will be adequate. It is unfortunate that we are unable to see even a limited version of Mr. Gray's report.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Ask him yourself.

Dr. EASTICK: After close questioning in this place and in another place, it was said on one occasion that it was to be a verbal report and on another occasion that it was to be a written report. We are here altering legislation that is vital to the rural community. In 1971-72 the export value to this State was about $34,000,000, and we are altering legislation that may affect the continuance of the industry. We are virtually making changes in the dark.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: This is but a very small first step in the total scheme.

Dr. EASTICK: Some of the things outlined, such as the wholesomeness of meat, will not be affected by these measures or any other measures.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: When we are talking about rationalizing the industry throughout the State, you say that that will not improve it!

Dr. EASTICK: Despite what controls are introduced, the Minister will not improve the wholesomeness of the product, for example.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: From Gepps Cross.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We are not talking about only Gepps Cross. That's where you're going wrong.

Dr. EASTICK: I return to the point that we are being asked to make these changes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: As a first step.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, I have said that. We are being asked to undertake these changes without having any information from the Government or the Minister about the advice that he has received or about what part these measures will play in the whole aspect of alterations being made in the industry.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you want us to wait until we do the whole thing?

Dr. EASTICK: No. We expected that the Minister of Agriculture would have done us the courtesy of giving us more information than we have at present, and I expected that we would know by now from the Government whether there would be a written report. I have said that we support the Bill. We will ask several questions in Committee and I have already foreshadowed one amendment. On other matters, replies to questions may show that alterations will benefit the industry.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I congratulate the Government on at least taking some action, however limited it may be, regarding the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. The action should have been taken at least 10 years ago. I express disagreement with some features of the Bill. We must study the history of the abattoir to know the general situation and the disadvantages that the abattoir has had.

I do not condemn the workers at the abattoir: they have worked much overtime and have been under pressure. Overall, they have done a good job. However, it is a basic principle that no organization can be successful unless the management has control of the workers and this has not been so at the abattoir for a long time. A major strike occurred about 15 years ago, and one of the biggest mistakes made was that that strike ended without the basic problem of who controlled the abattoir being solved. Until we solve that problem the abattoir will not be a successful, viable industry.

When I was at the abattoir about two months ago, I was extremely pleased at the tremendous progress that had been made in the seven or eight years since my previous visit. On the previous occasion I went through the private abattoir at Murray Bridge and then through the Gepps Cross abattoir, and I found that there was a vast difference between the two. The Murray Bridge abattoir was so far ahead of the Gepps Cross abattoir that we could not make a comparison. However, I am pleased at the tremendous improvement that has been made, and the abattoir now has a completely different appearance. It has progressed and now has an export licence. It has been claimed that these alterations will bring about a better supply of meat, but that is not so.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Read the second reading explanation.

Mr. McANANEY: When we compare the Minister's public statement with what is in the Bill, we see that he is engaging in false

advertising. Under the Government's own legislation on false advertising, the Minister should be taken to task for making these claims.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I made a statement in this House.

Mr. McANANEY: I am referring to a public statement by the Minister of Agriculture. We get too much of this. A week before the Bill was introduced, the Minister of Agriculture said that it would be a terrific thing, and he made claims about what it would achieve. Now the Minister in charge of the Bill has said that that is not so.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I am referring only to what I said in this House.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister of Works is over-sensitive. I am not tackling him. I know that he and the Minister of Environment and Conservation are on two different tracks regarding the Hills watershed area. One Minister is going east, the other is going west, and never the twain shall meet. We hope that the Government will be consistent and that the Minister of Works will support the claims made publicly by the Minister of Agriculture.

I am pleased that the change is being made regarding slaughtering charges. It is more expensive to carry out the operations at Gepps Cross than is the case in the other States, but no other State gives free paddocking for a week for stock held at the abattoir for slaughter. Hundreds of tons of hay are needed each year for this. Further, no other State expects its abattoirs board to carry out inspections under health regulations in butchers shops, with the expense included in the slaughtering charge. This matter, as is the case with other commodities, should be handled by the Central Board of Health. However, the manager of the abattoir told me recently that the administration would prefer to keep this inspection going. Should the producer of the meat pay for this service, when it is not provided in other circumstances?

The delivery charges also are wrong. The board will deliver meat to any part of the metropolitan area. At one time the board did that for one carcass. It would go even as far as Christies Beach with one carcass if a request was made. However, I think now six carcasses must be ordered before the board will deliver, and the position has been rationalized a little. In other States private enterprise provides the transport at a fraction of what it costs the abattoir here to deliver.

Nelsons Meat Market was operating in this State. If the situation was on the same basis as in Western Australia, where private enterprise picks up the meat at the abattoir, and if Nelsons could have used private transport, I think that firm still could be operating. The board would take a load of meat from the abattoir to Light Square, unload the meat in a few minutes, and return to the abattoir. For that load of meat the firm would be charged about 20 times as much as it would cost to deliver 20 carcasses to Christies Beach. The position must be rationalized and put on a fair basis.

The abattoir needs more money. At one time Loan money was made available to the board at reduced interest rates, but the Labor Government that was in office from 1965 to 1968 refused to make Loan money available to the abattoir, so the board had to borrow from the bank. We might say that there was some justification for this, but the Labor Party was not interested in providing this money and making the abattoir a competitive service. The board borrowed only a small amount privately in the way I have mentioned, and it has run out of money. I applaud the Government for allowing the abattoir, under guarantee, to obtain finance for extensions. The abattoir need not be extended to a large degree: possibly, it has reached its maximum size except for the mutton and lamb chain. This chain does not have sufficient capacity during the killing season, so that much overtime is worked; this places a strain on the workers. I think workers at the abattoir have done a good job, but are under stress and strain because of the long hours of work.

If money is available, it would be more economic to extend the mutton and lamb chain so that the work could be handled during reasonable hours of work. This would reduce the amount of overtime necessary and also the stress and strain on workers. The saving in overtime paid would more than compensate for the amount charged in interest and depreciation for the extension of the chain. The Minister, in his press release, said that the corporation was to be an advisory body to the Minister: this arrangement will not work satisfactorily. There should be a three-man board, consisting of people totally engaged in the board's activities, so that they are familiar with all aspects. I would make the member for Florey chairman of the board, and it would work most efficiently: he is an honest man. I refer to only one Labor member and will not go further than that.

A board of five members is too big: the members should know what is happening and should not represent an industry. It could be claimed that the board should consist of a primary producer, a neutral chairman, and a representative of people who sell meat. That system might work. It could also be a primary-producer controlled board, because past indications show that this type of board will employ experts, and I refer to the Wheat Board, the Barley Board, the Sugar Board, and the bulk handling co-operative as examples. Boards that have failed are usually those that have split control: the Egg Board is a typical example. Members of the Milk Board are not connected with the industry, but are experts in management, and this system works well. I hope the Minister explains the statement that appeared in the press release, as follows:

Mr. Casey said it was planned that overall administration of South Australia's meat industry would be put in the hands of an advisory authority which would be responsible to the Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We are not dealing with that in this Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: That is another committee that we may be able to speak about. In our opinion the board to control the abattoir has too many members, and a board consisting of three members would be more effective. It has been suggested that additional abattoirs will be built, and I am pleased that people are realizing that this will be necessary. When legislation was introduced 15 years ago, after the big strike, to enable the Government to build abattoirs in country areas, the Labor Party violently opposed it and said that there should be one abattoir. I am pleased to see that the Labor Party has learned that it is necessary to diversify and that for decentralization we require more regional abattoirs.

Something must be done about the Government Produce Department abattoir at Port Lincoln, which should be handed over to private enterprise. Having people trading in meat on Eyre Peninsula would make it a viable proposition. I support the Government on this Bill, although its provisions will not improve the quality of meat brought into Adelaide. It has been suggested that the cost to the consumer will be reduced and a greater return will be available to the producer, but these effects will be minimal. I believe that the new board will not be able to achieve much in either of these respects. Although this Bill will be a step towards making the metropolitan abattoir a viable industry and will be of benefit to workers at the abattoir and to people who eat and sell meat, I think it is but a small step in that direction.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I support the Bill, with some reservations, because, to a certain extent, it cuts across what I have said about the desirability of continuing the Gepps Cross abattoir. Recently, I spoke about this matter, and I intend to speak about it again. The problem of meat killing at abattoirs and of marketing meat throughout South Australia is a serious one, and involves the strategic placing of meat works so that buyers will attend at those works, because if there are not sufficient buyers at any market (and I have seen this happen in Port Lincoln) it is the producer who suffers. Currently, in addition to Gepps Cross, we have in South Australia four meat killing works, situated at Noarlunga, Murray Bridge and Peterborough (those three being private) and the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln. One is also planned for Naracoorte; I saw in the newspaper the other day that plans for that would be proceeded with soon. I am convinced more than ever that the time has come to consider the future of Gepps Cross, because its time is limited.

It is necessary only to look at a map of the suburban areas to see that the Gepps Cross works are becoming surrounded by suburban growth. That raises the point whether it is necessary to have a killing works situated in the metropolitan area where good roads and fast transport are available. Surely it would be better that the killing for the metropolitan area be done at regional abattoirs and the metropolitan area supplied from there. At Gepps Cross, available land is becoming scarce while the need for greater output is increasing. So, while this Bill is before us, it is probably an opportune time to examine the future of the Gepps Cross works and to consider seriously whether the spending of more money on them is warranted.

When the Minister of Works was giving his second reading explanation and speaking of the benefits to be obtained from the rationalization that the Bill seeks to introduce, one of the improvements mentioned was "in the quality and wholesomeness of meat offered for sale for human consumption". I do not know whether he was speaking there of Gepps Cross or generally.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Read what I said.

Mr. CARNIE: I am doing that. I am glad the Minister is not reflecting on the quality of the Gepps Cross works, because recently I

toured those works and was impressed by the standard of hygiene obtaining there. The beef hall is something of which this State should be proud. But is it warranted or necessary that more money be spent on those works? The works as they are will continue to supply Adelaide for some time and I think that, as more money is required, it should be spent on regional abattoirs and we should gradually allow the Gepps Cross works to be phased out.

I have said that before in this House, but the implication in the press (and I sympathize with the Minister's being misquoted in the press) was that I advocated a bulldozer being put through the works right away. I was not advocating that at all. Throughout the years ahead, the works will, to a degree, outlive their usefulness, and we should be assisting that to happen. This Bill is apparently a forerunner of others. The Minister states:

This Bill is but a first step in an overall reorganization of the meat industry.

I should like more information on what is planned. We are being asked to approve this Bill as a first step without knowing what the other steps will be. The South Australian Meat Corporation, in concept, I am not opposed to, provided it is concerned with the overall processing and marketing of meat for the State.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you think we should have waited until we had the lot?

Mr. CARNIE: I did not say that. I should like to have some idea of what the Government has in mind for meat marketing and killing for the whole State, because members on this side have asked (and I think I have probably been the most persistent questioner in this regard) about a report, which the Minister has had in his possession since February, from a committee of inquiry into the Government Produce Department, with particular reference to Port Lincoln. I have raised this matter by question in the House, in the Address in Reply debate and in the debate on the Appropriation Bill, and still no-one has seen that report.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Members will see it when we do something about it. We must decide what to do. I think that is fair enough.

Mr. CARNIE: The Minister says that is fair enough, but people in my area are vitally concerned about this and would like to know what is in the report.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They would be more concerned about what we are going to do in the light of the report, wouldn't they?

Mr. CARNIE: True.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We will work that out and tell you.

Mr. CARNIE: I should like the Minister to tell us whether the Government has any plans and whether it can give us any indication at this stage of what is planned for the whole State, even if it is a generalization, before we are asked to approve this Bill.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What difference would it make?

Mr. CARNIE: I think it would make a lot of difference, because we are setting up the South Australian Meat Corporation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: To take the place of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board.

Mr. CARNIE: Yes, with the implication that this meat corporation will be involved generally in meat production in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are wrong again.

Mr. CARNIE: I want to be assured on that point if I can be. Perhaps when the Minister replies to this debate he can say something about what is intended for the Port Lincoln works. Although the financial loss at the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln this year was better (if such a term can be used in relation to "loss") than last year, being only $140,000 compared to $317,000 the previous year, there is still much dissatisfaction at the overall operation of the works.

I raised the point recently of the purchase of boned mutton for the Port Lincoln works and the fact that preference was given to two firms. I appreciate that the main consideration in operating any killing works is continuity of employment and of working; but I maintain that, provided a guarantee is given, all buyers should be allowed to operate in a situation like that and anyone who has a killing quota for those works should be allowed to operate. A monopolistic situation appears to have arisen in Port Lincoln in this regard because, in the last 12 to 18 months, two buyers from Victoria have started operations in Port Lincoln. The first one came prepared to buy 1,000 sheep a week; he was granted killing space for only 500. Two major buying firms in the town had priority of space. The second buyer from Victoria, although he has been operating for only a few weeks, is most unhappy about the arrangement there, because one firm in particular has been paying appreciably above the normal market price for lambs. Certainly it is higher than the Victorian buyer was

willing or able to pay. In normal business practice, that is fair enough. However, these lambs are not being put through the works of the Government Produce Department at Port Lincoln, but are being shipped from the area to the company's works. If these firms are to be given preference, as they were given preference in the supply of boned mutton, they should make use of the works to the extent of their quota, but I believe they are not doing this. If they are not willing to do so, the quota should be given to someone else. An important factor in assisting the profitable operation of any works is continuity. It is vital that a full chain be kept operating wherever possible. One wonders whether this firm is using Port Lincoln simply to accommodate the overflow from its own works. I realize that these remarks are not relevant to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, and I shall return now to further comment on the Bill.

I commend and support the Government on the provision of the Bill which reduces from eight to five the number of members on the board, taking away the stipulation that all board members must represent certain sectional interests. I have always maintained that this should not be the criterion in choosing board members. The best man available for the job should be chosen irrespective of what interests he represents. A producer of beef should not necessarily have a place on the board unless he is also a marketing expert. If it should come to a choice, the marketing expert should be chosen before the producer. The ideal would be to have a man who is both. That is not impossible, and that is the man to be sought. I agree that there should be a smaller board, because obviously a smaller board, more tightly knit and efficient, is much better than one which is unwieldy. I hope the Minister is correct in saying that a soundly based and commercially viable abattoir will result from this new meat corporation. It seems at this stage that perhaps the operations of the abattoir will not be very much different; we are simply told there will be a different board at the top. I hope the board will examine in depth the operation of the works and make it more viable, as the Minister so piously hopes.

The Bill removes from the principal Act the existing borrowing powers of the board, replacing them with power to borrow from the Treasurer or, with the Treasurer's consent, from any other person for any purpose, giving the right to the Treasurer to guarantee repayment of outside borrowings. I do not oppose this, except that I am against spending too much money on the works. However, if this Bill is to pass, certainly this power to borrow is a good thing.

This Bill has been claimed by the Minister to be the first step in a move to rationalize the meat industry in South Australia. In dealing with this Bill, it is difficult to see whether the Minister's hopes will be realized. I appreciate his comment that the Government does not want to delay this action until the whole system is rationalized, but, in fairness, the Minister should realize that it is difficult for us, particularly those of us concerned with regional abattoirs, to see the whole picture.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We are not asking you to see the whole picture.

Mr. CARNIE: The Minister may be able to isolate this matter, but unfortunately I cannot do so. I like to see the whole picture, and cannot do that at the moment. I will have more to say on certain aspects of the Bill in the Committee stage, but meanwhile I support the second reading.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the second reading, and I will follow the course of the Bill with great interest, because I have been vitally concerned for a long time with the way in which this abattoir has been working.

Mr. Harrison: You should welcome this Bill. You have been complaining about it for long enough.

Mr. VENNING: The honourable member should just listen and learn.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rocky River must be treated with the utmost courtesy.

Mr. VENNING: My colleagues have mentioned what they hope will result from the implementation of this Bill. Representing a rural area, I, too, am hopeful that some good will come from it, although at this point of time I find it difficult to see exactly where it will come from. Any organization that, to a degree, is run by the Government or a board appointed by the Government is quite different from an organization run by private enterprise. A few years ago I visited Wyndham and Katherine where abattoirs had been run by the respective Governments. Just before I visited them, they had been taken over by private enterprise, and I learnt that the people supplying stock to the abattoirs received twice as much by way of return after private enterprise took over as they had been receiving when the Wyndham abattoir, particularly, was under the control of the Government of Western Australia. The office at Wyndham

had employed 22 people under Government administration, but under private enterprise six people did the same work. These are some of the problems I see with our abattoir at present. Labour has been put on the chain by the unions, and immediately there is a conflict as to the operation. It would be interesting to hear the Minister's comments. He opened the agricultural show at Melrose recently, and he was reported as having talked about regional abattoirs and how they should be upgraded. The existing regional abattoirs surely need to be upgraded so that they can operate for export if necessary, but I believe it is preferable to have an abattoir based as is our metropolitan abattoir, located near the railway and ports for export, and close to the metropolitan area for labour to handle the by-products. If there is to be any extension of abattoir facilities in the State it should be by addition to the present set-up—not necessarily to the existing abattoirs, but something in Adelaide.

I have paid much attention to the Minister's statements on this matter and have asked many questions of him about the result of the report made by Mr. Gray. Members on this side were concerned that the report was not to be a written one. We understood it was to be a verbal report on the results of the investigation. I raised the matter in the debate on the Estimates and pointed out that $11,000 was the cost of the report. The investigation has certainly not been cheap although, if it recommends improvements regarding the handling of stock, I suppose the sum involved is only chicken feed. However, $11,000 as the cost of a verbal report is a large sum of money.

Mr. Mathwin: Will the producers be pleased about it?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You should not say if you do not know.

Mr. VENNING: We will find out what its effect will be. However, the Bill is before us today and members are entitled to express their opinions on it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must not interject.

Mr. VENNING: The new legislation provides for a reduction in board members from the present eight to six, which is different from what I had expected. I thought that the new corporation was to be controlled by three members, but the proposed situation may be satisfactory. I am not happy about the number of members who constitute a quorum for the new corporation. The Bill provides that three members of the total membership of six provide a quorum. This allows the decisions to be made by two men, which is wrong. It would be better for the full corporation membership to constitute a quorum, because important decisions such as those which are likely to be made should not be made in the absence of any members.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What if one member went overseas to gain experience?

Mr. VENNING: True, but I do not like the situation that could develop. The same problem has arisen in other areas where decisions have been made by two men, with the Chairman having a casting vote, and this whole matter is much too important to be left in the hands of so few. I am vitally concerned about the situation in South Australia resulting from the high slaughtering charges that have been imposed on producers in this State and which have resulted in a loss to this State of many millions of dollars and the loss of many oversea markets. Two months ago, in conversation with a wholesaler operating in South Australia who also operates in other States, I was informed that a tender was being let calling for certain pig meats and the wholesaler said, "We will not get it in South Australia because our slaughtering costs are too high. It will go to private enterprise works in the Eastern States." This has been going on for some time and it is clear to me, as it is to all members, that the primary producers and the people of South Australia have missed out considerably as a result of excessive slaughtering charges applied at our abattoirs. Recent charges for the slaughtering of a 500 lb. beast for the local trade were about $20, and this charge is reduced slightly when animals are slaughtered for export, and the cost is again further reduced according to the numbers handled. However, the cost is excessive.

Another important point concerns country-killed meat brought to the metropolitan area, because an inspection charge of 1c a pound is applied to this meat. That fee has been a doubtful issue for some time, and I believe that these inspection charges subsidize our city abattoirs. The inspection charge on a 500 lb. country-killed beast is about $5, and in this way privately-owned abattoirs are also held back, because they must pay this inspection charge. The charge is classified as an inspection charge, but I believe it is applied to offset the losses incurred by city abattoirs.

Much money has been spent on the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board site in Adelaide. It was said five years ago that it would have been far better to pull down the buildings and start again. However, so much money has subsequently been expended and the standard of the abattoir upgraded so much to meet the requirements of the American and other export markets that the result of such an action would be a calamity. Nevertheless, much work must still be done to improve the facilities at the abattoir so that stock can be slaughtered in an efficient manner and the employees of the abattoir need not work long hours on overtime. Men can work only for so long before they become disgruntled and before absenteeism develops and strikes take place. Another problem concerns the lack of continuity of work at the abattoir. On a recent inspection during show week, I was informed that 100 men were absent from the sheep chain, and this must cause much confusion and inefficiency in the works. The corporation must try to reduce the incidence of absenteeism.

We have heard that South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent in the world, and this causes problems relating to the continuity of stock supply. In the winter we experienced a dry period and much stock was sent to abattoirs for slaughter. The season broke in July and the numbers dropped overnight. Last week about 80,000 sheep and lambs as well as other stock came to the abattoir as a result of our recent dry period, and it must be a problem to run a killing works when the stock supply is so irregular. I cannot suggest a solution to the problem, but it is a problem that has existed for some time even at the regional abattoir at Peterborough. When the stock are sent, work goes on in earnest, but there comes a period when the abattoir must close down because of insufficient stock being consigned for slaughtering. Although I am concerned with the alteration to the current legislation, I am more concerned by the comments of the Minister in his explanation where he stated:

> It is expected that, when the Bill to provide for this overall reorganization is introduced, substantially all of the principal Act as amended by this Bill will be re-enacted in that measure.

What will happen to the situation in this State? As a result of a report concerning meat marketing in this State, much concern has been expressed about the possible closing of operations run by small butchers. Many country butchers were worried about this because they had upgraded their own killing works. For example, if people in my district, particularly in Crystal Brook or Jamestown, had to draw their supplies from Port Pirie, killing charges would be increased. I have heard of no outbreaks of disease from country abattoirs. I fear that the Minister may eventually say, "All meat killed in the country will have to be slaughtered in these regional killing works, such as those at Peterborough, Port Pirie (which is centrally located), Whyalla, Port Lincoln and Port Augusta. Therefore, the cost to the consumer will be increased considerably and, where additional cost is involved, the producer will be expected to take a lesser sum for his commodity."

This inquiry, which has been undertaken for the Government, is not a new sort of operation. Indeed, various committees of inquiry, whose reports are available to members in the Parliamentary Library, have been set up by Governments over the years. Large sums of money have been spent setting up the southern yards at the abattoir and to improve the sheep yards. A problem exists, in that the abattoir is on the wrong side of the railway line; it is a pity that much of it could not have been redesigned years ago when the new organization was set up. However, that is not the position and, as much money has been spent on the existing site, it appears that we will have to make the best of the present situation. I believe that the situation at the abattoir will improve when the new meat hall is established.

The ability of the organization to borrow money has been referred to today. However, money that has been required in the past has been made available, and I cannot see how this legislation will make any difference to the organization's borrowing power. The organization must be economically run. I am sure that the unions will play an important part in the management and that they will put their labour on the killing chains, as they have done in the past. I should be surprised if there was any change in this respect. I was interested last week or the week before in a question asked in another place regarding the personnel on the corporation. Members understand that, because of the numbers involved, representation is to be restricted. I am sure the corporation will include a union representative, and I wonder whether it will also include a primary producer

representative. I fear that it will not. All sorts of comments are made by people that these boards should be run not by farmers but by experts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. The honourable member for Rocky River cannot be heard.

Mr. VENNING: I believe there must be some tie-up between the representatives on the corporation and the primary producers. It is all very nice for one to say that the stock should be handed straight over to the abattoir and that that is the end of it. I support the Bill and sincerely hope that, as the whole picture unfolds, amendments will be moved to straighten out the situation in relation to these killing works.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Like other Opposition members, I, too, support the Bill. I would like to refer to one or two aspects of the legislation. Prior to the introduction of the legislation, I asked the Minister of Works what the Bill was all about and what the Government hoped to achieve by it, and in reply the Minister said I would find that out when the Bill was introduced. However, Opposition members are to a great extent still in the dark in this respect, not because they are lacking in powers of understanding or because they do not have the necessary wherewithal to understand the legislation, but because the Bill does not tell us much or whether the Government hopes to achieve the aims publicly stated by the Minister of Agriculture and reiterated by the Minister of Works. I refer briefly to the following public announcement that appeared in the Stop Press of the September 26 issue of the *News:*

The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. M. Casey) said today control of the abattoirs would be vested in the South Australian Meat Corporation, which would replace the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. Mr. Casey said the corporation's aim would be to make the abattoirs economically viable.

That press report prompted me to ask the Minister of Works how the Government hoped by the legislation to make the abattoir economically viable. From reading the second reading explanation, one can only conclude that the Minister must envisage much more than this if he hopes to achieve that aim because if, simply by reconstituting the board and stating one or two pious hopes like those contained in the second reading explanation, the Government believes this is a major step towards making the abattoir viable, it is more naive than I believe, and that is saying something. I refer now to the following point the Minister made in his second reading explanation when enunciating the aims of the Bill:

The benefits that will be obtained from such a rationalization are as follows: (*a*) improvements in the quality and wholesomeness of meat offered for sale for human consumption; and (*a*) the creation of soundly based commercially viable abattoirs effectively serving the needs of all sections of the community.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Read it from the beginning.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister is suggesting that I am imputing some meaning to the quotation other than the one actually intended. I shall read the statements preceding the quotation and I shall then draw the inference that I believe is valid; the statements are as follows:

For some time now the Government has been engaged in the planning of a substantial reorganization and rationalization of the meat industry of this State. The benefits that will be obtained from such a rationalization are as follows:

I have already read the statements that follow; the Minister then continued:

This Bill is the first step in giving legislative effect to the scheme and is brought down at this time to meet the urgent need for a reorganization of this State's principal abattoir, the establishment at Gepps Cross.

I persist with my point that, if these desirable aims are to be achieved, this Bill will have to be only a first step. The sort of changes needed to achieve those aims will need to be much more far-reaching than anything provided in this Bill.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are dead right.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister's second point is that he hopes the abattoir will become a commercially viable business, ultimately self-sufficient economically, with slaughtering fees that are competitive with those of other States. The achievement of that aim revolves around the cost of running the abattoir and the amount of stock put through; those points must be considered when we talk about making something commercially viable. It is obvious that the charges at the Adelaide abattoir are far in excess of the charges levied at abattoirs run by private enterprise in other States. Of course, the basic problem (and I think Government members must concede this) revolves around the relationship between the abattoir management and the employees; employer-employee relationships are basic in any enterprise, and the abattoir is no exception. The wages of employees represent a major cost of any

industrial activity. Regarding the first point made by the Minister, in connection with improvements in the quality and wholesomeness of meat, I believe that, as a result of inspections by American authorities, massive efforts have been made to ensure a supply of wholesome meat from the abattoir.

Mr. Venning: Why don't they take stock from Eyre Peninsula to the Port Lincoln abattoir!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has completed his speech.

Mr. Venning: But I forgot to mention that point.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The basic problem relates to the abattoir's operating costs, particularly labour costs and the unit cost for slaughtering. I believe that the cost is $20 for a 5001b. beast for the local trade. In view of that outlandish cost, it does not surprise me that the charges of the abattoir are not competitive with charges in other States. The Minister said that cattle were being transported to other States, but I know of cases where lambs have been trucked to other States for slaughter there, and they have then been sold back to South Australia. So, the new corporation will have to come to grips with employer-employee relationships. The Minister says that he hopes to make the abattoir profitable. Also, he says there will be a board having a Chairman and five members; that could be a good move, but I cannot see that it will go far toward solving existing problems unless there are some terms of reference that are not apparent to us now.

More freedom is to be given to the new corporation than the amount of freedom that the board has had. If the corporation is to be charged with the mammoth task of making the abattoir profitable, it is logical that it should be given a fair amount of freedom. I agree with the point made by the member for Rocky River that the whole success of the operation is tied up with industrial relations, competition, and the sort of authority that the corporation can exercise in relation to its employees. Everyone who has taken any interest in the abattoir's operations must realize that, as presently constituted, the abattoir could not hope to compete with private enterprise abattoirs, in which management assumes the normal functions of management, with effective, direct control over staff and the normal rights accorded to employers. That kind of control has not existed at the metropolitan abattoir.

One only has to think back to the recent trouble, when Mr. Darcy Cowell resigned from the board because he believed that it was completely ineffective and that it did not have real control over a kind of situation that management normally should be able to control. Mr. Cowell felt completely frustrated.

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have said that the whole crux of this matter lies in the field of industrial relations and the relationship between the management and the employees at the abattoir. I have also said that, unless more is contemplated than has been provided for in this Bill, and if this aspect of the abattoir operations is not changed, I do not think there is much hope that the abattoir will become viable in competition with private enterprise, where there is the right sort of relationship between employer and employee and management has that normal control over operations that I think all sections of the community accept. It was this breakdown in the past that led to the resignation of Mr. Darcy Cowell, who was a member of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. He was completely frustrated.

Mr. Gunn: He was a valuable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and he brought considerable business experience to the board.

Mr. Venning: Do you think they would have him on the new corporation? He would be a good man for it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I could not guess at that: we have not had an inkling of whom the Government intends to appoint to the corporation. This man's resignation highlighted the complete frustration of those administering the abattoir, and, if the abattoir carries on as it has in the past, the Government's objectives will be nothing more than pipe dreams. Unless there is a real attempt to give management the sort of authority it should have, in competition with private enterprise, the whole exercise will be a waste of time and I do not think there will be much hope of achieving the objectives that the Minister has expounded in his second reading explanation.

None of the basic problems is dealt with in the Bill, as we on this side see it. Unless this position is corrected in legislation that the Minister says the Government intends to introduce subsequently, the whole matter is doomed to failure. We on this side support the Bill, because we, as well as all primary producers and, certainly, the Government, realize that the present operation of the abattoir leaves

much to be desired, certainly from the point of view of the producer, with killing charges so much higher than in other States, as the Minister has said.

The whole operations are doomed to failure if the union representatives are to have the right to hire and fire and to call the men out on strike if they do not get their way. That position is nonsense and the abattoir cannot compete with private enterprise on that basis. I speak for probably most members on this side, and this is the core of the problem at the abattoir.

One cannot quibble at the provisions in the Bill. In essence, they give the new corporation more autonomy, more borrowing power, and more powers to make decisions. If the corporation is to be completely hamstrung by union action, the provisions regarding killing charges are nonsense. The abattoir will become viable only if it competes with other abattoirs that are conducted by private enterprise and only if it has normal managerial control. Success speaks for itself. The abattoir cannot compete with abattoirs elsewhere, including those in other States, that are conducted by private enterprise and conducted efficiently under management control of operations. The Government-appointed board has in the past been completely hamstrung in its powers and, if this happens to the new corporation, the whole exercise will be a waste of time.

About a week ago I had the opportunity to hear the comments of Mr. Gordon Steer, who has been overseas on a Churchill fellowship, studying the meat industry. He spent much time in America at one of the specialist institutions there, and it was fairly apparent from what he said that the operations overseas probably were much larger than in the case of our abattoir. He spoke of regional abattoirs in America and said that the idea of carting stock to a central abattoir, as we do, is not popular. In America stock are slaughtered near the locality where they are raised.

While we depend fairly heavily on the export of lamb and meat overseas, there is much to be said for having an abattoir near the major sea-port and it is unreasonable to think that we can decentralize all our abattoir activities. However, Mr. Steer stated that, with regional abattoirs, one does not get the loss of weight and other losses caused by carting stock long distances to a central abattoir. Mr. Steer also told us about the inroads that synthetic meat is making into the American market.

I do not think we have this problem to a large extent in Australia and I do not think it will loom large in the near future. However, we should keep all these matters in mind when we are considering the future of the meat industry, on which, along with other primary-producing enterprise, the State's future rests. The Minister has said that the action taken in this Bill is a first step, and that is apparent, because the Bill merely gives a new corporation more power and more borrowing ability.

Regarding the talk about making operations viable and profitable so that slaughtering fees will be comparable to those charged elsewhere, the corporation must have much more authority over the day-to-day conduct of the abattoir if those objectives are to be achieved. The real power will have to reside in the corporation, not, as in this case, with union representatives and the employees. I say that without any malice. We are told that we hate unions, but that is nonsense. However, I do not hesitate to criticize the actions of union leaders in many of these disputes.

Mr. Langley: You hate the unions.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Unley has just woken up. I refute that statement completely. The honourable member should realize that what happened at the abattoir led to the resignation of Mr. Darcy Cowell. If the corporation is to have proper authority and decision-making powers that are normally vested in management, has the right to hire people, and to take action to keep the abattoir operating efficiently, there may be some hope in upgrading the abattoir in order to compete with private enterprise. However, if effective management rests with a few trade union leaders, the scheme is doomed to failure. If the member for Unley construes that remark as a hatred of unions, the honourable member is obtuse. Apparently, we hate unions if we make a valid point about union leaders in some circumstances.

The Hon. L. J. King: Give us the references to your speeches in *Hansard* in which you have made favourable comments about unions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should confine his remarks to the Bill, because we are not discussing trade unions.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Government members should also contain their interjections, which are grossly inflammatory and untrue. I am making the point about managerial authority that the new corporation will have, but I have been interrupted by obtuse and irrelevant interjections from Government

members. For the benefit of the Attorney-General I say, without qualification, that trade unions have done much for working people in general, and I would be the first to acknowledge that they have. However, I believe that some trade union leaders—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting wide of the contents of the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Government members, and particularly the member for Florey, have suggested that some operations of union leaders are not in the best interests of the people they are supposed to represent or in the best interests of this State. The Bill is the first in a series of legislative measures contemplated by the Government. I wish the Government well, but it will have to spell out more than appears in this Bill, if it wishes to achieve the lofty aims contained in the first paragraph of the Minister's second reading explanation. I support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, support the Bill, and agree with the remarks made by the member for Kavel, who has given an excellent resume of the irresponsible attitude of some trade unions.

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

Mr. GUNN: This amendment is long overdue, and, as one who has the privilege and pleasure of representing a large country district, I am aware of the problems at the Gepps Cross abattoir and at the Government Produce Department abattoir at Port Lincoln.

Mr. Payne: They have had problems with their representatives in this House, too.

Mr. GUNN: Perhaps the honourable member should look at himself and his colleagues before criticizing representation in this House.

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

Mr. GUNN: If you would contain yourself—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member wishes to take any point he should do it in accordance with Standing Orders, and not reflect on the Chair.

Mr. GUNN: I apologize if I have reflected on the Chair: I did not do it intentionally. In accordance with your ruling, Sir, I will speak to the Bill. I read an interesting article in a newspaper concerned with rural affairs.

Mr. Venning: I'd like to hear the speech.

The SPEAKER: That applies to the honourable member for Rocky River and all members: interjections are out of order.

Mr. Venning: I want to listen to the speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not interrupt when I am on my feet. He is being rude to his colleagues.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the interjections from the other side of the House?

The SPEAKER: Order! So is the member for Mitcham. If there are any interruptions from the member for Rocky River and the member for Mitcham, I will deal with them.

Mr. GUNN: Under the heading "Profit is aim for Gepps Cross" an article in this newspaper states:

> The State Government wanted to give the future body controlling the Gepps Cross abattoir as much scope as it could to run the abattoir complex as a commercial business.

After considering the clause dealing with appointments to the corporation, one is amazed to realize that no producer organizations are to be represented, but an exception may be a union representative on the board.

Mr. Venning: They run the country anyway!

Mr. GUNN: Certain elements of trade unions are trying to run the country. Many trade unions are responsible and their officers have done much for their members and I support their aims, but others in this movement have political aims and do not always further the industrial needs of their members. It seems ridiculous for producer organizations not to be represented. After all, if no stock was available to be killed at the abattoirs, employees would not have employment. Producers should have one representative on the corporation. An expert in accountancy is necessary also, and the member for Heysen would be pleased to hear me say that, because he is the accounting expert in this House.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Followed closely by the Minister of Education!

Mr. GUNN: That Minister is an expert on economics, but it is all theory.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: For an undertaking that is so important to the people of this State and to our export income, we should appoint people who are familiar with all aspects of business management. So I think the Government should at least outline to the House why it has not stipulated who the members of this board will be. Representing an area a long way from Adelaide, the member for Flinders will point out the activities of the works at

Port Lincoln. The producers on Eyre Peninsula are in a difficult position because they have a large freight bill to meet on most occasions. In the past, the abattoir at Port Lincoln has not been sufficiently attractive to have stock sent there. There are several reasons. In an article in the *Chronicle,* I see that the Minister of Agriculture said:

> A reassuring note from Mr. Casey's press conference came with his statement that expansion in killing facilities to meet future needs would be better achieved through regional abattoirs than by continually adding to Gepps Cross.

Of course, that will be at Port Lincoln, and we should be looking to some form of decentralized killing works. After all, much has been said about decentralization recently, and this is where we could take a practical step to assist country people. It would not be economical to build abattoirs willy-nilly all over South Australia, but Port Lincoln, with the best harbour in South Australia, would be an ideal place for an efficient and well-organized abattoir, since one of the problems facing Port Lincoln at present is that there is only a limited market because people will not go there to sell, for many reasons. First, there is only a limited number of buyers, and producers will not take their stock there. Certain concessions should be made available to other companies to attract them there to process their stock at Port Lincoln, which in turn would encourage the producers on Eyre Peninsula to take their stock to Port Lincoln. That would take the pressure off other meatworks. After all, there is a limit to the stock that Gepps Cross can take. This will affect the number of graziers in South Australia.

Mr. Venning: What if they dragged your wheat over here as well?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River must cease interjecting. The member for Eyre must ignore the member for Rocky River, who will not stop interjecting. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I think we are discussing a matter of vital importance to the people of this State—the reorganization of the abattoirs.

Mr. Clark: It is the Gepps Cross abattoir we are discussing.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And the first step is the Bill we are discussing tonight.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: There is no need for the Minister to get excited about it; every member can have his say. I have not much more to say. If honourable members opposite wish to continue interjecting, I shall be happy to remain on my feet for another half an hour.

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

Mr. GUNN: The member for Kavel said that it was of the utmost importance to the people of this State that we should have a well-organized and efficient abattoir at Gepps Cross as well as strategically placed abattoirs in country areas. In my opinion, it is the responsibility of this Government to have a board representative not only of the employees but also of the producers. I urge the Government to mention specifically in this Bill who the members of the board should be. I agree there could be one Socialist representative. The Government will again bow to trade union pressure; we are aware that the trade unions have put the Government in power and therefore there is this pressure on the Government.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): Obviously, the members of the Opposition are supporting this Bill in the faith and hope that the Government will be able to administer its provisions effectively for the producers who rely on the metropolitan and export abattoir. There is little to encourage us when we look at the Government's record in this regard. The Chairman of the new corporation must have business skill. The Government is culpable for its previous actions in this regard because, prior to 1968, it appointed as Chairman of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board Mr. George Joseph, a lawyer with no managerial skill in running abattoirs. This Government has greatly increased the problem by that appointment. I do not reflect on the integrity of Mr. Joseph. I know he is a strong supporter of the Labor movement in South Australia, and he is a lawyer. Let us stick to facts. Very few facts have been mentioned in this debate. This Government appointed a lawyer and from 1968 onwards has been extremely partial to lawyers. It has been a lawyers' Government and, wherever possible, it appoints a lawyer to some position.

Mr. Millhouse: Not necessarily.

Mr. HALL: Let lawyers stick to the law, and I hope they are not too busy because they charge excessively for the work they do. This Government was culpable for putting in charge of one of the most important facilities in South Australia someone who knew nothing about it. The Government says it is necessary to reform and provide sufficient financial

stability for the abattoir. The producers on that board are well aware of their frustrations over the years. The Chairman of the board has time after time given in to the unions. We know that, in consultation with a previous Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Bywaters), he was very partial to the unions in this regard. The almost iron control that the unions have at Gepps Cross is due to the Government's activities and its dominance by lawyers. What does the Government mean by coming along with, as the member for Kavel said, pious words? Apparently, it will produce a better financial result, but will it stop the damage to the skins on the line? Will it reduce from over 60 per cent the damage done to sheep and ram skins to the percentage (under 50 per cent) that applies to private abattoirs in South Australia? Will it produce more work from the men employed? Will more carcasses be produced at each shift, according to the number of men employed at the abattoirs? What does the Government mean by "economic viability"?

Mr. Venning: What is your guess?

Mr. HALL: My guess is that it is a lot of hogwash and window-dressing, as this Government has proved it to be with so many ideas it has presented to the House. According to the Government's last election policy speech, there were to be various committees of investigation and co-operatives that the Government was going to introduce for the benefit of the people on the land, but it has proved to be all figments of the imagination. There is nothing here except an idea. The Government shows no responsibility to this House by pointing out how it shall be achieved.

If members look at *Hansard,* they will find references to support my remarks. The Government knows that, to make the abattoirs much more viable, it has to do something about the output for each man-hour. We see what little influence this Government has on the unions in respect of a Government institution. Whether on television or in the newspaper I do not know, but the Premier is on record as saying, "This will mean cheaper meat for the consumer in Adelaide." On what does he base that prediction? The only hope this corporation has of producing anything is if the Government will have the courage, which I suspect it does not have, to go out into the commercial world and pay sufficient to someone who is well qualified to manage that corporation properly, efficiently, and firmly, and for the Government to stop playing favourites with the unions represented on that corporation. Unless the Government is willing to show that courage, what we have here is simply window-dressing and worthless electioneering by this Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I am delighted to think the Liberal Movement has at last reared its ugly head in this Chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This indicates to the primary producers of South Australia that it is not going to base its policies entirely on the metropolitan area, but will look at the primary producers and say, "We can do something about this, too". I am not sure whether the member for Gouger supported the Bill or opposed it; he did not say. He said it was a worthless piece of window-dressing, and on that statement alone I would have expected him *to oppose the* measure.

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My words have been misconstrued by the Minister and taken out of context.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Gouger described this measure as a worthless piece of window-dressing.

Mr. Hall: And that was conditional, and don't you take it out of context.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On those remarks he would oppose the measure, but he will not, of course, because he wants to have his cake and eat it too.

Mr. Hall: You are just talking a lot of nonsense.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was not impressed by one word he uttered. Obviously, he has not even read the measure. He has given it no consideration in depth, but he rants and raves for five minutes and thinks he will impress everyone. He did not impress me, and I do not think he impressed other people.

Mr. Hall: Obviously nothing will impress you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He is the only member in the Liberal Movement I will have to deal with, because he is the only speaker from the Movement in this debate. Now I will deal with the Liberal and Country League, the official Opposition. First, I appreciate the support the official Opposition has given this Bill and the thought it has put into the debate.

I say that quite genuinely. I think some members who have spoken to this measure tonight have not deliberately misconstrued the initial remarks in my second reading explanation but have tended to talk of "two points made by the Minister in his second reading explanation: first, improvements in the quality and wholesomeness of meat offered for sale for human consumption, and secondly, the creation of soundly-based and commercially viable abattoirs (plural, not singular) effectively serving the needs of all sections of the community". I had hoped it was clear that, in making those two points, we were speaking of the overall reorganization and rationalization of the whole of the meat industry of the State. The Leader said that he could not see how this could be achieved by this Bill. We know that it cannot be achieved with this measure, because this is only the first step in a series of things that will happen. That was mentioned later in the explanation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Members opposite have all had their say. I want to reply to some of the points made. In Committee members can speak as long and as often as they like. We have heard criticism to the effect that we cannot produce a written report: that we have said it is a verbal report. I think the member for Rocky River said we are paying $11,000 for this. We are getting value for our money.

Mr. Venning: Let's hope so.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will not even give it a chance.

Mr. Venning: Yes, I will.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This Government is grateful for the services of Mr. Ian Gray, who has been untiring in his efforts to solve this problem. He has been over the whole of the State to try to solve it. It is a tremendous and complex problem.

Mr. Venning: We know that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased to hear the honourable member say that. I do not care whether we pay him $20,000, if the results are there. The honourable member knows that we can earn that sum in a week with the results of this report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable member for Rocky River must cease continually interjecting. The honourable member for Gouger has already spoken to this Bill, and the honourable Minister of Works will be heard with respect. There will be no more interjections.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall quieten down, if you like, Sir, but I have to raise my voice to be heard.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There has been criticism from the member for Eyre because the newly constituted board will have no representative of the producers. One of the reasons is that in the past it has not worked. Members are saying we must have a producer representative, but does that mean such people should have a representative on the bank board because they produce money? This is an approach to a difficult problem. We have said it is a first step, and members opposite have supported it in the hope that the so-called pious statements made by us, which in fact refer to the total situation and not just this matter, will be justified. This problem has not arisen only in the past couple of years. The member for Flinders said that the Gepps Cross abattoir should have been knocked over 10 years ago.

Mr. Carnie: I did not.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I thought the member for Flinders said that he did not think the Gepps Cross abattoir should be there at all.

Mr. Carnie: No, I believe you should start phasing it out so that perhaps over the next 10 years it can be phased out.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I apologize to the honourable member. I though he said previously that the Gepps Cross abattoirs should not be there. I accept that he said it should be phased out.

Mr. Carnie: I said it was a pious hope that you would get the right management.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not deny that there has been difficulty between the management and employees. No-one in his right senses would ignore that or put his head in the sand about it. We hope that the new board will do better than has been done in the past.

Mr. Goldsworthy: So do we.

Mr. McAnaney: How long has that been going on?

Mr. Goldsworthy: You just took me up on the pious hope.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member said—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You agree with me?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not disagree, but so what?

Mr. Goldsworthy: Then we are in agreement.

The SPEAKER: Order! When honourable members are speaking, they must address the Chair. I am getting absolutely sick of listening to honourable members, particularly on the back benches, continually interjecting. They had their opportunity to speak in this debate, and it is about time that they learned to conduct themselves as responsible representatives of the districts they represent. I am not going to warn them again. I ask the honourable Minister of Works to ignore further interjections and reply to the debate.

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

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask why you always refer to this section of the House and not to members on the front bench opposite?

Mr. Clark: He didn't mention any names at all.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Speaker will refer to any member he sees and hears continually interjecting. The honourable member should take a point of order at the time it arises. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It was emphasized in the second reading explanation that this was the first step, yet this evening a whole range of matters has been mentioned. We have heard about Port Lincoln, about regional abattoirs and many other matters. We have heard complaints that the Government has not considered providing further information to honourable members regarding this first step, but I make is perfectly clear that the reports we receive from time to time from Mr. Gray will continue to come in until we can introduce further legislation, as has been mentioned in the second reading explanation. We are nowhere near this stage yet.

Mr. Carnie: What about the other matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is only part of the total scene, and the honourable member knows it. We could have held up this legislation until we had the total report and had decided what we should do regarding the whole State. However, this would clearly not have been satisfactory, because it might be another 18 months before we were able to do things that we wanted to do, or to even frame the necessary legislation.

Mr. McAnaney: You may not be here.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am trying to be serious and tell the House about matters in which it is interested, but I am insulted by the honourable member, who is not even in his place. It will probably be 18 months before we can even frame the legislation and examine the type of legislation necessary to give effect to the total plan for this State. This is a start.

Mr. Carnie: How do you know it will be effective?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If we had done nothing about the matter until we had everything sown up, we would have been subject to the most severe criticism, and rightly so. If members opposite are fair and are reasonable, they will realize that this is a matter about which we must do something quickly. If this does not work, we will have to do something else, but let us try, and that is what we are doing. The member for Heysen said that he was confused and that he did not know what was happening; he said "There is to be a five-member board and the next we know is that there will also be an advisory board. What is this board?" Had he read the second reading explanation he would have known what we were talking about when we referred to the advisory board.

Mr. McAnaney: The Minister made a public statement.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In the second reading explanation I said:

> In fact, it is intended that many of the interests at present represented—

and I was talking of producers—

> on the board will secure representation on a proposed authority that will ultimately have wide powers in relation to the meat industry as a whole.

I was talking about the industry as a whole and about the State as a whole. That refers to the board, yet the honourable member said he was confused about it. I doubt that I could make it any clearer. I continued:

> However, it is considered that the "new-look corporation", will necessarily have to be more streamlined and perhaps more "commercially orientated", if the plans for the Gepps Cross abattoir are to be made fully effective.

We try to streamline the situation and now we are told by members opposite that the quorum is too small, that we should have a larger quorum, because vital decisions could be made by two people.

Mr. Venning: That is true.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not disagree.

Mr. Hall: How will you make it more commercially viable?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When we say that we are going to adjust the system of charges and the system of cartage—

Mr. Hall: Give us details. There is nothing in it. You tell us.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am talking about the power to fix these fees by resolution rather than by legislation. Some say that that might be dangerous, that we should know what is going on, yet we are trying to streamline the organization. We talk about cartage and are told that suspicion is aroused about whether it will not cost more, yet that is streamlining the procedure to make it more competitive and commercially viable. When we do these things they are not examined and treated fairly and, in that situation, I do not know to where we should go next.

Mr. Hall: You certainly don't. What do you mean by "commercially" viable? Tell us how?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is an old ploy of the honourable member that we know well. As I said, he has not read the Bill or the second reading explanation. He has come to put the Liberal Movement to the front, but he did not succeed. I am pleased that members opposite have supported the second reading, and I look forward to an interesting Committee debate.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister say whether Mr. Joseph will be Chairman of the new corporation?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member's question is not relevant to this clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Amendment of heading to Part II of principal Act."

Mr. HALL: Is my question relevant to this clause, which refers to the setting up of the new corporation?

The CHAIRMAN: No, it is not, as this clause relates only to the heading of Part II of the Act.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Composition of Corporation."

Mr. McANANEY: I move:

In new section 10 (2) to strike out "five" and insert "two".

The old board has been criticized for representing sectional interests, and the Minister said in reply to the second reading debate that this could happen again. This board needs to comprise full-time members who do not have other duties to perform. I am not happy about the appointment to the corporation of members nominated by the Minister as, without going into personalities, many appointees to boards have been unsatisfactory. If the corporation comprises only three members it will be more effective.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I cannot accept the amendment. I am surprised the honourable member thinks I said that the board would represent sectional interests. He is obviously confused because we said that sectional interests that had been represented in the past on the board would have an opportunity to be represented on the advisory committee. I did not say there would be sectional interests on the corporation. I believe it should comprise five members and a chairman, as that would at least allow for members absent because of illness or travel. However, if the corporation comprised only three members, two of its members might be absent at the one time, leaving only one member to deal with any business that arose. Such a situation would not be acceptable to the Government. Much thought has been given to this matter, and I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. McANANEY: If I have misconstrued what the Minister has said, I will withdraw my comments. However, what he has said backs up my statements about having a small full-time board. The corporation needs to have on it not a lawyer but an accountant. I have advocated for the last 10 years that it should comprise three members.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HALL: I think my question is relevant to this clause. Can the Minister say, in contrast to the nebulous statements he has so far made, whether Mr. Joseph will be the Chairman of the new corporation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot tell the honourable member this now or at any other time in the debate. Indeed, the Government cannot say who the members of the corporation are to be until the Bill is passed.

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister say what the Government intends to do with the members of the present board regarding compensation and the payment of any allowance?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To my knowledge, absolutely nothing is to be done, although no doubt the Government will express its gratitude for the services they have rendered.

Mr. Millhouse: By letter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Quorum and Chairman."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I intend to move to strike out this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is not in order for a member to move to strike out a clause. The question will be put to the Committee that the clause stand as printed; if the honourable member does not want to accept the clause, he can vote against it, but he cannot move that it be struck out.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister say whether the quorum of three includes the Chairman?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I understand it, the quorum is a quorum of the board, which has five members plus the Chairman. The quorum would be three of the five members plus the Chairman, but I shall check that point.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is contrary to the common situation, where a chairman is considered to be a member of the board. In that case, the quorum would be two members plus the Chairman.

Mr. PAYNE: The principal Act provides that a quorum shall consist of any four members. Of course, the Bill alters that number to three.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I previously raised a query about whether a quorum of three included the Chairman or whether a quorum would be three members, plus the Chairman. Has the Minister clarified the matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will later move an amendment. I must move that a clause be reconsidered, and the amendment will mean that the Chairman is included in the quorum. The corporation consists of five members and the Chairman, making a total of six, and three will be a quorum, including the Chairman.

Mr. Millhouse: The Chairman must be present: there cannot be a quorum without the Chairman?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

Mr. Millhouse: When he is present, he makes one of the three?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is right. I intend to move that clause 4 be reconsidered and to move an amendment to put that right. That still leaves the quorum at three, not four as some honourable members have said should be the number, and that includes the Chairman.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of the Minister's explanation, I oppose the clause. If we consider that the quorum should be four instead of three, that is the only course open to us. I intend to vote against it, and I know I am voicing the sentiments of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can move an amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: You, Mr. Chairman, have ruled that we cannot do that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I did not rule that way. The honourable member wanted to move an amendment to delete the clause, and I told him that he could not do that but that he could oppose the clause.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: To ' move an amendment to strike out "three" and insert "four" would be nonsense. The quorum provided in the present Act is four. This clause strikes that out and inserts provision for a quorum of three. If the clause is defeated, the quorum will stay at four. It is not unreasonable to expect that four members should constitute a quorum on a corporation of six members, and the four can include the Chairman. It was obvious from what the Minister said that he was not clear whether the quorum was three plus the Chairman, which would be effectively four. As I believe the quorum should be four, I oppose the clause.

Mr. VENNING: Would the Minister oppose having the word "four" in place of "three"?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I oppose the suggestion made by the member for Kavel. The honourable member has to defeat this clause in order to gain what he wants.

Mr. Venning: Have we your support?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No. The Government has stated that a quorum of three should be sufficient, but the member for Kavel is trying, on behalf of his Leader, to provide that four shall be a quorum.

Mr. VENNING: When the member for Heysen supported part of the Bill and advocated a three-member board the Minister opposed it, but now he claims that a quorum of three is sufficient. Why is he not consistent?

Dr. TONKIN: This is an important matter of principle. If we wish to remodel the board to enable it to function effectively, with the wide powers it will have, any quorum should be one more than half, that is, four. I oppose the clause.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran (teller), Crimes, Curren, Evans, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (14)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Coumbe, Eastick, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 15 to 43 passed.

Clause 44—"Power of Corporation to borrow money, etc."

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

To strike out subsections (4) to (6) of new section 53 and insert the following subsections:

(4) The due repayment of all principal sums together with interest thereon borrowed by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board before the commencement of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act Amendment Act, 1972, and the due repayment of all principal sums together with interest thereon borrowed by the Corporation on and after that commencement is hereby guaranteed by the Government of South Australia.

(5) The Treasurer is hereby authorized—

(*a*) out of moneys to be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose, to make advances by way of loan to the Corporation, subject to such terms and conditions as he thinks fit, for any of the purposes mentioned in subsection (1) of this section;

and

(*b*) to pay out of the General Revenue of the State any sum required for fulfilling any guarantee referred to in subsection (4) of this section (and this section without further appropriation is sufficient authority for any such payment) and any sum paid under this paragraph shall, when moneys are properly available for the purpose, be repaid by the Corporation to the Treasurer and, when so repaid, shall form part of the General Revenue of the State.

As the clause appears in the Bill, there may be some doubt as to whether or not a specific appropriation of money would be necessary to meet any guarantee of past or future borrowings by the board or corporation. The amendment, which has been circulated to honourable members, will make it quite clear that no such specific appropriation will be required to meet such a guarantee. It also sets out by new subsection (4) the full extent of the guarantee. There are several amendments, but this is an exception. The others are simply consequential on the title of the board being changed to "corporation". The amendment to this clause is to make absolutely certain that no such specific appropriation will be required to meet the guarantee. I thought it was necessary to spell this out, hence this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 45 to 50 passed.

Clause 51—"Exemptions."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(*aa*) by striking out from paragraph (*b*) of subsection (1) the word "board" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Corporation".

This amendment is consequential. This and other amendments were overlooked in the original drafting of the Bill. This simply strikes out the word "board" and inserts the word "corporation".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 52 and 53 passed.

Clause 54—"Permits to slaughter stock on farms for consumption thereon."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(*ab*) by striking out from paragraph (c) of the proviso to subsection (1) the word "board" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Corporation".

This simply strikes out the word "board" and inserts the word "Corporation" in section 78a (1).

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 55—"Sale in metropolitan abattoirs area of certain carcasses and meat."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(*aa*) by striking out from paragraph (*d*) of the first sentence in subsection (1) the word "board" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Corporation".

This amendment is the same as that in clause 54.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 56 to 65 passed.

Clause 66—"Establishment of markets."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved:

After "board" to insert "twice occurring" and after "in lieu thereof" to insert "in each case".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 67 passed.

New clause 67a—"Control of stock markets."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

67a. Section 96 of the principal Act is repealed and re-enacted as follows:

96. No markets for the sale of stock, other than those referred to in section 94 of this Act, shall be established, erected or proclaimed within the metropolitan abattoirs area, any provision to the contrary in any Act notwithstanding.

At first sight it appeared that the effect of section 96 of the principal Act was exhausted since it related to a situation that occurred in 1913. However, there is some question as to whether a continuing right of a corporation to operate stock markets provided by this section should be preserved. In any event, it has been thought desirable to re-enact that section in the form proposed.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 68 to 76 passed.

Clause 77—"Compensation, how to be ascertained."

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

After "amended" first occurring to insert:

(*a*) by striking out the word "board" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Corporation";

and

(*b*)

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 78 passed.

Clause 79—"Power to lease and sell surplus land and property."

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

In paragraph (c) to strike out "board" and insert "boards"; and to strike out "Corporation" and insert "Corporations".

These are also consequential amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 80 to 83 passed.

Clause 84—"Regulations."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(*ab*) by striking out from paragraph (2) the word "board" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Corporation".

This amendment is also consequential.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 85 to 88 passed.

New clause 88a—"Hearing of complaints and information."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved to insert the following new clause:

88 a. Section 120 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (2) the word "board" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Corporation".

New clause inserted.

Clauses 89 to 93 passed.

Clause 94—"Service of notices."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved:

After "board" to insert "three times occurring"; and after "in lieu thereof" to insert "in each case".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (95 and 96) passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation"—reconsidered.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(*ca*) by inserting after the definition of "meat" the following definition:

"member" in relation to the corporation includes the person for the time being appointed Chairman of the corporation.

My amendment clears up the doubt that existed in my mind, because the amendment makes it clear that the Chairman is part of the quorum. The effect of the amendment is that the quorum will be three out of six people, there being five board members and the Chairman. This is what the Government desired initially, and the amendment puts the position beyond doubt.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): From what the Minister has said, I am convinced that this Bill is indeed the first step in a series of measures that will be necessary before the abattoir becomes anything like a viable proposition. I am also convinced from what the Minister has said that this Bill is a step in the dark. The Minister has said that, if we do not act now, we will have to wait for 18 months before we know where we are going. So, it is perfectly obvious that the Government does not know the full answer to the present problems of the abattoir. It is therefore clear that the terms used by the

Opposition to describe this Bill have not been misplaced. We support the third reading of the Bill, but we had hoped that the Government might see a little farther ahead.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I support the third reading, but I am disappointed with the Minister's handling of the Bill. When we criticized the lack of information about the Bill and the Minister's failure to provide it, the Minister resorted to abuse of members on this side when he was replying to the second reading debate. That was no cover for his failure to perform effectively as the Minister in charge of the Bill. I know that the Minister is a very likeable person and we all enjoy his company.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gouger cannot deal with personalities. He must speak to the Bill.

Mr. HALL: I was only trying to assure the Minister that I was not indulging in personalities. In fact, I like him. However, having a pleasant personality is no excuse for using it in such fulsome measure to cover the fact that he had no information to give the House. He accused me and other members of not having read the second reading explanation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That would be right.

Mr. HALL: That was incorrect, and the Minister had no way of knowing. It was a wild extravagant statement to cover his own deficiency. The Minister, in dealing with an amendment in Committee, refused to give information. We do not know whether the Chairman of the present board will be Chairman of the new corporation. I have expressed my dissatisfaction because the Chairman, a legally-trained man, is inexperienced in the conduct of this organization.

In supporting the third reading, I agree with the member for Kavel that we are doing so in the hope that the Government will provide a better administration of the abattoir under its control than it has in the past, and we hope that it will not repeat its mistake of appointing inexperienced people to this important position. I refute any imputation by the Minister in trying to smear this side of the House by saying that we oppose the Bill. I support what have been termed the Minister's pious statements, hoping that something will be done, but until the Minister tells us whether he will help to control the unbridled power of the unions at the abattoir and whether he intends to have a competent Chairman of the corporation, we must doubt his intentions.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I generally support the Bill, which has some good features, but it is regrettable that it makes only a half-hearted attempt at reconstituting the board. The size of the corporation is far larger than is necessary. It is ridiculous to have a corporation comprising six members and to expect only three to be a quorum. To have a successful corporation, we need a small body, the members of which can be there on the job. This is a half-hearted attempt to correct the situation at the abattoir. Until we have the employers controlling the abattoir, we will not have a viable industry there.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): It seems that a fair amount of heat has been engendered by this legislation, but the proof will be in eating the pudding. The member for Heysen said there were good points about this legislation, but I do not see any. However, I hope that there are good points and that it will work, so that it will be an improvement on the present situation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I am pleased to have the luxury of closing the debate. I rather envy those in Opposition, because I have had experience in Opposition and I know that it is wonderful to be able to stand up and knock what the Government is doing without suggesting any serious alternative. Tonight has been a perfect example of this situation.

Mr. Venning: You wouldn't accept an amendment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The suggested amendment was so far-reaching that it would have changed the quorum from three to four members! The honourable member was so concerned about this amendment not being accepted. How can anyone take seriously what has been said by the honourable member in this debate. Opposition members have had their fun, but not one has suggested seriously any sensible or reasonable alternatives to what the Government intends to do as a first step.

Mr. McAnaney: I bet you'll wish before long you only had three members on it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government has complete confidence in the person it has appointed to investigate this matter. This is the first stage following his report to the Government, and I look forward to receiving the remainder of his report. The Government is serious in what it is trying to do first, but, more importantly, it is serious about the

things yet to be done. Members have complained that the Government has not given them sufficient information about what is to be done in future.

The SPEAKER: That is out of order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We have many ideas to consider, but we have not decided on the complete answer. It may be 18 months before we know.

Mr. Venning: You won't be in Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We will be, and we will implement the measures necessary to reorganize and rationalize the meat industry in South Australia. I made two points, and the Leader was critical of the fact that we said we would achieve these things, but he misconstrued what I had said. We did not say what he suggested. We said we hoped to achieve those two things when we had completely overhauled, reorganized and rationalized the meat industry in South Australia, and not just the Gepps Cross abattoir.

Dr. Eastick: But Gepps Cross runs right through the middle of it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader should know better than that, but it does not matter. Again, I thank members of the Opposition for their support in this matter.

Mr. Venning: And their help.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I hope that the step taken here this evening (I am sure the members of the Opposition would say the same) will work for the sake of the industry. However, members opposite will not get it to work if they carry on in some of the ways in which they have carried on tonight.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 12. Page 1213.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, which implements the only decision that could be made in relation to the operations of theatres on Sunday evenings. The principal Act at present provides that, before theatres can be opened prior to 8 p.m. on Sundays, the proprietors must obtain the Minister's approval. It seems ludicrous that the proprietors should have to do that, in view of the fact that cabarets and dances can be commenced before 8 p.m. on Sundays. The Minister said that it was unlikely that church attendances would be affected if theatres were opened earlier than 8 p.m. on Sundays. However, I do not believe we can really assure the church authorities that that will be the case. I do not doubt that some young people will prefer to go to a theatre, if it is opened at 7 p.m. on a Sunday, than to their local church. I do not say that there would be a great number of such young people, but there would be some; of course, some elderly people may have that preference, too.

Mr. Clark: Surely such people would not go to church, anyhow.

Mr. EVANS: That is not necessarily correct. Some people attend church until an alternative attracts them; on one occasion they may go to the alternative and, following that, they may build up a habit and then cease attending church. I believe that the provisions in the Bill may result in some people ceasing to attend church on Sunday evenings, but that is not my main concern: I would not try to stop the individual from exercising his freedom in this respect. My main concern is this: if we start allowing licensed theatres to open earlier on Sundays and if we give them a licence to sell liquor from 6 p.m., that will be the first stage in a series of events leading to an approach for Sunday trading for hotels. Would we be justified in allowing licensed theatres to sell liquor from 6 p.m. to 11 p.m. on Sundays while preventing hotels from opening during those hours? And let us remember that hotels rely entirely on liquor sales. I am expressing my doubt now so that, if there is an approach by the Government to allow hotels to open on Sunday evenings, it will be on record that I raised my doubt about the aspect of the Bill I have referred to. In other respects, the Bill is the only sensible approach that can be taken, provided the theatre proprietors adopt a commonsense attitude. I support the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This Bill is very short. Certain Sunday entertainment was permitted under the amending Bill in 1967 and one restriction placed on screening films was that, if the film was to be screened before 8 p.m., Ministerial approval had to be sought. I understand from the explanation that several times the Minister has given permission for films to be screened between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m., and the Bill merely removes the necessity to obtain Ministerial approval. In his second reading explanation, the Minister states:

> Since its enactment, there has been general acceptance by the public of Sunday entertainment in a variety of forms.

I do not think that that statement is valid. Probably, people who held an opinion regarding Sunday entertainment before 1967 certainly

would not have changed their opinion. However, many people, including many of my constituents, have a contrary opinion about public entertainment on Sundays and I doubt that most of these people have changed their opinion since 1967. It is not apparent to me that in the Barossa Valley public entertainment on Sunday is a flourishing business, and I take the Minister up on his assertion that, since 1967, there has ben a general acceptance by the public. I think he means that, if some people want entertainment on Sunday and it does not intrude on the peace and quiet of other people, those other people have no objection. I would not dictate to people what their life style on Sunday should be.

The Hon. L. J. King: That is the meaning of "acceptance".

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If that is what the Minister implies by the statement, I do not quibble. It is certainly not a general acceptance in the sense that most South Australians have changed their mind and want Sunday entertainment. Many people value Sunday as a relatively quiet day when they can relax with their families and when their peace and quiet is not abused by entertainment in which other people seek to indulge.

I do not think we can take serious objection to the Bill. It will be difficult to assess any drift from Sunday evening attendances at churches. My observations show that Sunday evening church services have lost their attraction for many people, in the metropolitan area anyway, probably because of television as much as anything else. If the Bill sought to do more and threatened the right of people to have a quiet Sunday, I would raise serious objections. However, the Bill does not do that. I take it there has been no circumstance in which the Minister has refused permission for this Sunday evening screening. If there had been, the Bill would not have been introduced, as he would have considered that a safeguard was necessary.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I also support the Bill and am speaking only because I was interested in some remarks made by the member for Fisher. One could infer from those remarks that, if this Bill was passed, we would be preventing people from attending church. I completely favour people being encouraged to go to church on all occasions but I think the honourable member spoke on this matter in an unfortunate way. I consider that the Bill is long overdue, and it clears up an anomaly. I do not think it right to debar people from going to a picture theatre between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. on Sundays.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the Bill for similar reasons to those given by the member for Eyre. We must face the position that many Christian churches are reverting to Saturday as the day for observing their ceremonies. Since ancient times Sunday has been the proper day of observance. In my church this will be a notional thing soon, and I do not think the Bill will have any effect on religious observance. I see it as the member for Eyre does, namely, as merely correcting something that was overlooked in the first place.

Too much nonsense has been spoken about Sunday observance as against Saturday observance or observance on any other day. People ought to be allowed to have their entertainment as they wish and in their own time, provided that they do not interfere unduly with the rights of other people. It is noticeable that, in places where there are established churches (and, thank goodness, our country is not one of those: I am thinking of European countries in particular) Sunday may be the particular day of religious observance but it is also the particular day for sport. I have never been able to see logic in imposing a restriction as to any day of the week for sport or other entertainment facilities.

Mr. Evans: What about hotels?

Mr. McRAE: No, I see no logic in that restriction either.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to the prohibition of advertisements relating to tobacco.

I move that motion on behalf of the member for Bragg.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

JUVENILE COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 12. Page 1214.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Recently, I have been more concerned about rather higher ages than those of 8 years or 10 years and, in particular, whether one becomes an adult at 21 years or 18 years and whether or not we in this Parliament have succeeded in changing

that age for all purposes from 21 years to 18 years. In trying to argue those propositions, I found that it was difficult to draw the line and, in fact, the same has been proved here. It is extremely difficult to draw a line and say that below a certain age a child does not have a capacity, whereas above that line it does have a capacity. I find this Bill ironical. Parliament has done its best to reduce the age at which a person becomes an adult, but now we are moving at the lower end of the scale in precisely the opposite direction, in order to raise the age of criminal responsibility. If the Bill passes both Houses, we shall have narrowed the gap between a person who is not criminally responsible and an adult to 8 years. Up to the age of 10 years there will be no criminal responsibility and over that age a person will be responsible for all purposes.

It is strange that we should be moving to close a gap in this way. Because of the difficulty in drawing the line, I regret that the Attorney-General, in this second reading explanation, did not give any of the arguments either for or against the change. All he said was that the Bill gives effect to a recommendation concerning the minimum age of criminal responsibility that was made at the recent conference of Australasian Child Welfare Ministers. That is interesting, and I have no doubt that those gentlemen, if they are all gentlemen, or ladies, if any of them are ladies, acted with the best intentions. For the life of me I cannot see why we should be bound to follow that decision. Yet, we were offered nothing in explanation by the Minister. Therefore, I have done my researches to ascertain what arguments there are one way or another. I started, as I have started when on other similar excursions, with Earl Jowitt's legal dictionary. I was reminded when I looked at "Age" that the common law age below which a person was deemed not to have any responsibility was seven years. Under the heading "Age" it states:

At common law, a child under seven was incapable of committing any offence. This age limit was raised to eight by the Children and Young Persons Act, 1933.

This is the English Statute. The quotation continues:

A child between eight and fourteen is presumed to be *doli incapax,* but this presumption may be rebutted by evidence of the child's capacity to discern good from evil *(malitia supplet aetatem*—malice supplies age). A male under the age of fourteen is presumed impotent as well as *doli incapax,* and since the presumption of impotence cannot be rebutted *(R.* v *Phillips* (1839) 8 C. & P. 736), he cannot be convicted of an offence involving carnal knowledge, except as a principal in the second degree in a rape, or the like, where if he has a mischievous discretion, the presumption of impotence will not excuse him for aiding and assisting in the commission of the offence. He may, it seems be convicted of indecent assault.

The quotation continues with matters which are irrelevant to this debate. However, that is the potted version of the law in England. I have looked at the recent Australian book *Australian Criminal Justice System* by Chappell and Wilson and I found not a deep argument on this matter but a description of the various ages of criminal responsibility. On page 86 it states:

Various ages have been set at which a child can be considered responsible, namely criminally or legally responsible, for his acts. In England that age is 10—

The law in England was altered in 1967, I think, since Earl Jowitt's dictionary appeared. The quotation continues:

—in Sweden and Denmark 15 and in Australia and New Zealand it varies, being eight in Victoria, South Australia and New South Wales, seven in Western Australia, Tasmania and Queensland and 10 in New Zealand. The trend seems to be towards raising the age limit either by law or by implication. This latter tendency is evident in the latest English proposals for handling juveniles . . . Where the age is under 14 there is usually, as in Australia and New Zealand, provision for a rebuttal of the presumption of responsibility up to that age.

Chappell and Wilson show the tendency is towards raising the age, as has been done in England, at least, to 10 years. I was able to find a report from England on which certain changes in the law on this subject have been based. This is the Report of the Committee on Children and Young Persons (the Ingleby committee) of 1960, and here I found some argument set out under the heading "The minimum age of criminal responsibility." I intend to read some paragraphs of this report so that members may have an idea of the arguments that can be advanced about this matter. The report states:

Nearly all the evidence that we received was in favour of raising the age of criminal responsibility, but there appeared to be insufficient understanding of what would be the effect of the various proposals that were put before us. Some witnesses apparently thought that the age, whatever it might be, was essentially a line below which no legal proceedings could be brought in respect of the commission of offences, that is to say that children below that age would necessarily "get off". Another common belief is that an age line, by determining whether there can be conviction for an offence or not, automatically determines

whether that is an item of "criminal record". People who are disturbed at the thought of a child who is over eight, but still a child, being labelled for life as a thief, say that the age should be raised. But as higher ages are discussed other witnesses have produced the counter-argument that at such higher age a child knows right and wrong, and should not 'get off'.

The conception of a particular age giving a dividing line between "getting off" and suffering penalties was, as we have explained in paragraph 53 above, essential to the common law, but this no longer represents the position. Under present law, the age of a person determines the kind of legal proceedings that may be taken, but it never gives a total exemption from any proceedings. In the case, for example, of stealing, a child under eight cannot be prosecuted but the circumstances may enable him to be brought before a juvenile court as being in need of care or protection or as being beyond control.

The report goes on, at paragraph 81, to say:

More difficult considerations arise over arguments based upon children's knowledge of right and wrong. This conception is singularly difficult to apply when dealing with children, because we have always to think in terms of the child in his environment, including the climate of opinion in the family and group, as well as the physical surroundings. Differing environments may lead to wide variations in the age at which a child comes to this knowledge, so that any rule depending on a fixed age cannot have a sure foundation. Further, the environmental factors may be pulling in different directions. A child of, say, eleven may know quite well that stealing is wrong, and yet follow the behaviour of a group. It is, of course, common to find that a child is under stress from two opposing sets of value judgments. The standards of school teaching can be accepted intellectually, and to some extent emotionally, and yet at the same time group standards may control the behaviour. The fact that the child "knows right from wrong" does not mean that we should regard it as a personal responsibility equivalent to similar knowledge in an adult. A child's conception of right and wrong is, however, of vital importance in dealing with cases. In other words, we can properly use arguments of "knowing right and wrong" to help us deal with a child long before that child is sufficiently independent of its surroundings to be saddled with a permanent personal responsibility.

Our conclusion is that an age for criminal responsibility cannot be laid down except as part of the whole system of courts and legal procedures which may be involved in the protection, control and discipline of children.

Then, finally, it states:

Many of us consider that, in general, a child has acquired a reasonably full sense of discretion by the time he has reached the age of fourteen. But, judged by findings of guilt before the courts, the ages of thirteen and fourteen are peak years for juvenile delinquency and a number of children in that age group are found already to have offended more than once. This is a practical consideration of some importance and we propose that the new procedure should be applied to all children whose primary need is for care or protection and to children under the age of twelve who are alleged to have committed offences (with power for the age to be raised to thirteen or fourteen at some time in the future).

I have read that, to some extent to show the difficulties encountered in the United Kingdom some 12 years ago when the matter was discussed. I do not say this to criticize the Minister, but I do not think the Bill should have been introduced by him without any argument being advanced except the authority of the child welfare Ministers for a change in the age. It is a difficult matter, a matter in respect of which there are conflicting considerations. There are various opinions and eventually, I suppose, each one of us must, on the information, knowledge and background that he possesses, come to a conclusion on the matter. One can easily argue either way on this.

Because of the trend mentioned by Chappell and Wilson to increase the age, I am prepared to support the Bill, but I do so with some mixed feelings. As I say, I regret that the Minister in his second reading explanation did not really make out any case for the change he proposes.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I, too, support this Bill. Like the member for Mitcham, 1 did my homework. In fact, we did our homework together, sharing our textbooks from time to time. I must agree that the information he has given the House is correct. It is in a sense somewhat ironic that at a time when we have moved the age of majority from 21 to 18 years we are increasing the age of criminal responsibility from eight to 10 years. This is a most difficult problem. I do not think it is possible to be completely scientific in drawing a line so as to demonstrate clearly the age at which it can be said that a human being should be brought under the full duress of the criminal law. As it turns out, the move that we have made, as we find from Earl Jowitt's dictionary, is based on one of the more ancient forms of law, the Roman law, under which the life span of the child from the time of birth to the time of capacity to enter into a civil contract was divided into three periods: from birth to the age of seven, from the age of

seven to the age of 104, and from the age of 104 to the age of 14; then from 14 upwards to the age of majority.

That first period, from birth to the age of seven, and then the period from seven to 104 represent the approximate period we are discussing this evening. At civil law the first period was frankly described as *infantia,* meaning "child" as we know it; and the second period was *aetas infantiae proxima,* indicating it was the period at which one was so close to childhood that there was little point in drawing too much of a line of difference between childhood and this age immediately preceding puberty. It is also ironic that, having made a major move forward, leading many parts of this country and the world, in relation to the age of majority, we are now making what I think is a major move in this area but that in doing so we happen to coincide with a concept held by our predecessors hundreds, and indeed thousands, of years ago.

Although I think this proposition is worth while, it may be summarized from my point of view in this way. The practical experience of any lawyer (and although lawyers have taken a hammering this evening on another topic, they do sometimes have some merit and value, particularly in the juvenile courts) is such that the whole concept of having a child somewhere near the age of 10' brought before the court, with the full paraphernalia of an adult criminal court, is somewhat revolting. Of course, it has to be done when the child has been neglected or is running wild, but in that case a different procedure is used. Fortunately, today under the Juvenile Courts Act a procedure is laid down. It is difficult to believe that any but a small minority of people will be affected because of this change in the law between the ages of eight and 10. The change that is being made is likely to have a great impact not on the whole community but on the relatively few juvenile offenders who, between the ages of eight and 10, could conceivably be brought before a court. In the days when there were no juvenile aid panels or any of the modem, devices that we have today, there was nothing more disgusting than to see children of nine and 10 years of age being led across King William Street to the Juvenile Court by a burly police officer. He might have been kindly disposed and fatherly but there was no more disgusting sight than to see those children taken across a public road to the Juvenile Court housed in what used to be, I believe, the old Glenelg railway station. So, as a legal practitioner, I find the move very much in the right direction. The only sort of argument that could be used against it is the argument I have heard put on one or two occasions—the evil seed theory. This is a theory that some children, no matter how young, are inherently evil. There is some evidence to support this. I have on at least one occasion seen a case that might have led me to believe that there could be some evidence to support this theory. However, what evidence there is to support it is very flimsy compared to, first, the statistical evidence the Attorney has given in his explanation and, secondly, the practical evidence we can find from every-day experience in the courts. Therefore, it is with complete certainty that I support this Bill and commend it to the House.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill. My stance is not that of a lawyer, as has been the case with the two previous speakers, nor is my position reinforced by any legal writings I may have perused recently. My position is that of a member of the public, a former teacher who has had considerable dealings with young people and children, although of an age somewhat more advanced than the ages referred to in the Bill, and also as a parent, one of whose children is currently within this age group. To refer to children between the ages of eight years and 10 years as having criminal responsibility is, I think, completely unrealistic. My child, aged nine years, is a normal child, not retarded in any way, and normally developed for his age. Because I have a child of this age, I have first-hand knowledge of the age group dealt with in; the Bill. This indicates to me that the Bill is a step in the right direction.

To impute to children of the ages of eight years, nine years, and 10 years criminal responsibility is completely wrong. In my experience when children of this age have gone wrong the fault is invariably that of the parents or those charged with their upbringing or nurture. If anyone should come before the court, it is those charged with the care of the children. Simply on humane grounds, I support this legislation. I agree entirely with the sentiments of the member for Playford, who said it was a degrading experience to see in our society children of this age being brought before the courts. We are living in a somewhat more enlightened age than that which has gone before us. Not many years ago serious crimes were committed against children.

We do not have to cast our minds far back in English history to realize that society exploited children in many ways. Not long ago children in this age group were hanged. Fortunately, we have progressed since those days.

The Bill is desirable. The idea of imputing criminal responsibility to children of these ages is completely unrealistic. The manner in which the Attorney, in his second reading explanation, has mentioned the way in which children are dealt with is a realistic approach. He said that by far the majority at present were dealt with by discussions between police, welfare officers, and parents. Obviously, it is competent for the police to apprehend the child, even though he cannot be charged, and to initiate discussions with parents and social Workers. If people in these three categories, acting together, cannot work out a satisfactory solution whereby the child can be punished by the parents if need be, or some solution other than bringing the child before the courts and charging him with a criminal offence cannot be arrived at, it is rather a poor commentary on our society.

I am not swayed by any argument advanced by the Attorney, because he did not advance any: I am convinced by my knowledge of my own children and of other youngsters with whom I have had contact. This is a matter for common sense, although it is fairly difficult to define just what common sense is. I think common sense should go a long way in determining our attitude to legislation and its effect on the community. We can adopt all sorts of legalistic stances regarding legislation, but if we have any of this nebulous commodity of common sense we should be able to weigh up the merits of a situation without complicated legal precedent and decide for ourselves what is the right course.

I am sure that this Bill is on the right lines. A youngster may be charged in certain circumstances, as the Attorney points out. He can be charged with being neglected, but that is no reflection on him; it is a direct reflection on those responsible for his care. If he is uncontrolled he can be charged. Of course, if he is a habitual truant he can be charged. I think this covers the situation quite adequately. I agree with the member for Mitcham that the Attorney has not advanced any real arguments. Had I an open mind on this question (which I have not) I would not have been convinced by the only major point the Attorney raised, which was that a conference of Australian child welfare Ministers agreed that this was a good thing. I am not willing to take at face value the determination of a group of Ministers unless they advance some argument. I am convinced in my own mind, with my knowledge of youngsters of this age and what we mean normally by criminal responsibility, from my own knowledge of past history and the way in which society has dealt with children in the past. With these comments, I support the second reading.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the Bill. I did not mind the Attorney's introducing the Bill without giving any great discourse or legal argument. I strongly hope that he and the other child welfare Ministers concerned used a certain amount of emotion and what I would call, for want of a Latin phrase, common sense. I am certain that they would have looked at what alteration to this legislation would mean. The only test I have applied to the matter is to read the main section concerned, section 69 of the principal Act, which, with the proposed alteration incorporated, would read as follows:

> It shall be conclusively presumed that no child under the age of 10 years can commit an offence.

This calls on the reader to be able to accept such a presumption. I agree with the member for Playford and also the member for Kavel. I do not have any difficulty in accepting this presumption. I remind members of the remarks of the member for Playford, who pointed out that not so long ago he and other members of the public witnessed children being taken by a police officer across King William Street to the Juvenile Court. He and the member for Mitcham made several legal references, but I prefer to go along with what I believe to be a commonsense view. I am rather prejudiced when I consider the old legal situation inherited from England, because it was harsh and severe. It took England many decades to become a more enlightened nation, and I attach little weight to those examples as anything other than brief historical references to the matter.

I am not sure that even 10 years is the right age at which to draw a line, as the member for Mitcham put it. All members will be able to call to mind instances of children of 11 years of age being less mature than children 10 years of age. I look forward to amending legislation whereby children of 12 years of age, who are alleged to have committed offences, will be considered by an assessment group consisting of, perhaps, psychologists and others who will assess the degree of responsibility that can be imputed

to the child. Such pre-assessment could be used to decide whether proceedings should be taken against the child. I do not think I should canvass the matter further now, but I have mentioned it as my personal view. I think the Bill is a step in the right direction, and I support it.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I do not support the Bill. However, I do not raise any strong objections to it. I wish to refer to the Attorney-General's words on this matter, because they clarify the situation and make it clear that the move we are now considering is not necessary. I believe that I have as much consideration for youg people as does the Minister and, like many other travellers on the main Melbourne highway, I see young people trying to hitchhike to Melbourne, some of them only between eight years and 12 years of age. If I find such young people I pick them up and suggest that I take them back to their homes before they end up in perhaps deeper trouble than they are already in. I have a great respect for young people, and I do not believe that it is pleasant to see a burly policeman or welfare officer placing a child in a situation in which he fears authority. In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General said:

> Where these children are alleged to have committed acts of a criminal nature, the matter may be dealt with by discussions between the police, welfare officers and the parents.

Criminal action is not immediately taken against the child. The Minister admits that discussions are held with the authorities concerned and the parents. I believe that that is the approach that should always be made, and I agree with the member for Mitchell that some type of assessment should be made of the child's maturity and development, to determine whether the child is immature for his age or over-mature. Many eight-year-old children could be more mature than some 12-year-old children. Perhaps using age as this basis is wrong, because there is little difference between children between the age of eight years and 10 years. I have a boy of nine years and I expect him to know right from wrong. He might commit wrong: it would be surprising if he did not before he reached the age of maturity that we accept, which is 18 years. However, I know that when he does he will know that he has committed wrong. We are discussing whether a child knows right from wrong, and, regardless of whether his age is six, eight, nine, 10, 11 or 12 years, the right approach is for discussions to take place between the authorities and the parents to try and solve the situation without going to court. Children are put through stress and strain by being brought before courts in cases where they are uncontrolled or neglected or are regular truants. The Attorney admits this in his explanation, and that situation will still apply after this measure is passed (and I know that it will be passed because few people object to it). I do not object, because children should not be subjected to harsh treatment.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But that is not a case of criminal responsibility, is it?

Mr. EVANS: No, but it is just as frightening to the child to face up to the authorities in such cases as it is for a child who has broken into a home and stolen money and other goods. We are not considering the seriousness of the offence, but rather we are considering the child and the effect of discipline on him. The member for Mitcham makes a good point when he says that people are maturing at an earlier age than they did 20, 40, 60 or even 100 years ago. Consideration must be made of the complexities of modern life compared to life many years ago. Our world is more complex and people who live in it must be more mature to survive without too often clashing with the authorities. The age of majority has been lowered to 18 years, and in this Bill the age of criminal responsibility is being raised from eight years to 10 years. It will not be many years before politicians, who are looking for something on which to hang their hats, say that the age of majority should be reduced to 16 years. It could reach the stage, therefore, where the age of criminal responsibility is higher than the age of majority. The Attorney may laugh, but that would seem to be the logical conclusion if we keep reducing one and raising the other.

This measure is unnecessary. The passage of this legislation will have no effect on the way in which young people are handled or on the person who is capable of performing what is considered to be a criminal act. Believing that it is a waste of Parliament's time, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I strongly support the Bill, and again find myself at variance with the member for Fisher. It is horrifying to think that we in this enlightened age would drag before the courts a child of only eight years of age. No useful purpose would be served in doing so and, indeed, I doubt whether the child would be fully aware of what was happening. Such an appearance in court would have a horrifying effect on

that child's mind. This is an enlightened age, and this amendment will create a situation far more humane that that existing under the present legislation. I believe it could go even further. I have, most unfairly, been labelled as a conservative member on most issues; however, I have always tried to take a progressive view. Having during my term as a member of Parliament had the opportunity of visiting schools on numerous occasions and, with other members, a certain institution, I feel strongly about this measure, believing that it is an enlightened step. As it exists at present, the legislation is wrong. Believing that we are doing no-one any good by dragging an eight-year-old child before the courts, and that the parents of such a child should accept the responsibility for him, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

LISTENING DEVICES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 21. Page 1517.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is not the first time that a Bill of this nature has come before the House, and it will not be the first time that I have supported the second reading of such a Bill. In 1969 the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Premier, introduced a Bill called the Right of Privacy Bill. That Bill was rather wider than the Bill now before the House in that it was not confined to listening devices; it included what were called visual intrusion devices. We had at that time in Parliament quite a lively debate about the right of privacy and whether the Bill was good or bad. As Attorney-General, I put a number of amendments on file, and we passed some of them; then, the Leader got sick of it, and the Bill lapsed.

It was obvious even in 1969 that the matter was not new. Having at that time access to the records, I looked at the *Hansard* debates and saw that the question of protecting the right of privacy had been discussed at meetings of the Attorneys-General at least as early as 1967. At that time the Attorney-General of the day was non-committal about the matter. Even as late as February, 1968, near the time of the election, Mr. Andrew Wells, Q.C., as he then was, represented South Australia at a meeting of Attorneys-General and said that South Australia would be hesitant to get into the matter of legislation on this topic. It was raised again at a meeting of Attorneys-General that I attended in June, 1968. I mention all these things only to underline the fact that this is not something that the Government has suddenly thought up to save the people of South Australia from an intrusion into their privacy: this is something with which people have been dealing for a long time not only in South Australia but throughout the country.

One of the difficulties we have is that there is no defined right of privacy. No-one knows precisely what the term means; indeed, when I was considering the Bill of Rights, I was anxious to insert in it a provision in this regard. However, it was pointed out to me that, in fact, it is so ill-defined as really not to be capable of statutory protection. It has been canvassed, of course, but not in the law. The best exposition that I know of and the most recent, I think, was that given by Professor Zelman Cowen in the Boyer Lectures in 1969, published by the Australian Broadcasting Commission under the title *The Private Man.* In the first of those lectures Professor Cowen dealt with the concept of the right of privacy, and he included a couple of quotations in his lecture. I shall mention them now, because I believe that they sum up the matter very well. The first quotation is from an American writer, Clinton Rossiter, who says:

> Privacy is a special kind of independence which can be understood as an attempt to secure autonomy in at least a few personal and spiritual concerns, if necessary in defiance of all the pressures of modern society . . . (It) seeks to erect an unbreakable wall of dignity and reserve against the entire world. The free man is the private man, the man who still keeps some of his thoughts and judgments entirely to himself, who feels no overriding compulsion to share everything of value with others, not even with those he loves and trusts.

The other quotation, which concluded the first lecture, is from a report by the St. George Branch of the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Sydney. Professor Cowen states:

> Their strong and detailed report entitled *The Invasion of Privacy* presented to the National Convention of Jaycees in 1968 is a notable document. Their general conclusion is uncompromising—

and this is the general conclusion—

> . . . The right to personal privacy is being severely challenged by the demands of modern society in its never ceasing quest for efficiency and conformity . . . The growing awareness of a few thoughtful people is not sufficient to safeguard the right to privacy. There is a need to place before our community and business leaders the challenge of maintaining the dignity of the individual in a changing environment. There is also a need for us to realize our obligations to our fellow men.

Bureaucratic zeal and the pursuit of efficiency have blinded many men to the need to< preserve the basic dignities and freedom of their fellows. To maintain the role of free men in a free society we must insist on the right to be let alone.

I think that is as good an exposition of the right to privacy as is available. It is much broader than is required for the purposes of this Bill. As I have said, it is not in legal form, and the right to privacy has not been defined legally as far as I know. You may not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, from the things that I have said, that I support the Bill and its objectives. Several matters about it can be improved, although certainly it is much better than the Bill that the present Premier introduced in 1969.

Some matters in the Bill may justify what I have said about it or a criticism of it. Clause 4 is the main provision and subclause (1) contains the prohibition. The penalty is fairly severe, as was the penalty included in the Premier's Bill. It is a fine of $2,000 or imprisonment for six months, or both. I think that is the order of penalties for most offences under the Bill. One thing I like about the measure is that at last we have got away from the usual formula of providing that offences that we create by Statute shall be triable summarily. We now provide for a defendant to elect to have the offence tried as an indictable offence, and that is right when a period of imprisonment or a heavy fine is the penalty. I do not like (I find it entirely unnecessary) clause 4 (2), which is one of the provisions that refers to the onus of proof. Subclause (2) provides:

> In proceedings for an offence that is a contravention of subsection (1) of this section it shall lie upon the defendant to satisfy the court before which those proceedings were brought that he had the consent, express or implied, of the parties to the conversation in relation to which it is alleged that listening device was used, for the use of that listening device.

The onus of proof should not be reversed in this case. It would be easy for those who had taken part in the conversation to give evidence in court that no permission was given by them for the use of any device to listen in to what was being said. No case of difficulty of proof would justify a reversal of the onus, nor did the honourable gentleman, in introducing the Bill, suggest that there was any. All he said (and I suggest that this is rather pompous and certainly patronizing) in his second reading explanation, in justification of this subclause was, as follows:

> This burden of proof serves to emphasize the proper responsibility that is placed on a person who desires to use a listening device to overhear a conversation, that responsibility being to secure the consent of all the parties thereto.

I am afraid that, to me, is not a convincing reason to depart from the general rule that a person is to be considered innocent until proved otherwise, and the onus is on the prosecution to prove every ingredient in the offence. I will oppose subclause (2): it is unnecessary and undesirable. Clause 6 gives police the right to use these devices, but provides that they cannot be used unless there has been an application to a District and Criminal Court judge. The criteria that the judge has to use are set out in subclause (2), and I do not envy Their Honours the task that has been set them. The subclause stipulates:

> (*a*) the gravity of the matter in relation to which it is desired to use the listening device;
>
> (*b*) the extent to which the privacy of any person is likely to be interfered with; and
>
> (*c*) the extent to which the prevention of the commission of any offence or detection of an offence is likely to be assisted.

To me there cannot be any half-way measure: if one receives permission to use the device, one must receive permission to use it with regard to that person, but I do not know for how long. I suppose a policeman could say that if he used the device he would get the evidence he needed, and maybe that is all that is necessary to satisfy paragraph (c). The criteria are broad, and it comes down to the fact that an application will be made to the judge who will exercise his discretion and say whether it is justified in all the circumstances of the case. What I find amusing, in the light of discussions we had in 1969, is that all of this is, in any case, swept away by subclause (3), which allows a policeman to use the device without receiving permission in cases where the policeman is of the opinion, formed on reasonable grounds, that there would be too much delay in obtaining approval and permission and if, in cases where he sought approval, the judge was likely to give it. If this is not making the thing nonsensical, I do not know what is. All the policeman has to do is to have the opinion that he would not have time to get permission and that, if he sought permission, it would be granted. We may just as well tell the police that they can use the device whenever they like.

Mr. Gunn: It's window dressing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course. We had much argument about this when the 1969 Bill, introduced by the then Leader, provided in clause 8 that a police officer had to apply to a Supreme Court judge (before I had been able to get through the intermediate court legislation):

on evidence on oath that he has reasonable grounds to believe that in the circumstances he deposes to the use of a listening device or a visual intrusion device or a combination of them will lead to the detection of serious crime, for a warrant permitting him to use a listening device or a visual intrusion device or a combination of them.

It was hedged about very much when the Government Party was in Opposition, so much so as to be unworkable, and in my amendment to the Bill permission should be sought from the Attorney-General, and not from the judge, as the responsible Minister of the Crown answerable in this place. Since we now have the intermediate court judges (and I do not quarrel vigorously about their being the approving authorities) I do say, as the member for Eyre prompted, that the provisions are really nugatory; they are in fact window-dressing, and we may as well not have them there.

The marginal note of clause 7 is "Lawful use of a listening device by a party to a private conversation". The clause allows one to tape a recorded conversation if one is taking part in it. I could not help letting it occur to me when I saw this clause that probably this is in conflict with the Posts and Telegraphs Act and certainly with the regulations made under the Commonwealth Act prohibiting the taping or recording of certain conversations by telephone in certain circumstances. I do not know whether or not it matters—probably it does not. It is severable, anyway. However, more seriously, there is no provision in this Bill for the use of the device by any Commonwealth authority. Again, I suppose it will be argued that it is unnecessary that we should insert any provision allowing the Australian Security Intelligence Organization or the Customs Department to use the devices. In South Australia, they are after all Commonwealth officers exercising a Commonwealth jurisdiction. We would be happier if there had been provisions in this Bill exempting those people from its provisions, because we know (I am thinking particularly of the Customs officers now) with the growing menace of drugs and the infiltration of drugs into Australia how necessary it is to give every assistance possible to the authorities to detect offences of this nature.

The Minister appeared to be a little embarrassed about clause 8 in his second reading explanation. This clause gives him the power to declare certain devices and, if they are declared, it is an offence for a person to have them in his possession, custody or control. That is a severe measure, and no time is allowed in which to get rid of the device which one may have in one's possession when the declaration is made. I suppose only lip service is paid to personal freedom these days. There is certainly no personal freedom in clause 8.

Clause 9 is the provision for reporting. The Minister must give a report. The Commissioner of Police earlier on had to report to the Minister (for what that is worth; it is probably worth nothing—just window dressing) where the devices had been used when permission had not been sought. I have already referred to clause 10. I have a vigorous objection to subclause (4) of that clause and propose to move an amendment to it. Subclause (4) quadruples the time in which proceedings can be taken for an offence. It provides:

Proceedings for an offence against this Act may be brought within two years from the day on which it is alleged that the act or omission constituting the offence was done or omitted.

The normal rule, certainly under the Justices Act, is six months.

The Hon. L. J. King: Have you circulated the amendments?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I have not drawn them yet. Here the Minister has given himself four years. It is rather amusing to read the reason he has provided. Listen to these few sentences:

Subclause (4) of this clause somewhat extends the time within which a prosecution for an offence against this Act may be brought, to a maximum of two years.

In fact, it lengthens it fourfold. The Minister says in his explanation that it "somewhat extends" the time. Listen to the next sentence:

It is suggested that this extension is reasonable since, of their nature, offences against this Act are committed in a clandestine manner.

I think the overwhelming number of offences against any Act are committed in a clandestine manner. If it is to be justification for quadrupling the time within which proceedings may be taken, then I think it is a very poor justification indeed. I do not like it. It is quite unnecessary. It is certainly not necessary to the working of the Act that the authority should have four times

as long as the usual rule within which to take proceedings. Those are the criticisms in detail of the Bill. On the whole, I think it is desirable legislation. I support the second reading, but I hope the debate will last long enough for me to draw the amendments I have foreshadowed.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the Bill. As I see it, this is a logical further development of the law. The early law took account of the protection of the life of a person and the general well-being of a person, and so there were offences created for trespass to a person by way of either killing him or injuring him in some way. The next development was the concept of trespass to a person's goods or land. The next further development was much later, in the fifteenth century, when the concept of a right to one's reputation became embodied in the law by way of ecclesiastical law. That was the next area where a citizen was deemed to have some right to protection. Now we have this further extension to a right to privacy. This is an area very much in need of protection in view of the sophisticated devices now available. I am somewhat proud to recall that in my first few weeks in this place one of my first questions to the Attorney-General asked when the Government proposed to introduce legislation of this kind. I am also pleased to be able to note that this is not the last Bill of its kind to be introduced, but rather the first of a series.

The Bill deals with the rather simpler types of bugging, if I may use that expression. It does not deal with the more sophisticated types of bugging that are about to come upon us. Here I refer to the data processing areas and the areas in which people can make use of computers in order to steal other people's property. Under this Bill we are dealing with the use of listening devices and auditory devices of various kinds sometimes used by the police, sometimes used by private detectives, and sometimes used by ordinary citizens. I regret that the use of these devices has become so prevalent that it is common at ordinary conferences for many people to take tape recordings of what is said, without those speaking knowing that they are being recorded. The number of devices available is alarming, and the sophistication of these devices is remarkable. Taking into consideration the sophistication in relation to devices to record normal conversations in relation to computers, I can foresee a 1984 situation developing. I support this Bill not only for what it is worth in its own area but also because it leads to the prevention of other invasions of privacy in more sophisticated ways, especially concerning computers and other data processing systems, without the consent of the owner so that trade secrets and other information can be stolen or otherwise unlawfully obtained.

The member for Mitcham made various criticisms of the Bill, and I will now refer to some of them. He referred to clause 4 (2), which reverses the onus of proof. I do not like this clause either, and it is only in the most extreme circumstances that giving the Crown more power than it already has can be justified. In Australia as in other western countries, it is frightening to see what power the State has to suppress information and to attack the private citizen, while it is frightening to see what little defence the private citizen has. I draw an analogy in this instance between the evil that is being suppressed and the difficulty in suppressing it. The situation is rather like the situation in the legislation concerning drug offences where, because of the great evil that the legislation is dealing with, we are prepared to allow the use of devices that we would not otherwise support. It is on that basis that, with some reluctance, I support clause 4 (2): it is worth giving it a try to see whether any palpable injustice arises.

The member for Mitcham referred to clause 6, and he was right in saying that clause 6 (2) and clause 6 (3) were most vague. I do not deny that, but in drafting terms they cannot be otherwise. However, what the honourable member has not pointed out and what he has completely overlooked is that, in the situation where a police officer has not had time to obtain permission from the courts to use a device of this kind, he will make a report through the Commissioner of Police not more than once a month to the Minister of the circumstances in which these devices were used. The honourable member also forgot to link his discussion on clause 6 with clause 9, which requires the Minister to report to Parliament specifying in detail the number of occasions on which applications were made to a judge in accordance with clause 4 (2), the number of occasions on which a listening device was used pursuant to that clause, without the approval of a judge, and the circumstances under which it was used in general terms. That is something I thought the member for Mitcham would

have supported, remembering well his severe criticism of the Attorney in relation to releasing last year's report by the Juvenile Court judge. Although I agree with him, (and one could not do anything else) that subclauses (2) and (3) of clause 6 are drawn somewhat vaguely (it is impossible to do otherwise in the nature of the case), there is nevertheless some protection (and it is not window dressing, as the member for Eyre, supported by the member for Mitcham, said) because clause 4 (3) must be linked with clause 4 (4) and clause 9. This will give the member for Eyre, if he is still a member of this Parliament then, the opportunity in about 12 months to see whether his fears have been justified.

The member for Mitcham had two other criticisms, one of which related to clause 8, which gives the Minister wide powers. I fully support the use of these powers. This provision relates to persons (not the potential offenders but manufacturers, wholesalers or retailers) who possess listening devices. If this sort of bugging is to be stopped, the way to do it most effectively is to stop it at its source, which is the point of manufacture or retail sale. The member for Mitcham again forgot to point out that under that clause the Minister has a wide discretion to exempt classes and kinds of listening device. I have no reason to believe that this clause will be used peremptorily.

His last criticism dealt with clause 10 (3), which relates to the time in which proceedings must be taken for an offence, which has been increased greatly from six months to three years. Perhaps when the honourable member's amendments (which I have not yet seen) reach us, the Minister may consider examining this provision. This is a considerable increase which does not seem to serve much purpose because, by its very nature, it is a clandestine offence, which one is more likely to detect in six months than in two years. With those comments and reservations, I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill. As is the case with some of the legislation the Attorney-General introduces, one is prompted to ask what sort of abuses currently exist, or what the Minister is seeking to hedge off. Is this a step in the dark, or is it intended to hedge off possible situations that may arise in the future? A perusal of the Minister's second reading explanation does not give one much information in this regard. I must confess that, if I had not read the lectures of Professor Zelman Cowen, I would be more inclined to oppose the Bill than I am now, having ascertained from reading this sort of intellectual discussion more reasons for preserving the rights of privacy than one can glean from the Attorney's second reading explanation.

It would be far more appropriate if, in the sort of second reading explanation given to members, information of malpractice, a tendency towards listening in on private conversations, or the operations of the Police Force was given. However, members have no information on these matters. It is not the sort of information that is readily available to us, nor is it the sort of information that the Attorney-General seems to be able to give to the House. So, the only conclusion we can reach in approaching these Bills is that they are experimental.

It would have been helpful if the Attorney-General had said what sort of malpractices occurred, even if there was no evidence of such malpractices in Australia; such information would have been preferable to the way in which the Attorney-General has explained this Bill. I have no information about the use or abuse of listening devices in South Australia at present. So, if I had not read the Boyer Lectures, I would certainly be inclined to oppose the Bill. It is therefore not became of any evidence that the Attorney-General has produced that I am willing to support the second reading. The general public does not have much knowledge about the subject matter of this Bill, and I doubt whether the public knows the rationale behind the Bill. However, I am sure the public is interested in the security of the community, the detection of crime, and stemming the drug traffic. If it can be shown that listening devices are relevant to those situations, the public will seriously question the Bill.

It seems that many of the Bills introduced by the Attorney-General have been dreamt up at interstate conferences, or they represent something that the Attorney-General or the Premier has picked up in books or philosophical discussions. Members would like to know the views of the Police Force on the Bill, and they would like to know who requested that the Bill be introduced. The Attorney should include in his second reading explanations more background information so that members will know what the Bills are about.

Mr. Keneally: You mean that you don't want to do any research yourself?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not mean that.

The Hon. L. J. King: If I explain, the member for Mitcham ridicules that.

Mr. Millhouse: When did I do that?

The Hon. L. J. King: You've done that this time.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This Bill is a case in point. The Minister is trying to explain the various clauses. I object to the lack of information about the factual background that has moved the Government to introduce the Bill. The objections by the member for Mitcham to various clauses are completely valid. The Attorney has introduced a Bill to control the use of bugging devices, but members do not know when and where they will be used. I repeat that members of the public are interested in their security and in the detection of crime, and the House should be given information on the present use and abuse of these devices.

If the Attorney is not willing to give this sort of information, one can only conclude that the introduction of this sort of measure is an act of window-dressing. The people have a right to know the extent of the abuses now occurring. The Bill is fairly nebulous. We do not know what it sets out to achieve and whom it attacks, and I do not think the people will glean much from the Minister's explanation.

Another point raised by the member for Mitcham in which I was interested was the extent to which this Bill contradicts the operation of Commonwealth legislation, such as some of the operations involved in the security of the country. I do not think the people will be much interested in a Bill which inhibits the activities of those who are seeking to ensure the security of this country or which hampers police investigations unduly. I should like information from the Attorney about the opinions of the police, against whom fairly stringent prohibitions are laid down.

Some members with legal minds have said that the provision necessarily must be vague, but it seems to me that it is fairly restrictive. The Attorney has said nothing in his explanation about why he has introduced the Bill. When reading the Boyer Lectures by Professor Zelman Cowen, I was convinced that there might be an argument for introducing legislation dealing with undesirable practices.

The Hon. L. J. King: The member for Mitcham and you are reading the same books. Perhaps another alliance has been set up!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I read this book, because my daughter at the university had to write an essay on privacy, and the book was in our home.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You should go easy on reading what your daughter reads.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister is off the beam if he is trying to be insulting. The member for Mitcham quoted from the beginning of this publication and I quote from the final statements, which sum up more adequately than did the Attorney the need to introduce legislation that may be designed to take care of future activity. The document states:

> In these and in the other fields I have discussed in these lectures, I believe that we are faced with increasing and serious threats to our privacy. Modern technology has breached at many vital points the physical limits that once protected individual and group privacy, and we are coming to live in a transparent world. The protection of privacy will be better assured by appropriate legal protections and procedures, but it also depends to a very great extent upon the attitudes of men and women in democratic society to the values which are enshrined in the claim to privacy. It seems to me that in our lack of awareness and indifference, our responses to the growing threats to privacy are too often feeble and flabby. Early in these lectures I referred to the sinister title of an article published last year: 1984—*Minus Sixteen and Counting*. I end by commending to you the conclusion of the author of that article. It is that we cannot assume that privacy will survive simply because man has a psychological or social need for it.

Those sentiments from a bit of chance reading lead me to support the Bill: it was certainly nothing said by the Attorney-General, who expects far too much of members to run around and read philosophical arguments in order to support Bills that he is not willing to explain adequately. Under the provision of clause 9 the Minister is required to present a report to Parliament declaring the number of listening devices that were authorized by a judge and the number used without authorization. Obviously, the Government considers this a serious matter, and the Minister is keen to give this information to the House. I support the clause. However, the Minister has had a tendency to suppress information from the House when that information may have been politically embarrassing. This is the conclusion one must draw, because of the suppression of information by the Minister at other times.

Apparently, in this case there is nothing that can be politically embarrassing to the Government, so that a report is to be presented to Parliament. If we are to give informed judgments on legislative matters, it is essential that the facts be presented to the House and

that they should not be withheld by the Attorney-General for political purposes. So, obviously, the Attorney sees no political overtones here damaging either to him or to his Party, and that is why this clause, to which I agree, is included. With those few remarks—brief compared with the arguments put by the Attorney-General on other occasions on the most tenuous of grounds—I look forward to the member for Mitcham moving his amendments. I trust he has had time to have them drafted. I support the second reading.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, support the second reading of this Bill. As I indicated by interjection when the member for Mitcham was addressing himself to the Bill, I believe some window-dressing is taking place. It is the first volley to be fired in the coming election campaign. I have endeavoured to find out some of the reasons why—

Mr. Payne: Are you talking about the patch-up between the L.M. and the L.C.L.?

Mr. GUNN: I should be completely out of order if I were to comment on the interjection of the member for Mitchell.

Mr. Payne: You would get into very deep water and would be floundering in it.

Mr. GUNN: I am always happy to comment at any time on any political matters in which I am involved. This Party does not hide behind "faceless men" as the Attorney-General's Party does. This is a vague piece of legislation. I strongly support the principle that people should be entitled to their right to privacy. I have been endeavouring to find out some of the reasons why this Bill should be supported. I thought I would take a brief run through the Australian Labor Party State Platform and Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is discussing the Bill, not a Party's standing orders or platform.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. I will link up my remarks, because on page 46 of this document there is a vague reference to this matter. I also find a vague reference in the Commonwealth platform of that Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I have finished discussing that matter. I return now to the Bill. In the first sentence of his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General said:

> It is the first of a series of measures which will be introduced into this House and which are intended to protect the "right of privacy" of the individual.

One imagines credit bureaus and that sort of thing. I shall be interested to know what type of legislation the Attorney envisages. He should outline to this House the reasons for introducing this Bill and also the type of undesirable practices being carried out on criminals by law enforcement officers. He has a right to expect the House to make a considered decision on this matter, so he should explain the Bill fully. After the Bill becomes law, the police will have to report on these matters and the Attorney will be reporting to both Houses of Parliament. Members on this side believe that reports always should be made available to Parliament and not put away in cubbyholes, as this Government has done with a number of important reports. The Attorney should report to the House to make a proper explanation of what activities are involved. The member for Mitchell said he would do some research.

Mr. Payne: Wrong again!

Mr. GUNN: It was a member on his side of the House. Members on this side have not the facilities at their disposal which the Attorney has to carry out research.

Mr. Payne: The Attorney will make the information available, and you know it.

Mr. GUNN: That is his duty. When outlining his reasons for introducing this legislation, he should give the reasons so that the public at large—

Mr. Payne: I think you will find he was trying not to overtax the capabilities of members like yourself.

Mr. GUNN: I do not think the member for Mitchell should judge persons on this side—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. GUNN: I am addressing myself to this measure, and I think the member for Mitchell, if he is a reasonable person—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no mention of the honourable member for Mitchell in the Bill.

Mr. Venning: Thank goodness!

Mr. GUNN: On this occasion, as on most other occasions, I agree entirely with the member for Rocky River.

The SPEAKER: Who is entirely out of order in interjecting.

Mr. GUNN: With those few remarks, I strongly support the measure.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, and I believe during the second reading debate I should comment on some remarks made by members, as well as giving my own thoughts. As many rights as possible should be protected for the individual within our

society, and possibly the attitude today of many people who believe that their rights exist at all times is wrong. The only time our rights exist is when we exercise them and do not interfere with the rights of other people. If that occurs, the responsibility falls on both parties to show some restraint in not exercising their rights completely. Clause 4 is the main clause of the Bill, relating to the use of listening devices. I recall an occasion, since I have been in this House as a Parliamentarian, when a person came to interview me, carrying a bag containing a tape recorder. The interview concerned an issue before Parliament, and people were trying to obtain the opinions of Parliamentarians. Because of the type of questions being put to me I realized that possibly there was some method of recording being used, and when I asked if a tape recorder was being used it was admitted. This type of practice is the one we are trying to cover, not so much for Parliamentarians perhaps as for the average person within the community.

Although I think the measure is a sensible one, I do not accept the onus of proof being on the defendant. I have never accepted this, and I have always raised this issue in the House. I cannot support that aspect of the Bill, because I believe it departs from what we know as British justice, that a person is innocent until proved guilty. This provision means that a person is guilty until he proves himself innocent. I do not think it is necessary for such a provision in any legislation, whether in the Bill before us or in any other Bill. In particular, it is unnecessary here. We should be able to obtain the evidence (and I am sure we could) to bring the person apprehended to pay the penalty and to see justice being done.

If there should be a few occasions on which this does not succeed, it is better that that should occur than for us to go too far from the position where a person is innocent until proven guilty. That is what we are doing here now. The member for Mitcham referred to a two-year period of retrospectivity, a period of two years during which prosecutions relating to the commission of the offence can be made. I accept that, because it is possible with this type of offence that knowledge that the offence has been committed does not become known until some future date, and six months might not be sufficiently long enough to determine this. I accept the period of two years, and I am sorry that I have to disagree with my colleague in that respect.

The Government has had a difficult task in drafting the clause relating to the Police Force. The Government had to decide whether the police were to be exempt from the legislation or whether they were to be placed under some form of control. The suggestion has been made that this is window dressing, but I believe that the proposition put by the Government is worth trying and that, if we find it is not successful, that the police are irresponsible and do not use common sense in the application of their powers, we can change it. I believe it is a fair proposition in the instance where an officer finds a need, on the spur of the moment, to use a device to gain evidence to prevent the carrying out of a serious crime. He should be able to back his judgment, especially if he will have to stand up for his decision. I accept that and I support the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I am a little bemused by the turn taken in this debate, because I was berated by the member for Mitcham who said that I was suggesting that this Bill was somehow novel, yet the whole matter had been canvassed years before and the reasons for it had been adequately discussed not only in this House but elsewhere. I was then roundly criticized by him for not explaining why the Bill was brought forward, but I believe that this was not unreasonable in the circumstances, because members of this House were familiar with the subject. While I regret that I imposed on the member for Kavel the onerous task of consulting the book provided him by his daughter and also read by the member for Mitcham, I am sure he benefited by the perusal of that book.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't know what that book was.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order and I ask the Attorney-General to completely overlook his interjections. The honourable member had his opportunity to complete his remarks.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I did not speak slightingly of the book. The member for Kavel complained of the imposition of having to read the book. However, he seemed to derive some benefit from it.

Mr. Millhouse: He said that he had read it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not intend in this reply to attempt to elaborate on the circumstances in which intrusions on privacy might result from the use of listening devices. Members who have participated in the debate have indicated that they have read Professor Cowen's lecture, and I doubt the necessity to refer to these matters in detail. It is well known to most people that it is possible with modern electronic devices to listen to conversations taking place a considerable distance away. I have read of devices allowing the listener to overhear conversations over 400yds. away. This would enable industrial espionage and deliberate spying on industrial secrets which are the property of others to occur. It would also enable intrusions into citizens' homes to enable private conversations to be overheard and misused. One could continue indefinitely with instances of intrusion into the privacy of citizens made possible by modem listening devices. It is conceivable that a political Party may be split into factions, that one faction of the Party may meet secretly, and another may be tempted to use a listening device to discover what is happening at that meeting. This is a possibility against which members of the political Party involved ought to be protected.

The reasons for this sort of legislation are now wellknown and understood. The member for Mitcham referred to the provisions authorizing the police to use listening devices in circumstances that would be forbidden to the ordinary citizen. He suggested not so much that the provisions were nugatory as that the protections were nugatory, and based that opinion on the view that the authority given to a police officer in an emergency, to use a listening device without reference to the court, meant that in practice police officers would do what they liked and use such devices when they liked. I do not accept that. The scheme in the Bill is clear. Ordinarily, the police officer is required to apply to a local court judge, and the criteria upon which the judge is to make his decision are set out in the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: How long do you expect it would take?

The Hon. L. J. KING: One or two hours, or even less. There could be no difficulty in the police having immediate access to a judge in chambers to obtain this order.

Mr. Millhouse: Day or night?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not think it would be day or night, which is why the emergency provisions are included. For that reason, a police officer who is satisfied that the circumstances are such that a judge would make an order if an opportunity to apply presented itself is, if a judge is not available, given authority to use the listening device. Police officers will, generally speaking, observe the provisions of this legislation. I do not think for a moment that members of the Police Force will set out on a calculated course of conduct of ignoring the provisions of the. legislation and use the emergency provisions when they can apply to the court. Why a police officer would take that responsibility himself when he could have the protection of the judge's order, I cannot understand. This seems to me to be a sensible and practical way of dealing with the problem, and I am surprised to find the honourable member conceives that the Police Force would just ignore the requirements of going to a judge and take upon itself the practice of simply making decisions for itself.

The matter of Commonwealth authorities using listening devices was raised by the member for Mitcham. Obviously his reference to clause 7 was wrong in law. He suggested that it permitted a listening device to be used in certain circumstances and said that it might conflict with the provisions of the Commonwealth Post and Telegraph Act which prohibit the use of such a device in certain circumstances. A perusal of the clause would have shown that this clause did not permit anything. It simply provides that the prohibition in clause 4 shall not apply in certain circumstances, so there is no conflict. It simply means that the prohibition in clause 4 does not extend to the cases covered by clause 7. Any prohibitions in Commonwealth legislation are additional to that and are not touched by it at all.

The question of the use of listening devices by Commonwealth authorities can be satisfactorily dealt with only by Commonwealth law. True, the Victorian Parliament included an exemption in its Act for the security organization and the customs department. However, it seems to me that that is an entirely inappropriate way to go about it; only the Commonwealth Parliament can decide the circumstances in which Commonwealth agencies should be authorized to use these devices, and only that Parliament can impose the conditions under which they can be used. It is not open to the South Australian Parliament to surround the security organization or the customs department with conditions under which such listening devices can be used; we have not the necessary

authority. The course open to the Commonwealth Parliament is simply to indicate what statutory provisions it thinks to be proper for authorizing its own agencies to use listening devices in the circumstances defined by the Commonwealth Parliament and subject to any conditions defined by it.

The member for Mitcham made some vague criticisms of clause 8, but I do not think he really opposed it. It is obviously a very necessary provision, because there are listening devices the very possession of which is a menace to everyone in the community. There are sophisticated, electronic listening devices which have no legitimate use and the mere possession of which is a danger to the privacy of people in the community. On the other hand, it is impossible to devise a formula capable of being incorporated in an Act for the purpose of prohibiting the possession of those devices. The only course open is to empower the Minister to declare specific devices, the possession of which would thereupon become illegal. For the rest, the comments on what has been said are best left to the Committee stage, when, I understand, amendments are to be moved.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 4, at 2 p.m.