HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 30, 1977

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: URANIUM

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The first part of this statement has been prepared by the Director of Mines for me, as Minister, to present to the House. That part of the statement is as follows:

> The recent press statement that the South Australian Government was sponsoring a seminar in Adelaide to encourage mining companies to explore and develop the potential of South Australian uranium deposits is a misleading and totally unfounded accusation.

I emphasise that in this part of the statement I am using the words of the Director of Mines.

Mr. Millhouse: It sounds as though someone has a guilty conscience.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out or order. I hope he will cease interjecting. The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The statement continues:

> In the first place the seminar is being presented by the Australian Mineral Foundation as part of its information service to the Australian mining and petroleum industry. Officers of the Mines Department were invited by the management of the foundation to present the seminar. The foundation is a national organisation established by the industries, institutions and departments concerned with minerals and petroleum. It is administered by a council representative of these groups. It has no ties with any Government. In the six years since its inception in 1972 it has presented in excess of 100 workshop-type courses for the benefit of industry, most of which have been held in Adelaide, several interstate and a number in South-East Asia. The idea of the seminar was first presented to the Director of Mines in June of this year by officials of the foundation.

I was informed verbally this morning by the Director that it was Professor Rudd in particular. It continues:

> It was conceived as a means of presenting to mineral and energy exploration and development companies the current potential for exploration and development in South Australia.
>
> The project was planned as the first in a series of regular A.M.F. presentations on the exploration and development potential of the various Australian States.

The Director of Mines agreed to support the idea and to make his officers available to present the necessary information. As Minister, I was subsequently advised and invited to open the seminar which I have agreed to do and which I am happy to do. The Director's statement continues:

> The seminar will include technical discussion of the known and potential mineral resources of the State with particular reference to more recent developments and techniques. There is also a session devoted to the Mining Act with particular reference to those aspects covering exploration and protection of the environment, and including details of drilling and geophysical services provided by the Mines Department. As such the seminar is entirely compatible with the responsibilities and objectives of the Mines Department which include—
>
> 1. To elucidate the regional geology and geophysics of the State and publish results of this work for use by industry, other Government Departments and the public.
> 2. To investigate the mineral and energy resources of the State, including underground water, and to carry out basic studies in the search for these resources with the ultimate objective of their development by industry or Government bodies.
> 3. To publish reports, records, etc., to inform, assist and encourage the mining, petroleum and extractive industries.
> 4. To undertake and promote research into new techniques for mapping, geophysical surveying and mineral search generally.
> 5. To foster public interest and understanding of the geological features of the State and their relation to the mining and oil industries.

The brochure advertising the seminar listed several topics to be included in the technical portion of the seminar. These topics included petroleum and natural gas, coal, non-metallic minerals, and the metallic mineral potential of five geological provinces, namely, the Stuart shelf, the Torrens hinge zone, the Gawler craton, the Olary province, and the Adelaide geosyncline. An additional topic mentioned was the "potential for mesozoic and tertiary uranium deposits". It is entirely appropriate that this latter topic be included as these deposits are well known and of considerable scientific interest. They form part of the geological fabric of the State and it is quite essential that they be included in any overall discussion of the geology and mineralogy of the State. Furthermore, in so far as uranium occurs in known association with other minerals it will, of course, be referred to. To do otherwise would be quite unscientific and unprofessional. However, the inference that the five geological provinces to be discussed "contain 50 per cent uranium deposits" is bewildering and totally inaccurate.

> Officers of the department who have given freely of their time to prepare information for the seminar and assist the Australian Mineral Foundation management in maintaining the now nationally recognised high standard of A.M.F. presentations are naturally resentful of the misrepresentation inherent in recent political commentary. These officers include people of various political persuasions but united in a common effort to produce work of integrity and to a high professional standard so that people charged with making decisions on the results of their work will be provided with sound information on which to base such decisions. Any criticism which may inhibit the free dissemination and discussion of such information can only be regarded with dismay.

That is the statement prepared by the Director of Mines. I have some additions to make to that. The seminar, organised by the Australian Mineral Foundation, on exploration potential in South Australia is to be held on December 8 and 9, and was suggested by Professor Rudd. The Australian Mineral Foundation is controlled by a council, representative of the mineral and petroleum industries. There is also one representative on the council from a State, this year from New South Wales.

So, South Australia has no representative on the Australian Mineral Foundation. The nature of the seminar, which will be serviced by officers of the South Australian Mines Department, is concerned with the extent of this State's potential mineral and petroleum resources. It is also concerned with exploration and the legal provisions which relate to exploration, as well as the various services that are provided by the department to assist exploration.

The press, which received the doctored copies of the

seminar brochure from the Leader of the Opposition (and I have a photostat of it here) should have been aware—

The SPEAKER: Order! Exhibits are not permitted to be shown in the House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have it with me; it can be tabled, and I will table it at the end of my statement. The press should have been aware that the addition of the words "50 per cent uranium" in two places was part of the Leader's intent to distort and misrepresent in the grossest fashion the nature of the seminar. The Director of Mines and the officers of the Mines Department concerned with this project bitterly resent the actions of the Leader in this matter. I imagine that the Leader has already heard of their resentment. Further, as indicated in the Director's statement, it is absolute nonsense to describe the potential of the Stuart shelf, Torrens hinge zone, the Gawler craton, the Olary province, and the Adelaide geosyncline as 50 per cent uranium. It is a very serious matter indeed when the Leader of the Opposition doctors the facts that are presented to Parliament and the press allows the Leader to get away with it by publishing the distorted material. I repeat that the sole purpose of the seminar is to provide detailed information of the mineral and petroleum potential of this State and information relating to the way in which exploration must be conducted. To suggest that this is in any way part of a Government programme to encourage the development of uranium is to indulge in the politics of distortion and misrepresentation—the politics of the big falsehood.

I have one further statement to add: if the Leader of the Opposition were employed by a private company and misrepresented the facts in relation to the company's operation in that way, he would be guilty of an offence and capable of being prosecuted in this State. I charge him with political fraud.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's pretty serious.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order. The member for Davenport and the member for Mount Gambier are also out of order.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister just called me a liar, and I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was only repeating what I said on radio yesterday. I realise—

Mr. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mount Gambier. It is the second time within a few seconds that he has interjected. I uphold the point of order and ask the honourable Minister to withdraw.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I realise that it is unparliamentary; I withdraw "liar" and substitute "the perpetrator of gross falsehoods".

The SPEAKER: Order! I want the honourable Minister to withdraw unconditionally.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I withdraw.

Mr. Dean Brown: And apologise.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport. He has now interjected twice.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I table for the official records the doctored photostat copy of the brochure presented to the press yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CONTAMINATED FISH

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I make this statement on behalf of the Minister of Health in another place. Members will recall the reference yesterday to the spilling of certain material in relation to fish subsequently seen in the Port River. The material, manufactured in Sydney, came to Adelaide by road transport. The consignment was transferred to a smaller vehicle at Fast Freight Truck depot for delivery to Dow Chemical storage area at Brambles store, Port Adelaide. During this delivery run, at about 5 p.m. on Monday, November 28, 1977, a crate of 48 20-litre steel drums of the insecticide burst open, and some 17 drums fell to the roadway. Nine drums were fractured and the contents spilled. It was raining heavily at the time.

The driver phoned his depot, and then delivered the remaining drums to Brambles, where the storeman immediately reported the spillage at 6 p.m. to the Dow Chemical Adelaide office. The Manager, Mr. Howarth, after some difficulty, and with the help of the police emergency room, contacted the Woodville corporation.

I understand that an engineer from Woodville corporation inspected the site of the spillage, found no visible evidence of spilled material because of heavy rain, and then examined the storm-water channel in the centre of the Old Port Road, and the outlet points for this storm water near the Jervois Bridge. He reported no sign of milky emulsion, as occurs with this material in water, but this may have been because of the volume of storm water at the time. Mr. Howarth immediately contacted Dow's Sydney factory and office, and at 10 a.m. on Tuesday collected water samples for analysis in the company's laboratory.

At 6 a.m. on Tuesday, I understand, the police were informed about dead fish. These were reported by outside sources to the Public Health Department between 8.30 and 9 a.m. on Tuesday. The department immediately began to investigate the distribution and use of these fish through both commercial and private channels. The public was warned of possible dangers in a combined police and Public Health Department statement through all media. Commercial operators were instructed to recall and destroy all material sold that could have come from this source. In addition, individual households in the West Lakes and Port River areas were contacted by door knock, and a surprising number admitted to taking and eating these fish. There have been no reports of ill-effects. Nevertheless, the department has issued a warning that food species found dead should never be eaten, as it is quite possible that whatever killed them could have serious effects on consumers.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Barmera Primary School Replacement,

Two Wells Primary School Replacement.

Ordered that reports be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PHOTOSTAT DOCUMENT

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. TONKIN: We have just heard in this House an accusation by the Minister of Mines and Energy that I have in some way doctored a document with, I take it, deliberate intent to defraud or misrepresent. I have examined the photostat of the document, which the Minister has tabled, and I freely admit that on that document in large Pentel pen, in my handwriting, appear notes and certain emphases, but these, I submit, could in no way be called an attempt to doctor the document or to misrepresent the situation.

In fact, they were notes made to draw attention on the one hand to the very items that were quoted in this House by way of question yesterday, and notes which were made by me at the time that I was speaking on the telephone to an international mining consultant who is well aware of the Stuart shelf and Torrens hinge zone and the mineral potential of the Gawler craton, the Olary province, and the Adelaide geosyncline. It was his opinion that I quoted at the time that there would be there something of the nature—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who was it?

Mr. TONKIN: —of 50 per cent of the deposits involving uranium.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who was it?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

Mr. Venning: Warn him!

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. TONKIN: To say and make what I believe to be a ridiculous accusation in this House and back it up by producing a piece of paper with hand-written notes on it, I submit—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Which is absolutely—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Minister.

Mr. TONKIN: —is absolutely ridiculous. Such notes could not have been interpreted by the press as anything other than notes on the paper, and I am happy to return the document to the Assistant Clerk.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Mr. Becker: He hasn't finished yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the honourable Leader finished his personal explanation?

Mr. TONKIN: No, I have not.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TONKIN: I entirely refute any suggestion made by the Minister that I have deliberately sought to doctor the brochure or that I issued the brochure in a doctored form to the press. Whatever the photo-copy of the document showed, it showed what I put on it by way of notes, and in no way could it have been interpreted by the media as being a doctored document.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Honourable members: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have been accused across the House of uttering the word "No", and I certainly did not say "No".

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You did.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I did not.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

QUESTIONS

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

BUS WINDOWS

In reply to **Mr. OLSON** (October 19).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The difficulties experienced in opening windows on some buses is caused by the type of material used in the window channels. The windows are being modified progressively to overcome this problem. Some buses have already been modified, and the remainder of the work will be completed as soon as possible.

WHYALLA FURTHER EDUCATION COLLEGE

In reply to **Mr. MAX BROWN** (November 23).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The stage 2 extensions to the Whyalla College of Further Education are comprised of six major blocks of buildings. Block A, the larger of the two workshop blocks, was to be ready for occupancy in the first week of February, 1978. However, because the builder is a little behind schedule, the first portion of block A will not be occupied until late February or early March. The college staff has planned a staged takeover of block A, extending from early March to early May, 1978. This staged occupancy takes into account the mixed day/block release apprentice attendance pattern at the college, thus avoiding undue disturbance to students' training programmes. The remainder of the complex, including facilities such as the learning resource centre, cafeteria and auditorium will be completed by August, 1978.

The total apprentice intake for 1978 is difficult to gauge at this time of the year, but B.H.P., which supplied 78 per cent of the intake in 1977, has already indicated to the college that it intends to recruit 138 apprentices in 1978, a drop of approximately 8 per cent on its first-year apprentices for 1977. No reliable figures are at hand for other employers. A recent retraining programme at the Whyalla College of Further Education was highly successful. It involved the retraining of 14 ships plumbers so that they could become registered as sanitary plumbers. All the members of the group received registration—a pleasing result to a very satisfying exercise. The programme was funded under the NEAT scheme. B.H.P. is currently consulting with the college on the feasibility of retraining activities for riggers, fitters and turners, and boilermakers.

DEATH DUTIES

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say what will be the long-term cost—

Mr. Millhouse: You—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham for the last time.

Mr. TONKIN:—to South Australia of the migration of population and capital from this State to the rest of the country, resulting from the South Australian Government's adamant refusal to abolish death duties? In answer to a question on November 22, the Premier said that the Labor Party in South Australia did not intend to proceed to the abolition of succession duty, in spite of the moves promised by other State Governments and the Federal Government. Other Premiers have already announced the

ultimate abolition of death duties altogether, including New South Wales Labor Premier, Mr. Wran, who said, "We wish to alleviate this burden upon the people progressively, sensibly and as soon as practicable."

The Labor Premier of Tasmania has acknowledged that, following the abolition of death duties in Queensland, there has been a considerable transfer of both assets and people to that State. Mr. Neilson said that some people would see "migration to Queensland as a means of avoiding some death duties", when announcing legislation to exempt real property from death duties so that no Tasmanian resident is encouraged to leave the State.

There is evidence that some South Australians have already left this State, transferring their assets and themselves to Queensland because of the abolition of death duties there, and that this tendency will increase as other States follow suit. The continuance of death duties in this State will discriminate heavily against South Australians compared to the rest of the country, and must adversely affect the State's already failing economy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no evidence of any drain of capital from South Australia on this score. Tasmania has been something of a retirement haven previously, so there may have been some minor transfers from Tasmania to a retirement haven on the Gold Coast. I have no evidence that that is occurring in South Australia.

PHOTOSTAT DOCUMENT

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate the basis on which he was led to accuse the Leader of the Opposition of issuing a doctored document to the press?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, I will have pleasure in doing that.

Mr. Millhouse: He'll be happy to do it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham for the very last time. If the honourable member interjects again, I will take the necessary action.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order. I would like you, Mr. Speaker, to clarify the question of the warning of members. Five minutes ago you said to me that you warned me for the last time. I had not been warned at all today, or yesterday. Yesterday, you warned a number of Liberal members once, twice, or three times, someone says, in some cases. It is very difficult for members to know just what is in your mind so far as your practice is concerned. I have been suspended once from this House during the present session and that was after one warning—no more. Will you please, for the sake of all honourable members, make clear what your policy is; whether one warning or out, which is the way I was treated; whether it is one, two, or three warnings and stay in, as some of the Liberals have been treated; or whether I get several last warnings?

The SPEAKER: It is in the Speaker's discretion, and I will continue in that vein.

Mr. Millhouse: It—

The SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member, while the Speaker is on his feet, does not interject. I intend to use that method. I think, especially yesterday, I was very tolerant, and I do not intend to be as tolerant again. The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The document that I tabled, which was a photostat copy of the brochure for the seminar next week, had the words added to it, "50 per cent uranium" in the Leader's own handwriting, as he now admits. He gave that to the press, and I have a photostat copy of his press statement, which states:

> Mr. Tonkin said the topics listed for the seminar included: The potential for mesozoic and tertiary uranium deposits. The Stuart shelf and Torrens hinge zone (50 per cent uranium deposits). The mineral potential of the Gawler craton, the Olary province and the Adelaide geosyncline (50 per cent uranium deposits).

So the doctored document is translated exactly into the Leader's press statement without any indication that the words "50 per cent uranium deposits" have been added in the Leader's own handwriting. That is the basis of what I have said. By doctoring that document the Leader then starts off with this statement:

> The State Government—

wrong, it should be the Australian Mineral Foundation—

> will sponsor a mining seminar in Adelaide next month—

"next month" is right—

> —to encourage mining companies to explore and develop the potential of South Australian uranium deposits, State Opposition Leader, David Tonkin, said today. Mr. Tonkin said the seminar presented by the South Australian Department of Mines totally destroyed Premier Dunstan's credibility on the uranium issue.

The Leader has doctored the document, then prepared a press statement saying that the seminar will deal with certain topics, added the words that he has doctored on the documents to the topics to be listed to be discussed at the seminar, and then used that as a basis to accuse the Government of South Australia of deliberately setting out to develop uranium, then saying that this totally destroyed Premier Dunstan's credibility on the uranium issue. I suggest that the only credibility that has been destroyed is that of the Leader of the Opposition. He has indulged in a fraudulent misrepresentation to the public of the whole issue and his credibility has now been destroyed. He cannot be believed again.

NOISE CONTROL ACT

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment say when it is expected that the regulations in relation to the domestic noise section of the Noise Control Act will be gazetted, what has caused the considerable delay in gazetting such regulations, whether there have been any prosecutions under the Act, and, if there have not been, why not? It has been brought to my notice several times in recent weeks that this legislation is nothing more than a toothless tiger and is quite ineffective because of the lack of regulations by which the maximum permissible noise level can be judged.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is a little too ready to take the advice given to him without investigating the facts. If the honourable member took the trouble to make a simple inquiry he would ascertain that prosecutions have been launched under this Act, even though the regulations are not yet in force. If I remember correctly, a question was asked in this House and, from memory, I believe the reply was that 102 prosecutions have already occurred. It seems now that the honourable member is not interested, but 102 prosecutions have, from memory, already occurred under the provisions of the Act. The Act is operating, as demonstrated by the fact that those prosecutions have already occurred. The police and inspectors are quite competent to act under the provisions of the Act; they do not need machines, as someone suggested, to measure noise. Indeed, the regulations to which the honourable member has referred will be drawn up shortly; I have been told December, but I am not sure of the exact date. I expect them to be put into effect shortly. In fact, that, too, was said in this House some time

ago; the honourable member has not been paying all that much attention. It might have been the member for Hanson or the member for Coles who asked the question; the honourable member can find out. The honourable member should take a little more care and make a few more inquiries before he utters words in this House that have been suggested to him, that this Act is a toothless tiger, or something of that nature. I could tell the honourable member a good story about a toothless tiger, but I will not. The Act will be more effective with the regulations, but it is effective now and has been working.

NORTH-EAST AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Transport say whether a study is now being undertaken in relation to the North-East Area Transportation Study regarding the emission of carbon monoxide and hydro-carbons from motor vehicles on sections of the North East Road and, if it is, could he say whether the study is being undertaken to assist in determining a decision in regard to the North-East transportation corridor?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The North-East Area Transportation Study is progressing in all respects. Emissions are being monitored as, indeed, are the various routes that are available and the various modes of transport that are practicable and possible in the area. The study has not reached the stage where a final decision can be made. I confidently expect that either in December or January, probably January, the final report will be submitted to the Government, and a decision will then be made in relation to it. All the aspects of air pollution, noise pollution, and visual pollution are being taken into account.

APPRENTICES

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Education consider urgently and immediately an expansion of the pre-apprenticeship training scheme early in 1978, through an increased use of suitable facilities at secondary schools and through additional facilities being created for the Further Education Department? Many representatives of various industries have expressed concern at the expected shortage of skilled tradesmen in about 12 months time. They have indicated that many applicants for apprenticeships are being turned away because of the shortage of apprenticeship positions with companies, and limitations on staff and space at the trade training colleges. As a result, many young people are without a job or training.

This dilemma can be overcome by expanding the pre-apprenticeship training scheme, as this would allow young school leavers to get their formal training now and then obtain their on-the-job training later when more jobs are available. To achieve this expansion disused factory space which is fully equipped could be leased on a short-term basis. The old jam factory at Mile End has fully equipped accommodation suitable to train up to 50 joiners, covering a floor space of 80 000 sq. ft. Temporary teaching staff could also be employed. Statistics show that this year 75 people attended pre-apprenticeship training courses in South Australia with Commonwealth assistance, representing only 5 per cent of the national total. This excellent programme needs to be greatly expanded by early 1978.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Before getting to the nub of the question, I want to nail one statement which the honourable member made in passing and which needs to be corrected, that is, there has been a limitation on the number of apprenticeships because of the lack of facilities or space within the Further Education Department. That is not so. It may well be that employers for one reason or another have been loath to increase the number of apprentices that they take on, but where apprentices have been taken on they have been serviced by the Further Education Department. Indeed, it is because absolute priority has been given by the department to the apprenticeship side of its activity that some problems have arisen (and they have been aired in this place) in relation to enrichment courses. I want to make perfectely clear to the House that at no stage has an apprenticeship not been available because of lack of facilities within the Further Education Department.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's wrong, and you know that.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is warned for the second time.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member wrote to me in relation to two people. One has been accommodated and I understand the other has a broken leg and is not able currently to take up the position but certainly the course and the teacher are available. However, to get to the nub of the question, the Minister of Labour and Industry is keeping a close watch on the apprenticeship position.

I would not want to quarrel in any way with the honourable member's contention that pre-apprenticeship can be a valuable way around what sometimes becomes a difficult situation. If, in the new year, as a result of advice from my colleague that some expansion in pre-apprenticeship training should take place, naturally the Further Education Department will make its facilities available.

Mr. Dean Brown: I think it could be done this year.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: We are monitoring it all the time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows he is out of order.

INSTITUTE LIBRARIES

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Education say what will be the function of institute libraries on the introduction of shopfront libraries in the western districts? A few constituents believe that the new procedure will bring about the closing of some institute libraries.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is a firm policy now of three-year standing of the Institute Association that the institute libraries should amalgamate with municipal libraries. There have, of course, been problems in bringing this about, but that is the firm policy. I therefore anticipate that, where a proposition arises (and there are various types of proposition in the north-western suburbs for this to happen, as a result of this Government's initiatives) in a particular area for the setting up of a shop-front library, the local institute would want to amalgamate its resources with the library. This has happened in certain country areas: for example, it happened in relation to the setting up of the school community library at Pinnaroo that I visited about a month ago. In that situation, the institute library closed its doors, and most of its stock that was regarded as appropriate was transferred to the new school community library. Everyone (when I was there, anyhow) seemed pleased with the way in which the arrangements had been entered into. I expect that that would be the case, because it would be consistent with the Institute Association's policy.

SPEED LIMITS

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Transport consider imposing on-the-spot fines on drivers of vehicles who are detected exceeding the speed limit on the open roads in South Australia as an alternative to the awarding of demerit points and the cancelling of licences? I ask my question with professional transport drivers particularly in mind. These men drive for tens of thousands of kilometres a year and, if they incur three or four detections for speeding during that time, there is a chance that their licence could be suspended. While they are mindful of the dangers of speeding in built-up areas, I think that they would appreciate the Minister's examining this matter for them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that the honourable member is tending to get two different factors mixed up. I think that, if he analyses the two points, he would see the danger in the suggestion he has made. The basis of the points demerit system is to provide that the repetitive offender is treated in accordance with the number of offences he commits. In other words, it is acknowledged that a single offence cannot always incur a penalty commensurate with that offence, if taken in isolation. What happens with the points demerit system is that the perpetual offender has awarded against him the demerit points so that if after a period it is shown by the awarding of those points that he is not benefiting from having been apprehended, the obvious course to take is to remove him from the road. In other words, it is proving that he is a habitual offender and, as such, is a menace on the road. That system is vastly different from on-the-spot fines.

The only difference between on-the-spot fines and the course we presently follow is that, instead of having to go to court and having the opportunity of pleading his case, the offender has the opportunity of expiating his offence, similar to the position in relation to a parking fine. The two offences are separate and apart. Frankly, the points demerit system has now been so universally accepted and is so widely approved that it would be a very foolish person (not a brave one) who would suggest having it altered or watered down. As professional drivers comprise the least number of offenders, I doubt whether the Professional Drivers Association would support the removal of the points demerit system, as has been suggested by the member for Mount Gambier.

DOGS

Mr. BANNON: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government is aware of problems relating to the control and keeping of dogs, particularly in inner suburban areas, and what action is being taken to improve the situation? As a dog owner, I am not interested in conducting a vendetta against these essential household pets, but I think all members are aware of increasing complaints from constituents relating to dogs and associated problems. My question is prompted particularly by a letter received from a constituent who observed a small child who was bitten by a dog in her suburb. Among other things, my constituent says that she has seen youngsters on the way to school swerve without warning to avoid dogs which race up to them, snarling and snapping, and anxious to sink a fang or two into the ankle which is frantically pedalling to get away from the danger, without thought of another probable danger in the shape of a car following behind.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government is aware of this problem; indeed, I am sure the member for Semaphore, in his former occupation as Secretary of the Postal Workers Union, was familiar with the problems of dogs which liked to take a bite at the ankles of postmen and other people. We have been looking at various aspects of the question. At present, I have a committee which is looking at the problem and trying to bring together the various points of view of the people concerned with it. I hope that, early in the new year, the committee will have its report completed and that I shall be able to take it to Cabinet so that the Government may take action which I hope will overcome the problems involved. In the meantime, if any bodies, organisations, or individuals wish to make submissions, they should make them to the Local Government Office, which is responsible for bringing all these aspects into a single report.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works obtain a detailed report on the water quality and quantity of the various underground basins and surface storages on Eyre Peninsula? On October 25, I asked a Question on Notice in relation to the long-term water requirements of Eyre Peninsula. The second part of that Question on Notice asked whether there was any indication of falling water levels in each of the underground basins, and the answer was "No". I seek further information because there may have been some misunderstanding of my question. The majority of landholders who rely on bores and wells on Eyre Peninsula have reported falling water levels and increased salinity. When I gave the reply to my Question on Notice to the local paper, the reporter wanted further information. He was working on other reports from landholders, and at that time he was preparing an article. The reports from the landholders were contrary to those given in this House.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member and to bring it down as soon as possible.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry consider introducing legislation to limit to the bare necessity the questions an employer can ask and an employee is required to answer on an "Application for Employment" form? Persons applying for jobs are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain employment if they have had a history of compensation claims with an employer. A constituent of mine who previously had an injury but had subsequently obtained a certificate of good health from her doctor was refused employment because of company policy of not employing anyone who had a previous compensable injury. I have seen the application form that my constituent had to fill in, and there were 70 questions to be filled in. Apart from the questions pertaining to workmen's compensation, there were questions that in no way related to whether a person could be judged on suitability. I list some of the questions to which my constituent had to reply: nationality; religion; married, single, separated, divorced, or widowed; number of children and ages; occupation of spouse; six questions on education; 12 questions on military service; and 25 questions on health, including speech, taste, smell and lung condition.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not familiar with the application form described by the honourable member,

and I would appreciate being able to examine it. I am not sure what the position of the Government is in regard to deciding what should or should not be contained in an application form provided by employers to prospective employees. I shall be prepared to examine the situation if the honourable member would send the form to me. However, I am more concerned at this stage about the number of employees who, having met with an accident, however small, and in respect of the accident have received some type of compensation, are finding it difficult to get employment. This is not only happening in Adelaide, but I have received complaints from Whyalla and other country areas from members, and also various organisations have written to me about it. This problem could have been overcome, to a large extent, if the Legislative Council had not thrown out the Bill that I presented to the House last year. It was passed by this House, and by it we were trying to consider this matter.

Another matter that has emanated since then is the too-often cry of employers at not being able to find a solution to the problem concerning deafness, which is much more prevalent in industry now than it was because of new methods of production and new legislation that has been introduced. I have been examing this matter for about three or four months to try to find a solution to the problem, and it was discussed last evening at a meeting of my committee. The Government in early February will re-introduce amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act that we consider will overcome the problem. I know that there are difficulties that will be difficult to overcome, but we are trying to find a solution to involving insurance companies in considering their position in regard to accepting equal responsibility in this regard. If we can establish a method by which insurance companies are put in the position of accepting their fair share of the responsibility for the time the employee is involved under their insurance policies, we will go a long way towards solving the problem. I will examine this application form, and I warn the House that by February of next year we should have legislation to overcome the major part of this problem.

PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport treat as urgent the installation of activated pedestrian lights near the corner of Dunrobin Road and Diagonal Road, Oaklands Park? The Minister knows that the upgrading of the railway crossing at Oaklands is imminent, and he would realise that one of the main problems in that area is that the Christ the King Primary School is situated near the intersection of those two roads in Dunrobin Road. This school is situated in the south-western region, and next year it will have pupils from grades 1 to 6, as grade 7 children will be moved into what is called the middle school under the new system that is to operate. Traffic monitors at this school have all come from grade 7, the eldest of the children, but next year the children will have to be drawn from grade 6, and it would be desirable that either the young people have a press-button activated pedestrian light to operate or, alternatively, the Government could employ a retired person on a small retainer to look after the safety of these children.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question of employing retired, part-time people as monitors has been discussed and considered on a number of occasions, but on each and every occasion the answer has been the same: the schools, police, Road Safety Council and Road Traffic Board all hold the view that having children as monitors is a far better proposition, and it is for that reason that the part-time monitors, be they pensioners or whatever, have always been rejected in favour of using the children.

The question that the honourable member raises in relation to grade 7 being eliminated would, I imagine, create something of an unusual situation. If my memory serves me correctly, however, the monitors presently come from both grades 6 and 7. If that is so, the problem is not as great as one would expect. If it is not so, obviously there is a problem. I will certainly ask my officers to have a look at the problem to see whether there is something unusual that needs special action and, if so, to consider what action should be taken.

FEEDER BUS SERVICE

Mr. DRURY: Will the Minister of Transport consider altering the time table of the feeder bus service from Hackham East to Lonsdale railway station so that it synchronises with all peak hour rail departures? Also, will he have the bus re-routed along Collins Parade, Hackham? The feeder bus service from Hackham East to Lonsdale arrives at Lonsdale station to connect with the 7.33 a.m. and the 8.15 a.m. rail departures, but it does not provide a service for the train which leaves at 7.49 a.m. I believe that a number of people in my electorate, through which this bus service passes, work flexitime, and this extra service would be a great advantage to them. Also, the rerouting of the bus service along States Road, Doctors Road and Collins Parade would, I believe, result in more patronage of the service.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to consider the points the honourable member has raised. The reason why buses are not able to meet every train is that there is a limit to the number of buses on the service. In the initial stages we considered trying to have a bus meet every train, but found that the number of additional buses that would have had to be used was prohibitive; after all, the service was introduced on a trial basis to measure its success. I think it has been successful, and certainly now is the time we ought to be reviewing it. I shall be pleased to consider the points that the honourable member has raised.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SITTING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say why no decision has yet been made as to when there should be a joint sitting of the Houses of Parliament to choose a successor to Senator Steele Hall, resigned? Yesterday I had a question on the Notice Paper (which was answered) asking when the joint sitting would be held, and the answer was:

> No decision has yet been made.

That is, of course, the reason why I ask this question. I remind the Premier that the clear implication of section 15 of the Commonwealth Constitution is that a Senate vacancy should be speedily filled. Under the joint Standing Orders of this Parliament, seven days notice of such a sitting must be given by the President of the Legislative Council.

I understand that the Christmas holidays for Parliament are due to begin on December 8, which is tomorrow week. I cannot believe that it would be sensible to call members back after that time simply to sit jointly for the purpose of selecting a replacement Senator. I also understand that Parliament is not to sit again until late in February, 1978. For these reasons it would seem sensible to choose a replacement Senator on or before December 8, and,

therefore, before the Federal election on December 10.

It has been suggested that the real reason for the delay is that the Government does not wish to decide between the nominee of the Australian Democrats, Mrs. Janine Haines, and that of the Liberal Party, a man, I think, called Beagle. The question of Australian Democrats preferences at the election, it is suggested, is uppermost in the Government's mind. However, I can tell the Premier that unless the Government is prepared to accept the nomination of Mrs. Haines, and to do so before the election, he will run the strong risk of alienating Australian Democrats supporters—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not comment any further—and lose their second preferences, which will be quite vital to the Labor Party.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, in deference to you, Sir, I will not proceed with the rest of my explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can assure the honourable member that that sort of threat will not affect the Government. The position is, as it was yesterday, simply that we are studying the legal implications.

Mr. Millhouse: They're interesting, aren't they?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are quite interesting and we are determined that the decision that is made by the Parliament will be in accordance with the law.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: NOISE CONTROL ACT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: (Minister of Works): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: During Question Time I replied to a question from the member for Murray about the noise legislation. I said that I thought from memory that there had been 102, or something like that, prosecutions in connection with this legislation. In fact, I was thinking about the trail bike situation, about which the member for Coles had asked me. I think about 102 or 108 prosecutions have occurred over a period in that area.

The full reply to the honourable member's question is contained on page 335 of *Hansard* in relation to a question asked by the member for Davenport. I believe that in that reply the honourable member will see that about 72 or 75 investigations have been made. I would not want the House to believe that I deliberately misled the honourable member. I can assure him that I was confused. The legislation is working. I did refer to prosecutions, but I am not certain whether or not any prosecutions have occurred. I will get that information for the honourable member.

IRON WORKERS AWARD

Mr. KENEALLY: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware of the legal action taken by the Federated Ironworkers Association to obtain from Broken Hill Associated Smelters the $4·10 a week increase granted to it by Commissioner Pryke in the South Australian Industrial Commission in September and, if he is (I am sure he is), could he tell me what action the Government might be able to take to assist these workers to obtain the increase?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Government cannot take any action. I do not believe in interfering in the affairs of the Industrial Court, as has been proved many times. I can, however, cite to the House the situation which now exists but which should not exist. In fact, in my view the B.H.A.S. is acting quite bloody mindedly about the matter. There is no question about that. It has an obligation to pay these workers. The granting of $4·10 a week by Commissioner Pryke is law until either a stay of proceedings is accepted by the Full Commission of the court (and it has not been accepted) or, alternatively, an appeal is upheld by the Industrial Court. Neither of those events has occurred.

B.H.A.S., through its legal advisers, applied on October 21 for a stay of proceedings, but the Full Commission did not grant that stay. From that moment on, B.H.A.S. was legally and morally bound to pay that $4·10 increase. I do not know what is holding up the B.H.A.S.: it has usually been a fairly reasonable employer in my dealings with it, and I would appeal to that organisation to pay the money. Workers in Port Pirie are entitled to receive that $4·10 a week unless a stay of proceedings has been determined, and that has not been done.

I understand that further action is contemplated this week on behalf of the unions in order to force the employers to pay the money. I do not believe that litigation should be necessary, as I believe the decision of Commissioner Pryke is sufficient for the $4·10 a week to be paid. I make a last plea to the B.H.A.S. to come to its senses about this matter and pay the money to the workers who have been owed this money since the day of Commissioner Pryke's decision.

MASSAGE PARLOURS

Mr. WILSON: Will the Chief Secretary investigate whether the police have adequate powers to deal with situations where children are found to be residing on premises that are being used as massage parlours? This question is really supplementary to a question I asked the Minister of Community Welfare on October 19, to which I received the following frank reply:

> Members of the Vice Squad have seen children in massage parlours on a number of occasions during the past 12 months. In all cases these children were the children of persons conducting or working in the massage parlours . . . The position is more difficult when only part of the premises is used as a massage parlour and the rest is the residence of the family of the proprietor.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I shall be pleased to get what further information I can. I would have thought the reply was fairly self-explanatory, but, if the honourable member believes that further information is needed on the matter, I will get it for him.

BANKSIA PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education say when the additional classroom and science accommodation, comprising 10 Demac modules estimated to cost about $301 000, which is now being erected will be completed at Banksia Park High School, and when it will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get that information for the honourable member.

FLUORIDATION

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Works say whether

the Government will suspend the fluoridation of our reticulated water supply pending confirmation of the findings of Dr. Burk and Dr. Yiamouyiannis, world recognised cancer research and health scientists? I understand that Dr. Dean Burk, who has spent 50 years in cancer research and is a former head of the National Cancer Research Institute, CYTO Chemistry Division, Washington, and Dr. John Yiamouyiannis, Science Director, National Health Federation, Washington, conducted in America two statistical analyses into cancer death rates in relation to the effects of fluoridation of the water supply. I further understand that the survey included a period of five years before and after fluoride was added to the water supply of certain cities. The survey also included cities that do not have fluoride added to the water supply. I have been informed that the results showed an alarming increase in primary cancer deaths in cities where fluoride had been added to the water supply over a long period.

It has been claimed that there has been a 10 per cent increase in the incidence of primary cancers in America such as cancer of the mouth, breast, large intestines, kidney, bladder, urinary organs, ovaries, and fallopian tubes. I am told that Dr. Burk's report in April, 1976, claimed 35 000 excess deaths in cities in America because of the longer period of fluoridation of the water supply. I further understand that the Dutch Parliament outlawed fluoridation in Holland in August, 1976, following Dr. Burk's report. Since this matter was raised on a radio talk-back programme last Sunday, several constituents have contacted me about it. I therefore would like to know the Government's attitude in relation to the matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I must admit this is the first I have heard of the matter referred to by the honourable member. Certainly, I will have the Public Health Department and my department look at the matter and let the honourable member know the outcome of that inquiry.

FRUITGROWERS

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Premier say what action the Government will take through the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation to prevent growers of canning fruit in the Riverland being forced off their properties? I refer to an article on the front page of the *Murray Pioneer* dated Thursday, November 24, 1977, headed, "Cannery back payments should have priority". The article states:

> The Riverland Fruit Products Cannery, at Berri, should pay out money owing from the past three seasons before offering growers an advance on 1978 fruit, according to Mr. Len Thompson, of Paringa.

Mr. Thompson was a former board member. The article continues:

> Thompson Fruits are owed about $62 000 from the past three season's deliveries. As there were five families earning a living from the property this amount could not be "written off", Mr. Thompson said. He stressed that they were not the only ones affected as the cannery owed about $1 300 000 to its 800 shareholders from the past three seasons.

The shortfall is based on F.I.S.C.C. prices. In the same article there is a further comment, headed "Showdown likely", as follows:

> Many of the Riverland cannery shareholders now appeared to believe that there should be a "showdown" with the company, Mr. John Deakin, of Renmark, said last night. He is the chairman of the South Australian Canning Fruitgrowers Association.
>
> It had been surprising to see how readily shareholders had signed a petition threatening closure of the cannery unless the back payments were made, he said . . . Mr. Deakin said one bank manager had informed him that the situation was now such that he would have to "wind-up" some of his grower customers.

I am quite sure that the Premier readily shares my concern about this situation and I ask him whether the Government is prepared to give further consideration to a long-term loan in an endeavour to meet F.I.S.C.C. prices for the past three years to save the growers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A long-term loan that has to be repaid will not help the cannery which in fact does not have the money to pay the F.I.S.C.C. prices for previous seasons. The honourable member knows that.

Mr. Arnold: Is there no way of saving the growers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have been endeavouring to do that through the assistance given to the cannery from the Riverland Development Fund and the action of the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation, and the growers have been told what the S.A.I.A.C. has done in this area and what are the financial facts. The unfortunate situation facing the cannery in South Australia is that numbers of criticisms could be made of previous management and the decisions made. That is clear. In addition, those people did not have either the fruit or the range of products which allowed them to make the kind of returns which were made by canneries interstate.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: NOISE CONTROL

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. WOTTON: In a question today directed to the Minister for the Environment on the subject of the Noise Control Act, I said I believed no prosecutions had been made under the Noise Control Act. That statement was disputed at the time by the Minister. My remark was based on a statement made on page 3 of today's *News* by Mr. Stafford, the Senior Environmental Officer of the Noise Control Centre. The report states:

> Mr. Stafford said as far as he knew there had been no fines under the Noise Control Act in South Australia since it was introduced on August 18.

This statement suggests that both the Act and the Minister are toothless tigers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot go any further by introducing new material into his personal explanation.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time

It is in identical terms to a Bill which was introduced in another place in the second session of the previous Parliament but which lapsed in this House. It was re-introduced in the other place in the third session of the

previous Parliament but was still in the second reading stage when Parliament was prorogued.

The Bills were designed to create specific offences of using children for the purpose of the manufacture of pornographic photographs and of selling, distributing or offering for sale such photographs. We are faced with a comparatively new situation where pornographic material of a particularly obnoxious kind has been offered for sale in South Australia, and this Bill is designed to provide in one section of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act a comprehensive remedy to cover both the taking of pornographic photographs of children and also the sale, distribution or offering for sale of such material.

Since the previously lapsed Bill there has been evidence of public concern. I quote the *Advertiser* of May 20, 1977, as follows:

> A recent poll shows that a majority of people want heavier penalties for child pornography offences. The poll, conducted by Peter Gardner and Associates, interviewed 787 people throughout the metropolitan area. They were asked: "A Bill was defeated in State Parliament in the middle of April which would have made it an offence to photograph a child under 14 years in pornographic circumstances and provides penalties of up to $2 000 and three years gaol. Do you believe laws on using children for this purpose are adequate, or do you think heavier penalties should apply than exist at the moment?"

Only 8·1 per cent of the people interviewed said existing penalties should apply; 32 people, or 4·1 per cent, said they did not know; and the remainder, 87·8 per cent, wanted heavier penalties. The highest response for heavier penalties was in the 55 years and over age group, where 88·7 per cent of males and 91·4 per cent of females favoured heavier penalties. In the 18 years to 24 years group, 77·8 per cent of males and 93·7 per cent of females favoured heavier penalties. Polling on Party lines showed that 88·5 per cent of A.L.P. voters wanted heavier penalties, with 10·6 per cent favouring the existing law.

Of Liberal voters, 88·8 per cent wanted heavier penalties, and 5·6 per cent preferred the *status quo*. In addition, as recently as November 14, a letter appeared in the *Advertiser* over the signature of one Roslyn Phillips, of Tea Tree Gully, and 22 other signatories. The letter stated:

> If you forget to wear your seat belt the maximum penalty is $300. But if you sell the worst kind of child pornography the most you could be fined is $200. Moreover, there is no specific law at all in South Australia against the pornographers who take the photos and exploit young children in this repulsive way. So why did Miss Levy, Messrs. Banfield, Blevins, Casey, Chatterton, Corwall, Creedon, Dunford, Foster and Sumner fail to support the child pornography Bill in the Legislative Council last week?
>
> It scraped through 10-9, with no thanks to them. They ignored thousands of signatures on petitions and surveys of public opinion. They mumbled that the present hopeless law was "adequate" and they voted against any improvement. In August this year, the members of the Californian House of Assembly voted 75-0 in support of legislation making it a felony to send, possess or distribute smut involving children under 18 years of age. Those convicted could be fined $50 000.

I think that that is a little exaggerated; I think it should be $US5 000. The letter continued:

> The Californian M.P's voted for this law "to indicate to the citizens of California our deep concern for the children of this State". As citizens of South Australia, we would like to know if our members of Parliament have a deep concern for our children.

That letter brings to the fore the question of the Californian legislation, a copy of which I happen to have. The legislation was passed in the Californian House of Assembly by 75 to nil, and it was passed by the Californian Senate (although I do not have the figures on the vote). Section 3 of the Californian legislation (and this refers to minors under 16 years of age being used or promoted by persons) provides:

> . . . to engage in or assist others who engage in either posing or modelling alone or with others for purposes of preparing a film, photograph, negative, slide, or live performance involving sexual conduct by a minor under the age of 16 years alone or with other persons or animals, for commercial purposes, is guilty of a felony and shall be punished by imprisonment in the State Prison for three, four, of five years.

The following subsection provides:

> "sexual conduct" means any of the following, whether actual or simulated: sexual intercourse, oral copulation, anal intercourse, anal oral copulation, masturbation, bestiality, sexual sadism, sexual masochism, any lewd or lascivious sexual activity, or excretory functions performed in a lewd or lascivious manner, whether or not any of the above conduct is performed alone or between members of the same or opposite sex or humans and animals. An act is simulated when it gives the appearance of being sexual conduct.

That gives the objective definition as used in the Californian legislation, which is not so far removed from the definition in the Bill we are discussing. I quote further from the Californian legislation, namely, the last paragraph, which is really a summary and which actually declares the Statute to be an urgent one for the immediate preservation of public peace. The provision reads:

> Recent findings have indicated the use of children in pornographic materials is increasing at an alarming rate. Los Angeles County alone estimates that 30 000 cases of child and teenage molestation, including cases of child pornography, will occur in 1977. Due to the seriousness of this problem, the Legislature declares that laws prohibiting the use of children in pornography must take effect immediately.

I am not one of those who believe that everything conducted in the United States of America is necessarily right for us, but I believe that this is an example we should follow.

When the Bill was previously before the other place, Government members complained that, in most circumstances, the taking of pornographic photographs of children would constitute an offence carrying severe penalties under existing sections of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. However, these members steadfastly refused to face the fact that, under the present law, the only penalty for selling, distributing or offering for sale such photographs is that provided under section 33 of the Police Offences Act, namely, a maximum of a $200 fine or six months imprisonment. The offence of photographing children in pornographic situations is difficult to detect. Therefore, I place considerable emphasis on the need to provide adequate penalties for the sale, distribution, and offering for sale of child pornography.

Doubtless, some photographing of children in the circumstances I have been talking about is done out of sheer perversion and gratification, but I suspect that most of it is done for the making of profit. To strike at the sale will take away the motive for taking the photographs and subjecting children to this disgraceful indignity. The present penalties hardly provide a sufficient deterrent.

There are signs that the Premier has seen the need to provide realistic deterrents in regard to pornographic material, and I hope that the Government will reconsider its attitude to this Bill. Regarding the offence created of selling, offering for sale or distributing pornographic

material, this Bill also creates an objective test of indecency (as did the Californian legislation), which in regard to child pornography is much more realistic than the difficult subjective test in the Police Offences Act.

As I have said, the Government pointed out that in most circumstances the actual taking of pornographic photographs of children would be accompanied by acts which would already constitute offences. Mostly, this would be the case, but not invariably. The *Advertiser* of April 19, 1977, reports a case of the taking of pornographic films where the taker of the photographs was also guilty of indecent assault. It also reports the following statement of the learned judge:

> Oddly enough, while the maximum sentence for a first offence of indecent assault is imprisonment with hard labour for five years, the maximum sentence for a first offence of procuring an act of gross indecency by a person under the age of 16 years even in front of a camera is imprisonment with hard labour for two years only. It is for Parliament and not for me to say whether that is enough.

It is, as His Honour said, for Parliament to say, and that is exactly what I am asking Parliament to do. The learned judge did think the situation peculiar enough to comment that it was "odd" and to raise the question whether the existing penalty was adequate. I think it is not, and the proposal in this Bill is to increase it by 50 per cent to three years. If, as will often be the case, the offence is accompanied by other more serious offences, then of course the appropriate penalties will apply. I suggest that, apart from anything else, as this taking and purveying of pornographic photographs seems to have become a relatively new and specialised crime, there is merit in providing a code of offences to deter the commission of the crime in one section of the parent Act.

As I have said, I ask the Government to reconsider its previous attitude to this Bill. There is no reason why there should not be a vote free of Party discipline on this issue, and I urge the Premier to allow members opposite the freedom of their own conscience. The Opposition has been accused of electioneering in debating this issue in the past, but that cannot be said now. We are at the beginning of a new term of government, with still more than three years to run. There is no electoral advantage for anyone at this time. Despite what has been said previously, this Bill does nothing to the age of consent, and in no way detracts from any existing provision providing offences, whether consent is material or not.

During the debate on this Bill in another place, the Hon. Mr. Blevins said that the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee (otherwise known as the Mitchell committee) was due to report soon, and he gave this as a reason to oppose the legislation, on the ground that the committee may include the matter in its report. There is no guarantee that the Mitchell committee has considered this matter; indeed, the Hon. Mr. Burdett, in another place, has shown that it almost certainly has not done so. Honourable members may check this at page 558 of *Hansard*. In his speech on the Bill, the Hon. Mr. Blevins also stated (page 456 of *Hansard* on October 26):

> The Attorney-General intends to issue a statement regarding the review of penalties. I assume that this statement will be released later today.

The statement was then read by the Hon. Mr. Blevins. I have been unable to find any reference to this statement. Certainly, it was not brought down in this House. The statement attributed to the Attorney-General begins as follows:

> As announced in the election policy, the Government intends to review the penalties prescribed in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Police Offences Act. There will be a sharp increase in the fines for offences relating to child pornography. This matter is being considered by officers of my department at the present time, and I hope to introduce amending legislation either this year or in the first session next year.

I welcome that statement, and I am sure all members would welcome it. Nevertheless, the statement continues (and members could look it up for themselves) as follows:

> When this issue was first raised some time ago by Mr. Burdett, the Premier and myself made it abundantly clear that the present law was adequate in dealing with offences involving children. For serious offences of this kind the law prescribed quite substantial gaol sentences. In a recent case before the Supreme Court, a person found guilty of offences of this nature was sentenced to four years imprisonment.

I have mentioned that case. It was a case concerning not only the taking of indecent photographs but also indecent assault, a case that caused the learned judge virtually to bring the matter of penalties to the notice of this Parliament. That is what we are doing in this Bill. We are asking Parliament to review the penalties and to strengthen them, to provide specific offences, and to accede to the wishes of the people, as shown by the results of the poll I have quoted. I seek leave to have the remainder of my speech inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 provides a new section 255a in the principal Act, which creates the offence of:

(1) taking a photograph in which a person under or apparently under the age of 14 years, appears to be engaged in an act of indecency; and

(2) printing, publishing, distributing or selling or offering for sale such photographs.

The penalty is not exceeding imprisonment for three years and a fine of $2 000, or both. Subclause (4) provides that where a person whether resident within or outside this State or Australia derives any pecuniary benefit from the sale of photographs of the foregoing kind he shall be liable to the same punishment. Subclause (5) defines acts of indecency by objective tests (unlike those in the Police Offences Act) and provides other definitions.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND VALUATIONS

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I move:

> That this House is of the opinion that land valuations used for rating or taxing purposes should reflect a value which relates more directly to actual land usage.

I appreciate that, in the form in which I have brought forward this motion, it is a fairly airy subject; it is not concise or precise. It is that way on my own decision. I recognise that this is an area of considerable concern to Governments everywhere, State and Federal. It is a matter not easily resolved, and certainly it is not directed against any person in the valuation field. As I explained to the House on an earlier occasion, it is a matter of a belief or a view against the system which causes valuers to value in the form currently used.

In the previous Parliament, a motion which stood in my name and which was debated in part read as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the Land Tax Act, 1936-1974, should be immediately amended to provide a

formula for rating which gives due regard to current land use and not possible or potential use as reflected by present assessed value.

At that time I indicated that, although the detail I used was relevant to the Land Tax Act, I could just as easily have referred to the Waterworks Act, the Local Government Act, the Sewerage Act, and various other areas. I simply used the Land Tax Act as the vehicle for debate on that occasion.

The initial debate on the issue appears at pages 886 to 890 of *Hansard* of September 8, 1976. I hope that members opposite and people anywhere who follow this debate will give due consideration to a number of the points made on that occasion, because I do not intend to canvass the same material or to go back in the same detail. I stress, however, that the comments made on that occasion are equally applicable to the much wider motion to which we are addressing ourselves now.

The major problem which seems to exist tends to revolve about the decision taken in 1963 in the case of *H. M. Martin v. Commonwealth Taxation Department,* which gave the right, as far as the court was concerned, of acceptance of potential use (the best possible use that might be made of the land) being incorporated in the valuation for rating and taxing purposes.

In 1963, the problem did not have the magnitude that it has reached today because of the rapid escalation in land values. At that time, there was possibly no immediate thought or action taken by the Parliament to alter the legislation along the lines I now suggest. In more recent times, with the extensive escalation of the value of land and the somewhat ridiculous value being placed on recreational or hobby land, the matter is much more grave. We are looking at the problem created by this decision whereby a potential use value is created and may apply.

The matter which I now bring to the attention of the House was also brought to the attention of the House by the Premier. On April 28, 1977, during the debate on a motion for adjournment, much discussion revolved around the *Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study: Key Issues* report, which had come to light in February, 1977. The debate to which I refer is reported on pages 3840 and 3841 of *Hansard* of April 28, 1977, and the Premier in rebuttal, referring to the *Key Issues* report, stated:

> The report states: A sharper definition needs to be achieved at the boundary between urban and rural land with particular reference to land use and land taxation policies.

That was contained in the report. At the time the Premier said, "We entirely agree with that." That was a Government commitment to the realisation of a need to examine the critical issue. The Premier continued:

> Legislation will be introduced in relation to land use and land taxation policies to ensure that we keep the rural character of the hinterland of Adelaide. We have already introduced many planning measures. Apparently, the honourable member is not aware of them.

Then followed further abuse of the member who had previously been debating the issue. I come back to the commitment of the Government and the realisation and acceptance by the Government that there is a need for major variation on this matter. Whilst I do not limit the debate to the particular comment of the Premier in relation to land use and land tax policies to ensure that we keep the rural character of the hinterland (because the problem is greater than that) that is a major part of the overall problem that comes to the attention of members each day.

In an attempt to determine what was the situation throughout Australia, with the assistance of the Parliamentary Library staff we were able to obtain comment from Valuers-General in each State. From this correspondence, which was conducted in May and June of 1977, I will quote pertinent passages. The first comes from the Valuer-General's Department in Brisbane, as follows:

> I refer to your letter of May 26, 1977, wherein you requested information regarding land valuation methods and land tax provisions within this State. In reply, I have to advise that under the provisions of section 11 of the Valuation of Land Act, 1944-1977, the Valuer-General is required to make valuations of the unimproved value of all lands in the State on the basis that all such lands were lands granted by the Crown in fee simple. These valuations are used by local authorities and the Commissioner of Land Tax for rating and taxing purposes. Provision for the unimproved value to reflect current land use [I emphasise that] is made in section 11 (1) (vii) of the Act. This subsection stipulates that where land is exclusively used for the purposes of a single dwelling-house or for purposes of the business of primary production, any enhancement in the value for potential industrial, subdivisional, or other purposes shall be ignored.

This is a clear indication of the acceptance by the Government and by the system that applies in Queensland that a person's property shall be valued at a value which is current and actual, not the value which is airy-fairy or potential in the future. Much more information was given relating to Section 11 (1) (vii) of the Queensland Act, and I quote the comment referring to that provision, as follows:

> In making, pursuant to this subsection, the valuation of the unimproved value of land exclusively used for purposes of a single dwellinghouse or for purposes of the business of primary production, any enhancement in that value for that the land has been subdivided by survey or has a potential use for industrial, subdivisional or any other purposes shall be disregarded irrespective of whether or not, in the case of potential use as aforesaid, that potential use is lawful when the valuation is made.

Further evidence is given, but I make no further comment on that. The document is available for any member to peruse. From the Acting Valuer-General in Tasmania we received the following letter:

> In Tasmania, the Valuer-General prepares all valuations for rating and taxing purposes. A general revaluation is carried out progressively throughout the State, with all properties in each municipality being revalued each five years.

I want it appreciated by members that the request to this organisation was made when rural land tax was in vogue to a degree in South Australia, and part of the inquiry related to land tax values. The letter continues:

> Land tax is based upon the concept of "land value". This concept became operative on July 1, 1976. Previously land tax was based on unimproved values. All rural lands as defined under the Land and Income Tax Act are exempted from all land tax as also are timber growing lands. Apart from the usual exemptions, such as charitable organisations and pensioner-owned properties, etc., all urban properties pay land tax.

In other comment the situation seemed to enfold that that State was very much in line with activities undertaken in this State. The letter continues:

> Land shall be deemed to be rural land if—
>
> *(a)* Being of an area of five acres or more, it is used principally for agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, viticultural, apicultural, orcharding, dairy farming, or poultry farming purposes, or for any two or more of those purposes: or
>
> *(b)* Being of an area of less than five acres, it is used for any purpose or purposes mentioned in subpara-

graph *(a)* of this paragraph and the use of the land for that purpose or those purposes provides the owner or occupier of the land with his sole means of livelihood.

I say nothing further relating to Tasmania at this stage. From the Valuer-General's Office in Victoria we received the following letter:

I am enclosing herewith information which I hope may assist you to inform yourself on the matters raised.

(a) The criteria for land valuation for the purpose of determining the tax base in Victoria is provided by definition in the Local Government Act. Basically, the definition requires that the market value as at the date of valuation of a property whether it be net annual value or site value be determined. The rating base adopted is determined by the rating authority concerned.

It goes on to indicate that the rating base for land tax is site value, for water and sewerage authorities the rate is on the net annual value system, and local government is the net annual value system, the site value system or a combination of both, using any portion of each. In other words, areas of valuation in Victoria are opened up that are quite different from those that apply here. We do see the concept of site valuation playing a major part in the valuations in Victoria. We have talked of site valuation in South Australia, and I think I am correct in saying that the definition of "site valuation" is contained in the new valuation legislation, which was passed in this House four or five years ago. We have not, to my knowledge, used it for taxing measures which we are considering in the broad sense this afternoon. The interesting point is then made, as follows:

Site value is the "bare" land value but includes improvements which may have been made to the land such as the removal of timber, rocks, stone, drainage, or filling of the land or the arresting or elimination of erosion. To this extent site value deviates from the previous statutory definition of unimproved value which required the notional removal of so-called "invisible" improvements before arriving at the rating base. The Valuation of Land Act, section 5A, details the criteria that the valuer must take into account in fixing the valuation.

5A. (3) *(a)* the use to which such land is being put at the relevant time, the highest and best use to which the land might reasonably be expected to be put at the relevant time and to any potential use;

(b) the effect of any Act, regulation, by-law, planning scheme, interim development order or other such instrument which affects or may affect the use or development of such land;

(c) the shape, size, topography, soil quality, situation and aspect of the land;

(d) the situation of the land in respect to natural resources and to transport and other facilities and amenities;

(e) the extent condition and suitability of any improvements on the land; and

(f) the actual and potential capacity of the land to yield a monetary return.

Paragraph *(f)* above is of extreme importance in so far as the situation that is applying in many places in South Australia today. We are finding in great measure in this State, as it has been highlighted in other places, that there is no capacity for the land to produce anything like the monetary return necessary to service the debt being placed on the land by the various taxes that are applied to that land. The letter continues:

Valuations in Victoria are required to select the prevailing land use as at the date of the return of the valuation. There is no provision for the making of supplementary valuations for changes of a town planning nature which may occur during the life of the valuation. The only method available is to cause a fresh valuation to be made.

Other details follow, but the important passage is "required to reflect the prevailing land use". From New South Wales, I received the following letter:

The Valuer-General is required to value all land in New South Wales, determining the unimproved value of each parcel for rating and taxing purposes. Unimproved value is a statutory concept which requires the valuer to regard the land valued as being unimproved, that is, as it was at the time of white settlement in New South Wales. Value is found from evidence of market transactions, not the highest and not the lowest, but the fair market value in each case.

That is an interesting concept when one has regard to some valuations that have been put forward (many of them having been effectively countered in the court) where the best price is the only price that will be considered by some authorities for the value of the land. Here it is a balanced view between the highest and the lowest. The letter continues:

Evidence of value may come from sales, offers, leases, rents and so on, with regard being had to the provisions of town planning restrictions and other land use controls. In short, it is the valuer's duty to fairly interpret the market evidence and in doing so he must be fully aware of all the circumstances in connection with each transaction.

The definition of "unimproved value" in that Act is provided. Assessed annual value is also referred to. A comment towards the end of the letter from New South Wales states:

Further reference to the general question of land taxation may be found in an article by K. C. Taueber, Chairman of the South Australia Land Commission, delivered in the Eighth Pan Pacific Conference of Valuers held in New Zealand on April 17, 1975. In this paper the author deals with land taxation both generally and then State by State. A copy of this speech has been reproduced in *The Valuer*, volume 23, pages 504 to 513 [number 7] and pages 611 to 614. [number 8 of October, 1975].

I will refer to the Taueber paper later. I have also had information made available from Western Australia. The letter in that case is from the Commissioner of State Taxation, and outlines the situation that applies in Western Australia. It comments at some length about site value, and the importance of that valuing concept in Western Australia. In other areas the information would suggest that rather similar attitudes are applied there to those which apply in South Australia.

In concert with the material that has been provided by the various Valuers-General, I have received a copy of a publication called "Explanatory Notes, the Valuation of Land Act, 1960, Parts X and XI and sections 569b and 569h of the Local Government Act, 1958" of Victoria. This document which was prepared by the Valuer-General's Office, A. J. McGlade, Valuer-General, was tabled of August 1, 1975. It indicates the various aspects of valuation in Victoria. It certainly gives some useful background information. I refer to it only so that any member who wishes to look at the matter in some depth may have reference to it. Another document from the Valuer-General's office of Victoria called "General Review of Rating Systems", dated February 28, 1977, contains a number of pages that summarise the various measures associated with valuation and the taxing in the State of South Australia.

It is a useful document that gives a fairly rapid comparison of the measures in the individual States. It

goes further and lists a series of papers (between pages 36 and 51) on property rating on an international basis. Later, it makes a series of recommendations to the Victorian Government, only one of which, recommendation No. 8 (which appears at page 100), I refer to as follows:

> There is no consensus as to the best form of rating base. The rating base varies from site value to capital value, net annual value or a combination of capital value and site value. However, it was recognised that each system has its own problems and that legislative direction or differential rating is necessary to smooth the impact of rates levied in some areas.

On reflection, I believe that members would accept that as being a fairly considered opinion of the difficulties and, considering that there are so many variables in the whole field of determining a valuation, those comments are quite pertinent.

I referred to the articles that appear in the *Valuer* over the name Mr. K. C. Taueber, Chairman of the Land Commission in this State. The information contained in that article is historical and comparative of the various issues associated with the taxation of land and various rating systems. This comment, which appears at page 507 of the *Valuer* of July, 1975, again gives a fair indication of the nature of the problems we run into when dealing with the subject that I have introduced to the House:

> To the extent that the interest possessed by the taxpayer varies from the defined interest, and the physical conditions of the land varies from the defined condition, the definitions of value contain elements of artificiality in relation to any particular parcel of land.

I like the word "artificiality", because there is a marked artificiality relative to the value of several parcels of land where the potential land value has been placed on it as opposed to the actual value and the returnable value from that parcel of land. The article continues:

> Because of the novelty and artificiality of the measure of value, and the need to apply it to the large range of land uses, with their infinite variety of types and degrees of improvements, it was to be expected that its interpretation by the taxing authorities would be litigated. Under State legislation, the first taxes were not high enough for owners to be sufficiently concerned to incur the expenses of litigation in the higher courts. However, the levy of the Commonwealth tax at steeply progressive rates had enough impact on the bigger landowners to cause them to initiate litigation aimed at the fundamental principles of the tax, and the value upon which it was levied.

That is a pure statement of fact with which I do not believe anyone would argue. It reflects back to the comment I made earlier this afternoon that one of the big issues associated with these problems today has been the marked escalation of values brought about by so many different factors: the problem of increased values is causing difficulties in many areas of taxing and rating today. I do not stop at land tax, council rates, water rates, or sewerage rates, but I project it further into the difficult area of succession duty on the Federal or State basis. It is that escalation that is causing much of the difficulty. Mr. Taueber continues:

> While the early judicial pronouncements had the beneficial effect of clarifying fundamental issues of principle for those administering the legislation, the problems of recent years have been matters of practice. The best evidence of market value is to be found in sales of comparable land, and it has been well established that unimproved value may be assessed by any of the following four processes, listed in descending order of reliability:
>
> 1. Based on the sale of subject land in an unimproved condition at or about the date of valuation.
> 2. By comparison with sales of comparable unimproved land at or about the date of valuation.
> 3. By comparison with analysed sales of comparable improved land at or about the date of valuation.
> 4. By a calculation of the hypothetical development of the subject land for its optimum economic use, using data derived from sales of other land, to derive the unimproved value as a residual amount.

I do not intend to develop that comment further, but again would refer members' attention to those articles which are split into two issues of the *Valuer* and which I find most interesting and helpful.

What then of some of the other problems? Recently the member for Napier mentioned the Chairman of the Munno Para District Council, Councillor Kane, and indicated that he is a person who is highly regarded and who takes seriously his responsibility to local government and all aspects of it. Councillor Kane has taken the opportunity recently to give some thought to the investigation that is now being undertaken on behalf of the Government by Mr. Stuart Hart in relation to the control of private development. It is rather impossible to consider the whole matter of valuation, potential land use and current land use without straying into the general area of land development, because many of the problems have been foisted on us by various decisions made under the Planning and Development Act and in the general area of land development.

Councillor Kane, in a submission which he made to his council and which he made subsequently to Mr. Hart, made the following points:

> The concept of basing rates and taxes on market valuation forced landowners to subdivide. Furthermore, it still threatens to drive out people who are on smaller allotments and who have contributed to the restoration and/or preservation of the Hills environment. It cannot be said strongly enough that for the rate and tax basis to be allowed to continue to force further subdivision and to drive out established small landowners would be tragic.

That statement has been made in several different ways in this House over a period by different members. The member for Fisher has several times highlighted the difficulties of the person who has land in the general hills face area, who is being rated on a value that he cannot make by way of production from that land, who is forced to subdivide or is forced to clear the land and who, in doing so, destroys the natural beauty, aesthetics and amenity of the area. That person has no other alternative if he is to be so rated that it becomes too much of an expense for him to preserve for his own use and that of his neighbours that delightful piece of wooded land.

In that connection, I will mention later fairly recent Commonwealth decisions relating to the Adelaide Plains. I do not think I am doing the Minister for Planning an injustice by saying that he has acknowledged across the floor of the House recognition of the fact that several actions taken in the name of progress or better planning have tended to result in the exact opposite of what was desired by those who initiated the action. The member for Murray (as the member for Heysen) has drawn to the attention of the House the great difficulties which exist in the Hahndorf area. He has pointed out the difficulties of a person living in a typical old German-type house, which helps to give character to the Hahndorf area, on a block of land of half an acre or one acre who has been forced to subdivide or sell it to a person wanting to undertake commercial activity because he can no longer pay the rates and taxes which apply to land in that area.

The owner does not want to get out, he does not want to destroy the house, he does not want to move away from

the type of living which helps give the area its character. However, because of the changed land use nearby, his property is being valued at a figure which causes him to have to let the property go and see its destruction, and therefore the deterioration of the amenities of that area. I have no doubt that other members will develop that theme as the debate in this issue continues. That problem is certainly not only related to the Hills area or the planning problem which Councillor Kane referred to in his report. Item 5 (5) of the report makes the following point:

> Urgent action is required to alter the basis of levying rates and taxes.

In June, 1976, in another document, under the heading "Preservation and conservation of the Adelaide Hills—an alternative view", he discusses at length the reports which were current at that stage, the Lewis report on the Adelaide Hills area and more particularly the Moore and Hartley report, which approached the whole subject on a different basis. Lewis had much to say about rural retreaters and hobbyists, terms which in the minds of some people have become almost dirty words. The suggestion has been made that because a person wanted a rural retreat or a rural hobby he was to be despised and not tolerated. This attitude was regrettably taken by many environmentalists at that time, but I am pleased to say that more recently this view is not so forcibly pursued by the environmentalists, who now recognise the need for a balance in the way people live.

Mr. Kane makes the point in relation to rural retreaters that it is important that, in relation to allowing people to live in the manner they want to to help develop and maintain the character of an area, to apply themselves to the restoration of a great number of our rural areas by the planting of trees, they not be driven out nor their enterprise destroyed by making it completely impractical for them to persist in their endeavours by being priced out. On page 7 of this document, under the heading "Problem of increased values and associated high rates and taxes", Mr. Kane states:

> While the demand for this type of land is undoubtedly high and is one reason for soaring values it must be remembered that the supply side is under the control of the genuine farmer. Many of them are engaged in a headlong rush to break up their land and sell it not at a price related to its agricultural use value but at the highest price they can get out of the demand situation. This is a vicious circle: farmers are forced to sell because of higher charges, by selling the market value is forced up, charges increase, etc.

That vicious circle is known to many people. He continues:

> This not only makes it difficult for the farmer to meet his rates and taxes, but these same charges have reached a level where they are bleeding the small landholder dry. There is a serious danger that many in this category will be unable to establish the living environment they set out to create. There are two popular misconceptions in this regard. One is that the owner of this type of land is rich. In fact, the opposite is often the case. He may have the initiative, drive, enthusiasm and will to work to establish such a property, he may be prepared to put his money into the venture rather than spend it at the club or the pub, but the one thing he often does not have is cash. The second misconception is that the increased valuation of his property somehow makes him rich and therefore able to pay high rates and taxes. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, about all the increased valuation will do for many, apart from make them pay higher rates and taxes, is to ensure that if one member dies it will probably be necessary to sell the property.

He makes other pertinent comments along those lines. When dealing with this and other matters previously I have drawn the attention of the House to the existence of a metropolitan farming study which was undertaken in 1977 by Aberdeen Hogg and Associates for the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. On page 42 of that document, under the heading of "Agricultural use value", the following statement is made:

> A number of submissions have been received which have recommended that agricultural use value is a more equitable method of valuing agricultural land, particularly in the urban fringe of Melbourne, than is current market value . . .
>
> The suggestion is that the value of land for all purposes associated with property taxation should be on the basis of capitalising the operating profit. There are many problems associated with this approach, the first of which is to establish a fair and realistic capitalisation rate. A further problem arises when dealing with a "loss" situation which the accompanying table indicates is likely to be the continuing situation on many farms, particularly the smaller ones in the metropolitan region.

Whilst I do not want to pursue this point any further, I believe it is another point of view in this rather difficult area that should be considered particularly in relation to the motion.

Associated with that report is the document *Review of Planning Policies for the Non-Urban Zones, Melbourne Metropolitan Region.* At page 85, that report, under the heading of "General Recommendations", states:

> Submissions should be made on behalf of the board to State and Federal agencies in order to obtain maximum assistance for the promotion of *bona fide* farming use within appropriate areas. These submissions are to concern rates, land tax and probate duties with a reassessment of relevant policies and appropriate recommendations relating to any necessary amendments to existing legislation to achieve the revised policies. Such incentive schemes would apply only to desirable management practices consistent with the planning policies outlined in this report. Rates, land tax and probate duty assessments should be based on the existing use value or agricultural potential of land.

I incorporate that comment because, here again, it introduces in another form different concepts along the same lines. It refers to existing use value or agricultural potential value of land. The documents to which I have referred were highlighted particularly in a document called *Living City 21,* issued by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Area Board of Works, autumn-winter, 1977. Page 12 of the document, in referring to the various difficulties that were foreseen in the major document, again makes the point, under the heading "Threat to Ownership", as follows:

> Many "traditional" farming families in the metropolitan area were found to be suffering economic hardship, primarily because of the current rural recession and significantly lower farm revenues, and because their prospects of retaining ownership of their farms is threatened. Rates emerged as a major cause of hardship to farmers, along with probate and death duties. Because few farmers have made provision to minimise duties by transferring assets, and low returns from farming have provided little capacity for farmers to service the loans that payment of duties would involve, the sale and subdivision of most family farms on the deaths of the present owners is, in many cases, seen as inevitable by the farmers and their families.
>
> This is not only an unreasonable situation for the farming community; it has important implications as far as the objectives of the planning scheme, relating to the non-urban zones, are concerned. The sale of a family farm usually results in subdivision of the land and thus to a further reduction in the capacity of the non-urban zones to achieve the stated aims of retention of agricultural production and

rural landscape.

I could take other comments from the same document, but they all add up to the same thrust I have tried to indicate to members previously: it is important that we view this matter in its entirety, not purely and simply as a reduction in taxation or in rates for individuals only in the rural sector. We must look at it also in relation to the difficulties associated with industrial areas and housing areas. I go along with the views expressed recently by one of the Elizabeth City Council's aldermen (Martyn Evans). In the Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler and Munno Para *News-Review*, dated October 7, 1977, under the heading, "Save the Hills plea by Alderman. Council Opposed to Development", appears the following:

> Elizabeth Alderman Martyn Evans has called on all local councils and the State Government to help save the Para escarpment from development "before it is too late".

Other details are contained in the report. As much as one can accept the plea made by Alderman Evans, one must still come back to the fact that that environment will be maintained only so long as it is economically possible for the owners to maintain it in its current form. So many of these people are being forced to pay rates based on a valuation which relates to subdivisional values, whereas the land is being used entirely for grazing purposes. It is land, which, being in the delegated hills face zone, may not be subdivided. Even though it may not be subdivided, as provided by regulation, without the initial acceptance of this Parliament, and, therefore, with the agreement of this Government, it is assessed on a valuation form based on the subdivisional value, a purpose which may not be created.

We have identical situations in many areas throughout the hills face zone where one can take out the valuations and find that they are on the adjacent subdivisional value. It is impossible for the current owners to continue to subsidise the rest of the community, according to the plea of Alderman Evans, by maintaining it as open space, when they are being asked to pay their rates on a purely fictitious or hypothetical value.

Let us now look at another problem that is currently affecting people in this State, again as the result of a decision of the State Planning Authority. It is probably a commendable decision, but it prevents people building holiday homes, or even homes in which they will live permanently, on areas close to our major river, the Murray. They are no longer permitted to build on these places, because they come into what is known as the flood plain area. Because they may not build on these sites, and because there is no value in purchase of the land by a person who is looking for recreational benefit, the owner is left with a series of blocks that have no resale value.

Under the provisions of the Local Government Act, they are considered as individual allotments, if they are not contiguous because of some earlier sales. They have an individual value, and assessment, and they will be considered and rated on the council's prevailing minimum rate. I could take any member to several of these blocks along the Murray. It may well be that, in the coastal areas, because of some of the decisions in relation to shack sites, the same position arises.

Mr. Evans: And in the Hills area.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. I could take members to areas along the Murray where the owner has a property which he cannot sell, which has no value because of a decision by the State Planning Authority, accepted by this Government, and on which he must pay the council's minimum rate.

Mr. Evans: And in all probability it has a high mortgage on it.

Dr. EASTICK: That is right and, in many instances, he is paying $50, $60 or $70 a year for a block of land which has no resale value and from which he can get no return.

The situation obviously is one of major difficulty in the general area of assessment of values and the application of rates and taxes. We can instance the position applying today in the area of Morgan, Bower, and Mount Mary, where, under the terms of the State Planning Authority, it has been possible to create subdivisions, each of 30 hectares, which a person is able to purchase for about $100 an acre for use as a weekend hideaway. The land is covered with bluebush, saltbush, or spindly old mallee, and, through that country, a person would be lucky to be able to maintain one sheep to 20 acres. However, it has a fictitious value of $100 an acre by virtue of the criteria used, looking at existing sale figures. People have been enticed to go there for their hideaway activities. They are paying a figure which is quite ridiculous; nevertheless, the sale has been legitimate. I hate to think of the situation that will arise for those people in the pastoral and semi-pastoral areas when they are called upon to pay probate or other taxes on the basis of recent sales.

I turn now to the situation of the so-called hobby farmer and the decision taken by some valuers. In this case I refer to a Commonwealth valuer and a small area of land on the Adelaide Plains which has an existing natural scrub growth and which he says must be valued at a valuation higher than that of a block of land which is fully arable or fully developed, because the claim is that a hobbyist will want it so that he can get close to nature. This area is helping the amenity of the district, breaking up the bareness of general agricultural development, and it has been valued by the Commonwealth at a fictitious figure well above the value of the land, and not reflective of recent sales of adjacent land almost identical in form: it is agricultural land with some cleared land and some natural scrub. The figures are available. We have the statement by the Commonwealth Taxation Office in relation to the estate of Mr. Robert Perry, in the Roseworthy area, as follows:

> The "reasoning" as referred to in your second and third query is encompassed in the sales evidence available to this office and is listed below for your perusal.

It indicates a number of other sales, none of which was related to the availability of that scrub-like area. A letter has been received from the agents who are working on behalf of the estate reading as follows:

> You are aware of the differences of opinion between yourself and Mr. Urlwin about the three lots of land involved.
>
> In order to clarify the situation would you please supply us with the following particulars by way of further information which we require in order to reassess the original valuations.
>
> First, would you confirm the individual calculations of each of the three lots of land involved?
>
> Secondly, would you please advise us of the reasons for the disproportionately higher values of the land in certificate of title register book volume 3519 folio 1 and to a lesser extent of the land in certificate of title register book volume 3351 folio 40 as compared with the land in certificate of title register book volume 132 folio 175?
>
> Thirdly, would you please give us particulars of the extent to which your valuation of the land in certificate of title 3519 folio 1 was influenced by its alleged appeal to the so-called "hobby farmer" or "environmentalist" as compared to its usage for primary production purposes?
>
> Pending the supply of such further particulars and information, would you kindly retain your valuation and the file and defer assessment of the estate?

The land is passing from a deceased father to his daughters, who are being asked to pay in relation to a

valuation, for Commonwealth estate duties, on the basis that some hypothetical environmentalist or hobbyist who likes to look at birds will pay a higher value for that small parcel of land because it has a block of scrub on it. An identical block of scrub about a kilometre from the property was sold two weeks ago at a lower value per hectare because of the scrub on it. If the Commonwealth were to persist with this argument, the scrub would have to be cleared immediately so that a return could be obtained from the block. It would be necessary to clear the scrub, so destroying its amenity and its value, and destroying the on-going decision of the members of the family to maintain that area of scrub on the Adelaide Plains. All the correspondence and the details of this case are available for members to inspect.

I believe it is of assistance to bring to the attention of members of this House the difficulties of the ongoing interpretation of the original *Martin v. Commonwealth Taxation Department* decision of 1963. I do not suggest for one moment that the matter has a simple solution or that any individual in the valuation system is acting other than justly and with great integrity. However, the system is forcing the placing on properties of valuations which are quite unreal and which do not allow an individual to make a return on the property so that the amenity can be continued for the benefit of the community.

I mentioned earlier that members can quote such examples as the Hahndorf Village and the difficulties that have arisen where some of the old homes that give the place character have had to be destroyed. One could go into many villages and towns in the Adelaide Hills and elsewhere where people today are looking to maintain something of their heritage but where the reverse action is taking place because of the lack of sympathy of the various authorities in relation to the land use value of the property. There is evidence of it at Kadina, and certainly at Kapunda. One can see evidence of it at Lobethal, although the situation there is not of such long standing as is the situation at Hahndorf. There is a consistent destruction of the purpose for which so many people wish to maintain the originality of those towns.

We also have the frequent problem that services (an extension of water mains, of electricity, of roads, and of those other facilities that help to make up a livable quality of an area) are refused to a landholder, yet the value being placed on the property is the same as that for properties for which such services are immediately available elsewhere. At present, under a revaluation in the Murray Bridge area, rate notices have been distributed, and the member for Murray has told me that, in the centre area of Murray Bridge, there has been an increase of between 700 per cent and 1 000 per cent in council rates. The mind boggles at such a situation. I would not be surprised if these people were upset at a 60 per cent to 120 per cent increase, as has occurred in other places, but these increases are from 700 per cent to 1 000 per cent for places in the main area of Murray Bridge, some of which are residential.

I make no apology for the breadth of discussion that I have introduced on this subject. This matter will not be resolved by simply passing this motion. It is a matter that may not necessarily be resolved during this session of Parliament. Basing my consideration on the statement by the Premier in this House on April 28 of this year that the Government recognised and accepted the need to review several of these charges, I hope that we will achieve at least a step in the right direction to correct many of these anomalies. I know that my colleagues will bring forward examples that should show an appreciation of the present problem, and I hope that members on both sides will apply themselves to the difficulties that are recognised within the whole ambit of this question.

I submit the motion for the attention of the House, and I trust that the honourable member who will take the adjournment and who has professional expertise in this area will make a contribution to the debate, recognising that it is not a reflection on him or his professional colleagues but is an expression of concern at the system under which they work.

Mr. DRURY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CADET CORPS

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I move:

That this House congratulate the Federal Fraser Government for re-establishing the Army Cadet Corps and in particular for the formation of the first open unit in Australia, namely, the Warradale 27th Cadet Unit, giving great benefits to those young people who feel inclined to take this advantage.

In asking the House to support this motion, I am sure that members will recall that the Whitlam Federal Government disbanded the cadet corps, certainly against considerable public opinion expressed by people from all walks of life. It was not suggested that these people were from the lower, upper, or middle classes, but they were from all over Australia and included academics, people working with their hands, on the bench, those in schools, and housewives. The parents of boys at that stage involved in Army cadets through the different schools they attended were concerned.

In my district it involved Glengowrie High School, Sacred Heart College and, close to my district, Marion High School and at one stage Brighton High School. I understand that throughout the State at that stage 16 schools were involved with cadets, some of them having started as early as 1940. I refer to the St. Peters Cadet Unit. The Premier attended that school as did, I think, the member for Mitcham, the present Leader of the Opposition, and the present member for Ross Smith.

Opposition came from the general public to the closing of the cadet corps, and it came most certainly from schools, especially the staff and parents of children attending them. I was approached by parents about this matter, because two years ago I asked the House to support me in asking the Whitlam Government to reconsider its position. I did not get the support of the House, and we all know the history of that. Government members were not allowed a conscience vote on the matter, so the hard core (the heavies) were put on to answer me: I refer to the member for Stuart and the member for Semaphore. They did their best, which was not very good, to convince themselves (not their colleagues or me) that they could not support my motion. One would hope that they have changed their stance and have seen the light because the situation is quite different now and my motion deserves the support of all members on the other side of the House, irrespective of what tiny excuse they may find to speak against it.

I mentioned earlier that there were a number of schools in my area that were upset about this happening, one being the Glengowrie High School, which was in my district but is now in the district of the member for Morphett. I ask him, if he wants to talk in this debate, which I hope he might, to talk to some of the people at that school and some of the staff who are interested in the cadets and who were disappointed after the cadets were disbanded a few years ago. After that close contact with the parents, staff and children of Glengowrie High School

he might be obliged to support me in this motion. I look forward with interest and anticipation to his involvement in this debate.

Sacred Heart College, a school that is still in my area, has a long and fine record in relation to school cadets. The Deputy Premier will be well aware of that college's involvement and as an ex-serviceman I am sure that he, irrespective of what he said last time, will have a change of heart and support the motion. He will also support my thoughts about that college's long and fine record in the field, particularly the band of that cadet unit, which was excellent and won many trophies. There is a trophy given for the whole of Australia which the Sacred Heart College cadet band won year after year. That band travelled all over Australia and was very successful in competitions. That college is known throughout Australia for its ability in that field.

If I were considering only my own area in a selfish way I would say that there had been a great loss to the youth of my area because of the Whitlam Government's direction that the cadet corps be disbanded. Many appeals were made at that time by many people in this State. Ministers were approached, the Government was approached and the Federal Government was approached directly by a number of people.

I brought the matter before this Parliament by way of motion and question. It was obvious that the Government and the present Minister of Education were not at all sympathetic towards the cadets, and that indicated that they did not approve of cadets in the school system. That surprised me about the present Minister. I was aware that the previous Minister, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, was not sympathetic toward the cadet movement, so I would not have been surprised if he had indicated to his schools that the Government would not support it. I was more surprised and disappointed that the present Minister of Education took the stance he did about the matter. Not only I but also many people in the State (certainly close friends of mine) were more than surprised at the decision of the Education Department, the Minister and the Government, up the line, and their attitude to cadets and their disbandment.

I hope that members on the other side will face up to the issues. If they do this and understand the new system in the cadet units, they must realise the advantages that the youth of Australia will receive from the training they get. The new programmes for cadets are quite different from some of the old ones referred to previously about this matter. I refer to *Hansard* of October 8, 1975, at page 1191, where the member for Stuart, in a very quick salvo that he blasted to this side of the House, said:

> The purpose of military training of any kind is to instruct the participant in the art of war and to develop within the individual an ability to destroy and kill.

What great words from the honourable member, that he should think the only training that is given to Army cadets is in the ability to destroy and kill. He continued:

> The very suggestion that this type of training should be inflicted on children of impressionable age, whether voluntarily or otherwise, is despicable, immoral, and unworthy of the support of any individual, let alone any Parliament.

There is the voice of wisdom from the member for Stuart! Surely the honourable member did not believe what he said. I would not be surprised if he had someone write that for him. I cannot imagine his having thoughts like that, because he seems to be a reasonable sort of member who can think things out for himself. To say that members of the cadet units are only being trained to kill and destroy is despicable, immoral and unworthy.

Mr. Keneally: It was a direct take from General MacArthur's memoirs.

Mr. MATHWIN: If that is so, I am surprised, because I did not know that the member for Stuart was close to General MacArthur. At least he came back.

Mr. Max Brown: The member for Stuart certainly returned, too.

Mr. MATHWIN: He did indeed. The member for Semaphore had his two penneth in the debate, too. I will not go through the dreary part of that member's speech when he went on and on about television programmes and films, but I should like to bring to the attention of the House part of his speech when he stated that the reason the cadet unit had been stopped by the Federal Government at that time was the advice from the Chief of the General Staff, who maintained that the training the cadets were receiving was practically worthless, as any full-time member of the Regular Army would glean in a fortnight the same knowledge it had taken a member of the cadet corps to learn in an entire course. That is a real sign of the brilliance of the member for Semaphore.

Mr. Olson: I am still of that opinion.

Mr. MATHWIN: Maybe so. There is nothing like the person who reads what he wishes to read and does not see any more, or hears what he wishes to hear and still maintains that he cannot hear. That is ridiculous and completely wrong. Furthermore, the member for Semaphore would know that, too. If he was honest and above board, he would say to me, "John, I made a mistake; I was talking through the top of my head." I would remind the honourable member that it took more than a fortnight in 1939 for troops to be trained. After all, one cannot entirely forget that situation, if one wishes to be serious about the whole matter. The punchline to his whole speech was that cadets were only learning something that could be taught to troops in a fortnight. As far as I am concerned, that is pure bunkum, and the honourable member knows it. It proved that the honourable member did not understand what the corps was about and that he had not taken the trouble to find out.

A committee was set up to investigate this matter and it issued a report. That report, the Millar report, is available in the library for any member on the other side to learn from if they wish to know what the committee was about and what were the findings of that committee. I doubt whether the member for Semaphore, when he made his speech, had even read the Millar report.

Mr. Olson: If you read my speech you'll probably find that I quoted some of it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I would be more than surprised if that is so, because the programme for a cadet unit is quite different and involves adventure training and all sorts of different things about which I shall tell members later.

Mr. Slater: Tell us now.

Mr. MATHWIN: The impatient member for Gilles had better hang on for a while because he will hear all the good news in due time. The Millar committee was set up in June, 1974, to report on the Army Cadet Corps: it was a committee of inquiry into citizen military forces, June, 1974. The committee was chaired by Dr. T. B. Millar, Australian National University, Director of the Australian Institute of Internal Affairs, Canberra. The five other members of the committee were Major General D. B. Dunstan, C.B., C.B.E., General Officer, Commanding Field Force Command. I should not think by any stretch of the imagination that he could be related to the Hon. Donald Allan Dunstan. The other members of the committee were Major General K. D. Green, O.B.E., E.D., B.E., Secretary, Premier's Department, Govern-

ment of Victoria, Melbourne.

Mr. Max Brown: They were military officers?

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member can hear as well as I can. The member for Whyalla can make his own choice. The other members were Mr. Wilfred A. Jarvis, B.A., B.Ed., Dip.Ed., A.B.P.S., M.A.P.S., Senior Lecturer in Behavioural Science, New South Wales University, Sydney; Graham O'Loghlin, B.Sc., Director, Kinnaird Hill deRohan and Young Pty. Ltd., Consulting Engineers; and Colonel L. A. Simpson, C.B.E., E.D., F.R.T.P.I., F.R.G.S., Chartered Town Planner and Surveyor, Hobart. They were the illustrious members of the committee.

Mr. Max Brown: How many letters do you have after your name?

Mr. MATHWIN: I have the letters "M.P.", and I have had them for a long time. I was a master painter before I came into the House, and the letters after my name have not changed. It would be rude for me to tell the member for Whyalla the only military operation he would know about; I know that he could not do it as he is not a contortionist. That committee was set up to consider the matter of school cadets. On page 15 of the Millar report, under the heading "Cadets as a youth activity", are listed 13 points relating to what happens in the cadets and what are the advantages of being a cadet. Perhaps it would do members opposite some good if they paid some attention to the advantages that some of the reasonably young ones could take advantage of. First, the cadet corps teaches discipline, which is a naughty word as far as the Labor Party is concerned. It fosters the capacity to accept and give commands, and the first must precede the second. It fosters self-discipline, which is important to all of us. I have had to use that many times in this House.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think pledges and discipline are two entirely different things?

Mr. MATHWIN: There is some relationship, between the two. One pledges the discipline and one brings in the discipline if the pledge is not kept. It teaches leadership and encourages initiative. It makes the boys think their way through situations in which they are responsible for others. About one cadet in three eventually has a position of leadership of some kind. Whatever his advocation, he becomes a leader.

Mr. Keneally: There are good reasons for that, that you are not prepared to discuss.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know the member for Stuart does not believe that. He believes that everyone should be on the same level; we should bring them all down to a certain level and not allow them to rise any higher. It teaches boys to work as a team. The boys on the other side of the House work as a team when they are forced to do so. It teaches boys to sublimate personal considerations in a common objective and shared experiences. It fosters comradeship among the boys, crossing class or educational barriers.

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: My colleague and friend, the member for Alexandra, has just reminded me that comradeship would really be well known to members on the other side of the House. It does not matter whether one is an academic or a working chap; it does not matter that much because the boys are taught how to get over that situation. We know there is a situation on the other side of the House regarding academics and the workers. It fosters loyalty to one's country. Now there is an interesting thing. How do members opposite feel about that? We know very well that in the last days of the Whitlam regime we were so close to becoming a republic it did not matter.

It fosters loyalty to one's country, to the school, and to the group to which one belongs. It teaches self-reliance and self-confidence, enabling young boys to cope with situations they would otherwise find difficult or impossible. Who would argue with those principles? Who would say those principles are bad? Surely no-one in this House would do that. It teaches familiarity and safety with firearms. When there are so many accidents in the community with firearms, it is important for boys to know how to handle them safely and care for them. It is well known to all of us that firearms are becoming easier and easier to procure. They are getting into the wrong hands and it would not be completely wrong to teach young people—

Mr. Max Brown: What figures have you got on that?

Mr. MATHWIN: It would be no use quoting figures to the honourable member; he does not know what figures are. It is important for young people to know how to handle firearms safely. When dealing with a side arm such as a revolver or a pistol, which are easily handled and mishandled, it is important to have had some proper instruction on its use. I have seen experienced soldiers get hold of a pistol and demonstrate—

Mr. Drury: They must have been officers.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, they were not officers. I am talking about chaps in my unit who had Lugers and small side arms that were taken from the enemy. They were demonstrating to their friends how easy they were to use. In one small unit three accidents occurred when overconfident people were using pistols and Lugers. Accidents have been caused through a lack of instruction in the proper use of side arms. I believe any information that can be given to young people on these matters is to their advantage and to the advantage of society in general. There have been times in this House when I have wished I still had a pistol because I could have used it.

Cadet training accentuates outdoor activities, and teaches boys skills at living and moving in country areas—bushcraft, map reading, field hygiene, survival and the prevention of pollution, rock-climbing and canoeing and many other things are taught to these young boys which will come in handy later in their lives. It also helps to develop fitness both in mind and in body. These are only some of the activities of the cadets which are an advantage to the boys who join a cadet unit.

The Millar report on the Army Cadet Corps, at page 19, states:

> 5.2 Cadets have considerable support in the community. In hundreds of submissions, in many more interviews around the country, and in the various surveys, we found that the great majority of parents, teachers and boys concerned believed that Cadet training benefited the boys and should be retained, if with modifications. In the public opinion survey conducted to determine community attitudes towards the Citizens Military Forces, two questions were asked about cadets, with the following results:

Are you for or against Cadet training for boys at school?

	Per cent
For	76
Against	18
No opinion	6

So, 76 per cent were in favour of cadet training. At the same time, the following question with regard to the possibility of females being allowed to join the corps was asked:

> Are you for or against cadet training for girls at school?

The answers were that 56 per cent were for it, 37 per cent were against it, and 7 per cent were of no opinion. The final recommendations of the report, at page 25, are as follows:

> The committee, therefore, recommends:
>
> a. That the present Army cadets system be retained, with

modifications, and on a totally voluntary basis during peace time.

b. That, with the consent of the Education Department in each State, and the principals of the schools concerned, all secondary schools throughout Australia be invited to consider whether they wish to have or retain a cadet unit.

The report contains a full page of recommendations. It is obvious from the report which was commissioned by the Whitlam Government and about which that Government decided to take no notice that sufficient numbers in the community voted for the retention of school cadets. I think I have given members an insight into what is contained in the report. I hope some of them will read it, and I hope that some Government members will vote for my motion.

The first re-establishment in Australia of a cadet unit, an open unit, was the Warradale 27th Cadet Unit, which was not formed in the school. The unit takes students from several schools in the district, such as Sacred Heart College, and Brighton, Marion, Mawson, and Glengowrie High Schools, together with students from schools farther afield. Some of the cadets are from as far afield as Hallett Cove and O'Sullivan Beach. The unit had its first march past and was paid its full official recognition last Sunday. The unit has a committee of management, which a unit of this type must have. The committee comprises 12 members, who are fully responsible for the setting up of the unit and for the programming of the kind of activities in which the boys will be engaged. The committee comprises the President (Mr. Robin Smith), the Secretary (Mrs. D. Freeman), and the officer-in-charge (Captain McDonough).

I attended the unit's march past at the Warradale Army Camp last Sunday, and it was a treat for me, and I am sure for others present, to witness the way in which the young men from the area conducted themselves. The salute was taken by the Minister for Veterans Affairs (Mr. Garland) at 2 o'clock, and about 120 cadets took part in the march past. They were a picture of pride to the onlookers. Members of the Returned Services League clubs at Plympton, Marion, Brighton, Glenelg, plus another sub-branch, were also present.

Dr. Eastick: Were there any Labor members of Parliament or Labor candidates?

Mr. MATHWIN: Several of them were invited. Mr. Jacobi was present, and I am sure that he was impressed by the ceremony.

Mr. Hemmings: Was Steele Hall there?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, and so was the member for Kingston. A good smattering of members of Parliament was present and, from what I gathered, they all agreed that it was a good occasion for the cadets and for the spectators.

Mr. Hemmings: Did they show any war films?

Mr. MATHWIN: No, and I do not think that the matter of war films being shown to the young has any relationship with cadets. People can watch them in *The World at War* on Sundays. As we watched these young people marching past, it was apparent to us that they were the youth of the country and that their morale was high. They conducted themselves in a military style, and their discipline was excellent. The parading cadets were not forced to have hair cuts.

Mr. Keneally: What's the significance of that?

Mr. MATHWIN: They were proud and pleased to have their hair cut shorter, believing that others were doing the same. It is something like the member for Stuart wearing jeans or a denim jacket into the House, and his colleagues coming in in similar attire, or like the Attorney-General coming in wearing a red shirt, and the following day the member for Stuart coming in wearing his red shirt. It makes them look like robin red breasts.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is moving away from his motion. There is nothing in the motion about red shirts.

Mr. MATHWIN: This was the first open unit set up in Australia. It has been set up to test the situation. If the Warradale 27th Cadet Unit proves successful, as I am sure it will, the scheme will be extended to other parts of Australia as an open unit, rather than having units in only one school. The units from all schools will be pooled.

The boys volunteer to join the units. Whilst I was visiting, a boy came in bringing a list of 40 names of boys from the Glengowrie High School who wished to join the unit. There is no doubt that there is great advantage in the establishment of such units. It has nothing to do with the rather ridiculous opposition put forward on a previous occasion by some members opposite in relation to killing, shooting, and getting rid of people. The advantage is to young people who learn something, combining outdoor activity with many things which will be of use to them in later life. The units are of advantage to the youth of Australia and of South Australia. I ask all members to debate the motion, if they see fit, and to support it.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I will not be supporting the motion.

Mr. Becker: Why?

Mr. KENEALLY: I am somewhat bemused about the insistence of the member for Glenelg in taking the time of the House on issues that more properly are the prerogative of the Federal Government. It suggests to me that, in the past, the honourable member himself must have been a member of a cadet corps. I can visualise him in his teens, pre-First World War era, marching along, all strapping 4ft. 10in. of him, in his khaki uniform, with his gaiters and boots, and with a rifle bigger than himself, with his little heart beating wildly as he went to the rifle range to be taught how to shoot. How to shoot what? To be taught how to shoot another human being.

The honourable member took some pains to refer to a contribution I made in a similar debate in this House some few years ago. He thought that I might have changed my mind, but there is no hope of that. I should like to read what I said in the debate at that time. It has been read to the House once, but I think it bears repeating. This was my view at the time, it remains my view now, and it will always remain so. My comments were as follows:

> The purpose of military training of any kind is to instruct the participant in the art of war and to develop within the individual an ability to destroy and kill. The very suggestion that this type of training should be inflicted on children of impressionable age, whether voluntarily or otherwise, is despicable, immoral, and unworthy of the support of any individual, let alone any Parliament.

No matter how the honourable member dresses up his motion, when it is reduced to its basic component the whole purpose of cadet training is to teach young and impressionable children the arts of war.

Mr. Arnold: To defend themselves.

Mr. KENEALLY: Honourable members opposite are throwing up their hands in disgust. A few points have been made by the member for Glenelg. I shall be seeking leave to continue my remarks at a later date, so that I can check whether or not he made any valid points that I have missed. The paper I have here, however, is reasonably clear of valid points. He mentioned discipline, leadership, team spirit, comradeship, loyalty to country, self-reliance, bush walking, physical fitness, and so on. All of those things can be taught to children without their being

members of a cadet corps.

Many people support the Boy Scout movement in Australia, and that movement teaches each of those individual benefits listed by the honourable member. There is no necessity to combine with that the teaching of young people in shooting someone else, in camouflage, and in the use of sophisticated weapons. There is no requirement for young children to be taught that to fulfil each of the conditions about which the honourable member feels so strongly. They could be taught in sport and recreational activity. Orienteering combines many of the points the honourable member uses as a basis for promoting the value of cadets within the community.

Mr. Arnold: Who will you call on to protect your family, or aren't you going to—

Mr. KENEALLY: I will not call on children of 14 or 15 years of age to protect my family when there is some mystical combat that the honourable member might conjure up that no-one else is aware of. The member for Chaffey has got to the basic component that the member for Glenelg evaded during the whole of his speech: what cadets are all about is the defence of this country.

Mr. Arnold: Discipline.

Mr. KENEALLY: The defence of this country is the point the honourable member makes, and now he is trying to slither away from that. The whole idea of cadets is to teach people the arts of war.

Mr. Arnold: Utter rubbish!

Mr. KENEALLY: I think it is utter rubbish. I agree with the honourable member, and I look forward to his support later for what I am saying. The member for Glenelg said that the R.S.L. and other bodies would support the cadets. Of course that is so; they are in the same business.

Mr. Becker: Would you let the Japanese take this country over?

Mr. KENEALLY: The honourable member is being ridiculous. It seems to me that we live in a world that is fast becoming accustomed to accepting that the only way to resolve a difficulty is to take up arms and involve ourselves in a war. If we are to train children of this tender age that this is the only answer to international difficulties, of course that will be the answer that they will look for when they are adults and when they are the decision makers in this country and throughout the world. If they know only military answers to difficult situations they will apply only military answers to difficult situations. Honourable members opposite are promoting a total national and international mentality that the only way to resolve difficulties is to train children in the arts of war so that these kids might be able to defend us in a fictitious war that someone might imagine is to take place. The honourable member made a number of points which cause the mind to boggle. He saw some significance in the fact that boys who marched last Sunday had had their hair cut. I would be delighted to be in the position of needing a haircut. That does not detract from the point I am making.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I hope you are not reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. KENEALLY: No. I believe the Speaker has an admirable haircut, and one that I will be emulating before long.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no reference to haircuts in the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: Of course not, Sir. The honourable member should be aware that a football coach dear to his heart required the same sort of hair cuts of footballers. A person does not have to be a cadet to have a short haircut. That is a ridiculous suggestion.

The honourable member also tried to make the point, and seemed to be confident that people everywhere would agree, that the overwhelming majority of people in Australia are keen to have cadet corps set up in schools. He quoted figures to support his argument, but everyone knows that figures can be quoted to support any argument. In preparing myself for this speech, I read the debate that took place on October 8, 1975: there were good and poor speeches, the good ones coming from Government members and the poor ones from Opposition members. The Deputy Leader of the Government at that time pointed out that a survey had been made amongst people throughout Australia by the National Youth Council of Australia, and it found that cadets were among the least popular forms of youth activity among all age groups studied. That is a significant factor that the honourable member should consider.

Mr. Mathwin: Where was that taken?

Mr. KENEALLY: It was commissioned by the Federal Minister in 1974-75, and it was an Australia-wide survey.

Mr. Becker: Who was the Government then—the commos!

Mr. KENEALLY: That remark is typical of Opposition members, and that is why they cannot have an unemotional debate on this issue, because they refer to the previous Labor Government as a communist Government and are suggesting that the survey was coloured.

Mr. Becker: He is a conscientious objector.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am neither a pacifist nor a conscientious objector. I do not have the courage to be a pacifist, as that takes enormous courage, and I believe that I do not have it, but I admire genuine pacifists who carry out their beliefs. I am not a conscientious objector. I do not understand what these matters have to do with this Bill, except that Opposition members are trying to put me off the track.

However, I remind the honourable member that I am a fully trained national serviceman. At that time I was an important cog in Australia's national defence plan and was taught all the arts of war. I can recall being instructed by a sergeant to run down the field, stick a bayonet into the Russian, and then hit him with the butt of the rifle. I said that I would put the bayonet into the sack of hay, but, if I had to imagine that that sack was a person, I would not do it. The officers did not seem to know how to cope with that sort of feeling. I probably was not the best soldier trained in the national service or the C.M.F. training that followed, but I suspect that I was not the worst.

I did fairly well in sporting events, and was captain of the company cricket team. Probably, that is where I learned some discipline. I was not completely disenchanted with the training we received, but at that time I was 18 years old and I believe that, if there is a form of national service training, it is reasonable for 18-year-olds to do it. I am opposed to the concept of anyone imposing the sort of training that I had, which is reasonable for a young man of 18 years, on someone of more tender years. If Opposition members suggest that the defence of the country depends on a late primary school or early high school student, that is a reflection on the defence planning of this country. However, no-one can reflect on that planning, because there is no such thing.

Mr. Evans: Aren't people maturing at an earlier age each year?

Mr. KENEALLY: There may be such a situation, but the member for Fisher is the classic example of people who mature at a much later time in life. We are looking forward to his maturation and also to that of some of his colleagues.

The member for Glenelg may have raised some points that need closer attention, and I will do that later. It is true that the cost of keeping the cadet corps operating in

Australia has been considerable, and it is arguable that this money could be spent in a much better way in order to achieve the objectives that the honourable member finds attractive without needing to teach war games as well. I find it objectionable to see so many young people running around in this type of uniform. If war is necessary, I expect that people will not shirk from it and, if the situation warrants it and the country is under attack, it behoves everyone to participate in the defence of the country.

However, I cannot imagine how anyone can suggest that at this stage in Australia we should worry about that. We do not border countries that are aggressive towards us and we do not border countries that wish to make incursions upon us, and it is unnecessary to train kids to participate in some future war. The member for Glenelg carefully did not say that that is what it is all about. He kept denying that, and tried to promote the other objectives. When it is reduced to its basic concept, it is no more than what I say it is, and that is what honourable members will have to vote on.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why is the member for Glenelg so much against the Boy Scouts?

Mr. Becker: It has nothing to do with the Boy Scouts.

Mr. KENEALLY: It has everything to do with Boy Scouts. I attended a Boy Scout troup or two. I have a chequered past. The Boy Scout movement is supposed to be teaching its members all these objectives. The member for Glenelg said that it was essential that young boys and girls should be taught to be familiar with weapons so that they could handle them, and that would prevent accidents. That is a load of rubbish. If we teach children how to handle weapons, we are encouraging them to use the weapons: not necessarily to use them on people, but they will be encouraged to shoot our wild life. The best way to ensure that young children do not have accidents with rifles or other weapons is to ensure that there are no rifles or other weapons in the house and that children do not have access to them. It is no good teaching them to be familiar with them, because familiarity breeds contempt, and contempt of weapons is the very thing that brings about the sort of accidents that all honourable members wish to avoid.

Dr. Eastick: There has to be a certain amount of familiarity in order to breed anything.

Mr. KENEALLY: That is expert advice from the veterinary surgeon of the House, and I cannot argue with it. Although two Opposition members spoke for at least 2½ hours this afternoon, members opposite object and say that there is not sufficient private members' time. I wonder whether they can be serious but, so that other honourable members can utilise private members' time, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I move:

That this House condemn the economic policies of the Federal Government in creating widespread unemployment within the Australian community, particularly affecting the young people seeking to enter the Australian work force.

It is beyond dispute that the Federal Government's economic policies over the past two years have had a disastrous effect on the Australian economy. About 360 000 persons are now unemployed, comprising about 5·6 per cent of the work force. The young people in the community, especially school-leavers, comprise a disproportionate number of unemployed persons, as they represent 15 per cent of the work force and 40 per cent of unemployed people.

First, I wish to deal with some of the conflicting statements and policies of the Fraser Government. In January, 1976, the former Federal Treasurer (Mr. Lynch), under the heading "We will not devalue dollar, says Lynch, not part of strategy", was reported as follows:

> The Australian dollar would not be devalued, the Treasurer (Mr. Lynch) said last night. He said the economy was sound and devaluation could not be justified.
>
> Devaluation would raise internal prices and defeat the Government's primary objective of reducing inflation. "Devaluation is not part of the Government's economic strategy," Mr. Lynch said. "A devaluation could not be justified in terms of Australia's balance of payments position and outlook." Mr. Lynch's statement follows mounting speculation about the exchange rate and a fall in international reserves in December.

Yet late in 1976, the same year, just the reverse position applied: the Federal Government devalued the dollar with the highest devaluation this country has known, about 15 per cent.

Mr. Olson: It was over 17 per cent.

Mr. SLATER: True, but it was reduced to about 15 per cent. The statement of Lynch at that time did not assist the business community or the Australian public generally in having confidence in the economic policies of the Federal Government. In March, 1976, during the early days of the Fraser Government the Prime Minister said that the economy was on the road to recovery. We have suffered more than 700 days of Fraser Government, but the press report of March, 1976, was as follows:

> The Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser) said yesterday his Government had restored responsible economic management in its 100 days in office. "Our economies in the Public Service [we know what effect that has had on the economy] the Bland Inquiry, our monetary measures, have knitted together to start Australia back on the road to economic recovery," he said. Mr. Fraser said the Government's programmes were now well administered in Parliament.

The situation has not improved yet, and the people most affected are those who are now unemployed. As I stated when the opportunity presented itself last week during the adjournment debate, unemployment is not evenly spread: some groups are suffering more than others. The group suffering the most disproportionately is the under 21's, who comprise 15 per cent of the work force. People likely to suffer the most are school-leavers seeking to enter the work force for the first time. There is much doubt that the low levels of unemployment experienced in Australia in the post-war years will ever return.

I refer to the experiences one has to cope with when one is unemployed. I refer to the hardship, frustration and demoralisation—the psychological effects of unemployment to both the individual and the community. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to require the disclosure by members of the Parliament of South Australia of information relating to certain sources of income and other matters, and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It is intended to ensure that there will be available to the public as a matter of public record an accurate and up-to-date statement of the financial and material interests of members of both Houses of this Parliament. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 sets out the definitions used for the purposes of this Act, and I would draw the attention of honourable members particularly to the definition of "income source". Clause 4 provides for the appointment of a person to be known as the Registrar of Members' Interests.

Clause 5 sets out the obligations on members to make certain disclosures and is commended to honourable members' particular attention. In subclause (1) of clause 5, members are required to make returns every six months setting out their income sources and the income sources of members of their family, as defined. Income sources that yield an income of less than $200 during any six-month period will not be required to be disclosed. Subclause (2) requires a monthly return relating to certain matters set out in that subclause, but I would point out that if there has been no change in the information relating to those matters at the end of any month the member will not be required to make a return under this section. In this regard I would draw honourable members' particular attention to the requirement to disclose details of travel and holidays.

At paragraph *(e)* of subclause (2) a power is given to prescribe by regulation additional matters in relation to which information shall be provided by members; it is felt that this power is necessary if the legislation is to maintain its effectiveness. Clause 6, which is generally self-explanatory, sets out the method by which the information obtained from members will be given appropriate publicity. Clause 7 provides a substantial penalty for members who breach the provisions as to disclosures. Clauses 8 and 9 are formal.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 1020.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): This Bill tends to be rather technical in certain areas; therefore, I will try to go through it systematically and assess what I believe are the changes to the principal Act. Before debating the Bill I pay a compliment to the board members, especially the outside members of the corporation, who I believe at this stage are faced with a difficult task. The Chairman of the corporation, Mr. Cavill, and the other members (and I do not know all of them) have put much time and effort into trying to assist industry in South Australia. Although at times I have been critical of some of the decisions made, I do not wish to detract from what is a difficult task facing the corporation in the present economic climate, with more companies needing some kind of financial assistance. I pay that compliment to them even though I do not agree with them all the time.

First, I shall discuss, as I see them, the six principal purposes for introducing the Bill. The first amendment is to change the name of the corporation from the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation to the South Australian Development Corporation. In reality we have no objection to that; the change of name means little, but I appreciate the reasons for the change. Confusion has occurred between the Industries Assistance Commission (the Federal body) and the Industries Assistance Corporation (the South Australian body). The last time we changed the name of the State body we called it the State Industries Assistance Corporation but that still did not identify it with South Australia, so we then called it the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation. I therefore accept the need for the change of name because of the confusion that has been caused, especially as the Industries Assistance Commission in Canberra has become such an unpopular body, at least in some sectors of industry, because of its attempts to cut down on tariff barriers, thereby reducing protection to industry.

The second amendment in the Bill is to change the definition of "industry" to include overseas industry. The Premier said that the change related to overseas consultancy by South Australian firms. I have no objection to that whatever. I believe it is important that the S.A.I.A.C., which I shall continue to call it in this debate, should be allowed to participate through overseas consultancies. I am not sure that I would agree that it should become the formal body under which South Australian consultants consult overseas. However, the Premier made the point that many overseas countries require some sort of fixed commitment and obligation from the State Government rather than from just a private enterprise organisation.

From my discussions with people, I understand that in many cases now that procedure is absolutely essential, and it is therefore important that there be a Government body like the S.A.I.A.C. through which consultancy can be conducted and through which negotiations can take place and perhaps almost an unwritten guarantee at Government to Government level (rather than at Government to private company level) can be given. We support the second purpose of the Bill.

The third purpose of the Bill is to broaden the powers of the Industries Development Committee, allowing it to investigate any financial matter referred to it by the Treasurer, rather than just considering the specific allocation of grants, or guarantees and other specific requirements, as set out in the Act. That is almost a mere formality, and likewise we support it.

The fourth purpose of the Bill is to raise the upper limit of financial assistance to a company. That upper limit for assistance by way of loan is now $300 000. That sum is to be lifted under the provisions of this Bill, to $1 000 000. The Premier stated that one reason for that amendment specifically involved the Riverland area. I imagine he was referring to Riverland fruit products, concerning which the State Government has given financial assistance. I will not go into the details of that case, but I understand that

$300 000 has already been given and that, under the terms of the agreement, that sum could be considerably larger, making this amendment necessary.

In his 1976-77 Report at page 445, the Auditor-General, commenting on the activities of the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation in relation to the Birdwood Mill Museum Proprietary Limited, said that, as the total purchase and grant involved more than $300 000, a specific allocation of $32 328 had to be listed as reimbursement to reduce the corporation's assistance to the maximum of $300 000 allowed under the Act. Perhaps when he sums up the debate the Premier could confirm that that is yet another case where this provision could have been of assistance. I have no objection to raising the limit. Many large companies that operate in this State and need assistance may need more than $300 000. O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited is a case where a loan of $300 000 was provided and, when further financial assistance was necessary, is was provided by way of guarantee, because the loan limit had already been reached. Perhaps the Premier could also confirm that that would be another case where this increased limit could have been used. Therefore, I have no objection to the fourth purpose of the Bill, that is, lifting the limit.

To my understanding, the last time that the limit was increased was in 1971; it might have been increased since then, but I do not think so. I notice that the Premier has not lifted the maximum limit that can be granted by way of loan before a matter must be referred to the Industries Development Committee. In 1971 that amount was raised to $100 000, but it is not being lifted in this Bill, not that I necessarily believe it should be lifted. I presume that more matters will be referred to the Industries Development Committee, and I would support that, because it is important that any such assistance by the Government to private industry should be carefully examined by members of Parliament. On several occasions the Premier has said that I should know details of Government assistance and whether or not a matter has been approved by the Industries Development Committee, because the Liberal Party has two members on that committee. It is my understanding that that committee's proceedings are confidential. At no stage have the members come to me and said, "This is what is going on in the committee." So, although the Premier has told me that I should know that something has been approved by my Party and that I know the facts although I have not admitted to it, that is not the case.

The fifth purpose of the Bill is to remove the upper limit of the corporation's right to borrow public funds to grant assistance to industry. At present the limit is $5 000 000, but it is now being completely removed. Under the existing policy of the existing board of the corporation, I have no objection to that, but I see dangers if any Government decided to run amok in the amount it raised and in the amount handed out without due care.

If the decentralisation policies that the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation should be applying through Government policy to this State were adopted, the amount of assistance handed out might be far in excess of $5 000 000, although I realise that it involves loans rather than grants. I have no objection to that, although I have some reservations if the corporation's present policy is not continued.

The sixth purpose of the Bill, and the most important purpose, is to allow the corporation to buy shares in existing companies. Here we are referring not to new shares or new issues of shares but to existing shares. Later, I will draw a clear distinction between existing shares and new issues of shares.

I have checked to see to what extent the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation has bought shares in companies, and I find that there have been a number of cases. It bought shares in Professional Consultants Australia Proprietary Limited to the value of $300 000, as reported in the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1977. Page 446 of that report, giving details of shares in companies controlled by the corporation, states:

> During the year shares in two companies (cost $300 000 and $2 500) were disposed of and the investment cost recovered. Dividends were not received from the companies but the corporation has agreements with both which provide for reimbursement for the use of capital.
>
> During the year the corporation purchased shares in Professional Consultants Australia Proprietary Limited referred to previously and 250 000 shares of $1 par value for $250 000, being 50 per cent of the issued shares of a new company incorporated to take over section of the business of a clothing company.

Obviously that refers to Golden Breed Proprietary Limited. I have already read to the House the parts of the agreement under which those 250 000 shares were purchased, and I do not think I need add further to that, except to say that I think the principles I outlined at that time should be considered in examining this Bill. The extract from the Auditor-General's Report that I quoted makes us realise that the corporation had power to purchase new shares in an old company or new shares in a new company, and it has exercised that power.

There is also the classic case; no doubt if I do not mention it the Premier will remind me of it. I refer to the case of Cellulose Limited. Under the Playford Government in 1939, Cellulose was established as a public company. There were 165 000 $1 shares issued. The South Australian Government underwrote 25 000 of those shares and eventually took up 12 per cent of the shareholding. On various occasions the company issued new shares and by June, 1969, the South Australian Government held 693 420 50c ordinary shares and 416 052 50c convertible notes. When that company was taken over by Australian Paper Mills, all those shares and convertible notes were sold, I understand, to Australian Paper Mills.

Therefore, that power of being able to purchase new shares has certainly been used by both Liberal and Labor Governments. What is the need for this provision? I can understand that under certain business conditions, if the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation is to loan or guarantee money to a private company, there may be some benefit in ensuring that the share equity of that company is at least controlled by people who have some interest in South Australia. There have been recent examples where perhaps the share equity of the company has been partially, if not wholly, owned interstate or overseas.

The South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation may have reservations in lending money or guaranteeing a loan to a subsidiary company wholly owned interstate or overseas, especially as the controlling interests with the equity capital may have little regard in the long term for maintaining that industry in South Australia. That should be taken into account when the future of that industry is assessed by the board members in connection with the question of whether they grant assistance. I can see that an argument could be put forward that, if financial assistance is to be given by the corporation, in certain circumstances it would like to have at least some say in the equity capital of that company.

I can also see the advantage in certain circumstances of where, if the Government is to take over an industry, it

would be handy to be able to take it over through existing shares, rather than having to establish a new operating company and to buy the assets of the old company.

I go back to what I think is a significant statement in the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1977. The reference is to Birdwood Mill Museum Proprietary Limited. This is an example which has possibly prompted the legal necessity to introduce this Bill. The report states:

> During the year the assets of the Birdwood Mill Museum were purchased and leased to a new company, Birdwood Mill Museum Pty. Ltd., the subscribers of which are the Treasurer and the Minister of Works, and the net cost to the corporation, $300 000, is included in the balance-sheet under this item. In addition, payments from Consolidated Revenue relating to the museum comprised—

	$	$
Reimbursement to reduce the corporation's assistance to the maximum allowable of $300 000 under the Act		32 328
Grants to Birdwood Mill Museum Pty. Ltd.—		
Towards capital expenditure	42 000	
Towards operating expenses	5 000	
		47 000
Total other payments		$79 328

> In connection with the purchase of the museum, the Industries Development Committee recommended the following financial support from the South Australian Government—
>
> (1) a grant of up to $250 000 for capital purposes; and
> (2) an annual grant (to be reviewed after five years) towards operating expenses estimated to be at least $50 000 per annum initially.
>
> The corporation has sought an opinion from the Crown Solicitor concerning the validity of the recommendation to purchase the museum. To date the opinion has not been received.

Perhaps the Premier, when replying, will say whether or not the legal opinion sought in that case is the legal opinion on whether or not the corporation can buy existing shares or only new shares. If that opinion has now been brought forward, will he say what it is? I raise that matter because, obviously, this is one type of example the Government had in mind when introducing the Bill. I think that has established at least the fact that, under certain conditions, one could argue that it would be preferable to buy existing shares.

I will now move on and examine other arguments that should be considered in relation to this matter. First, what is the effect on the company of buying existing shares? The Premier's second reading explanation states:

> It is made clear that the corporation can purchase shares on the open market. At the moment a legal view has been taken that it can only purchase shares on the initial establishment of a company. That was not the original intention of the legislation. It was intended when the legislation was introduced that, if a company needed additional capital by way of the corporation's taking up share capital, it should be able to dispose of a certain part of its equity to the corporation. That was clearly forecast when the original Bill was introduced. However, the view of the Crown Solicitor has been that the wording of the Bill confines it only to the taking up of shares which have never been previously allotted or which are indeed only on the formation of a new entity.

The Premier said that it might have been necessary to give additional capital to the company by allowing the corporation to buy shares in the equity of the company, and so injecting the equity capital into the corporation. That does not occur, even though the Premier implied that, when dealing with existing shares. Certainly, dealing with a new share issue, when the corporation takes up some of those shares, the money from the corporation goes to the company and is an injection of funds into the company. Take, for example, shareholder A, who lives in Sydney: if the corporation decided to buy 20 per cent of the share capital in the company from that shareholder, in no way would it be injecting new capital into the corporation. In other words, there is no way in which it would be directly assisting the financial capital position of the new company. All it would be doing would be transferring money from one shareholder to another shareholder, and the company would be no better or worse off.

Now, there is one indirect effect on the financial position of the new shareholder, but certainly the implication created by the Premier in his second reading explanation would not apply. Therefore, at least on those grounds there is no valid argument the Government has or can put forward that an exchange of existing shares is assistance to industry. It is simply bargaining for the share value on the open market, involving an exchange of money between shareholders. Certainly, if we are going to allow the corporation to do that, no longer could we refer to it as the Industries Assistance Corporation, because it would be not be assisting industry: it would become a development corporation because it was entering the traditional field of private enterprise.

I should now like to differentiate between the issue of new shares and the buying of existing shares. The amendments to the Bill in 1971 (no doubt that is what the Premier was referring to as the original intention when introducing the corporation) clearly involved only new shares (I can see why the Crown Solicitor's opinion is that it should apply only to new shares) because the purpose then was to inject new money into the company by the taking up of these new shares by the corporation. Section 16g provides that the corporation shall have the following powers:

> *(b)* to subscribe to the capital of any corporation that engages or proposes to engage in an industry by the purchase of shares;

That clearly refers to injecting new money into the company by taking up new shares. That is what happened with Cellulose and in some of the other cases in which new shares have been taken up. That can be validly argued when dealing with a Government statutory corporation that assists industry, but, when the corporation simply turns to buying and selling shares on the open market (if for no reason other than to take control of the company, but not necessarily to assist it financially), we are looking at a totally different concept.

The next argument is to compare this Bill with those available in the other States and in the Commonwealth sphere. At the Commonwealth level, we have the Australian Industries Development Corporation, which can buy shares. The South Australian Government has just bought from the A.I.D.C. portion of the share capital in the Cooper Basin through the various partners there. Perhaps it involved the petroleum authority, but at least purchase was made from the Commonwealth Government. I have checked today with each of the other States, all of which have clearly indicated that none of their various bodies that would relate to the S.A.I.A.C. has the power to purchase, in full, new or existing shares. In New South Wales, I checked with the development corporation, which clearly stated that it did not have such a power.

In Victoria, the development corporation did not have the power. In Western Australia, I checked with the Industrial Development Department, which did not have the power to buy new or existing shares.

I checked with the Queensland Industrial Development Department, which certainly did not have this power. The only Government authority there that had power to purchase shares was the State Government Insurance Office. However, neither the Industrial Development Department nor any other similar body designed for the purpose of assisting industry had this power.

The only other State to which I have not referred is Tasmania, which, likewise, said that it did not have this power; although it had considered the matter, it had decided not to proceed with it. However, that did not mean that it might not try to proceed with it in future. Of the other five States, none has the power even to purchase new shares, let alone the wider power to enable them to buy existing shares. I cannot therefore see how the Premier can argue this matter on that basis. If we start buying shares in existing companies, it no longer involves assistance to industry, although it certainly involves development. I have covered that point previously.

I now refer to a document that has been referred to previously in this place. I raise this matter, as it is important when one examines the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation. At the time that this document was read to the House by the Leader of the Opposition, it was said that it was confidential: the Premier said that it was a stolen document, although he did not refute what was contained in it. At the top of this document, entitled the *South Australian Banking Corporation,* is a section dealing with staff. This document deals with the State Bank of South Australia as a trading bank, a South Australian finance company, and the Savings Bank of South Australia. I will not deal with those matters, however, as they are outside the scope of the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I want the honourable member to stick to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The part of it which relates to the Bill is that dealing with the establishment of a development bank of South Australia, including "S.I.A.C.", which was then called the State Industries Assistance Corporation. This document clearly indicates that it was the Government's plan to establish such a development bank of South Australia, including the S.A.I.A.C., in 1980.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to stick to the Bill. He is moving away from the Bill, and I hope he does not continue to do so.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I point out, Sir, that the clock has been turned on.

The SPEAKER: Unfortunately, the clock is out of order and must, therefore, be warmed up. The honourable member has unlimited time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Sir. I will stick to the Bill. However, I point out that it has been said in this House that there are plans for the S.A.I.A.C. to be broadened in its scope and made into the Development Bank of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now surmising. I hope that he will stick to the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Sir. One point that this Bill raises is that the name of this authority is being changed from that of an assistance corporation to a development corporation. There has been speculation that such a body—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have just told the honourable member that he is not permitted to move away from the clauses of the Bill, as he is doing. This is the third time that he has done so, and I have already warned the honourable member twice today.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think he understands what you're saying.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This Bill is starting to deal with what we now call the South Australian Development Corporation and, under its new name, if this Bill is passed, it will be taking on more the functions of a development bank rather than as it has been referred to previously, that is, the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation. I see dangers in passing this portion of the Bill, as it will certainly widen the corporation's powers and give it developmental powers rather than powers to enable it to assist industry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is moving away from the Bill. He is referring to the Development Corporation and the Development Bank. I want the honourable member to stick to the Bill. I will not warn him again.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Sir. I point out that under this Bill we are forming a development corporation. I appreciate your ruling, and will certainly speak only in relation to the Bill. I also point out that we are widening the corporation's powers and, in doing so, are giving it the powers of a development corporation rather than simply an industries assistance corporation. I am referring to those clauses that will extensively widen the corporation's powers.

I have also examined the success various Governments have had when trying to purchase shares in existing companies, which is what we are talking about in relation to this part of the Bill. Basically, it is fair to say that where there is a free enterprise system in a Western-style democracy, as we have here, and Governments have tried to buy existing shares, they have not proved successful in operating those ventures. In other words, Governments have not been highly successful in trying to operate companies that were traditionally private enterprise companies.

I was interested to know that the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation has so far generally tried to sell its shares as soon as it could, having already purchased them. If one looks at what I read out in the House earlier, one will see that the corporation sold its shares in two companies. One company dealt with meat and, although I forget in what commodity the other dealt, I think it involved food. The commodities in which those two companies were involved were outlined in the 1975-76 report.

So far, the corporation has exercised very well its powers in relation to the purchase of new shares. That is why I would have not much fear if this power was given to the present board members of that corporation. But, of course, there is no such guarantee at all. If this Bill passes, these new powers will be included in the Act, and, without having to consult Parliament, it will be possible for those involved to change the membership of the corporation board and, therefore, dramatically to change the corporation's policy. If that happened, one could foresee a totally different use being made of the powers that would exist under this legislation if it was so amended.

I took interest in reading many articles, the main one of which was entitled "The Grim Failure of Britain's Nationalised Industries", which was taken from the December, 1975, issue of *Fortune,* to assess the performance of private companies as operated by Governments. When one examines that report by Robert Ball, one sees that he is pessimistic about the performance

of any corporation or company operated by Governments. In fact, in his opening sentence Mr. Ball says:

> Nationalisation, it turns out, can cost the taxpayers dearly. After $18 billion, the meter is still running.

He is there referring to the large losses incurred by Government-run businesses in England. I refer also to a book entitled *Business in Britain*, written by Mr. Graham Turner, on page 189 of which is a chapter dealing with nationalised performance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows only too well that there is nothing in this Bill regarding the nationalisation of industries, to which he is referring. For the last time, I ask the honourable member to stick to the clauses. Otherwise, I will name him.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I did not intend deliberately to wander outside the scope of the Bill. The Bill gives power to the corporation to buy shares in a company. It can buy all the shares in a company, certainly a controlling interest, but it could buy the entire corporation. I adhere to your ruling, Sir, but I am simply trying to refer to cases where Governments have bought shares in companies and to show how this has performed. I can look at examples only where it has occurred overseas, and that is what I am attempting to do.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member sticks to the Bill. He is moving away from it. There is nothing about nationalisation in the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have drawn the overseas comparison and I will not proceed with that line. I go back to the Auditor-General's Report under the S.A.I.A.C., and point out that the Birdwood Mill Museum Proprietary Limited in that report obviously was going to run at a deficit of at least $50 000 a year. That is a case where the Government has stepped in. I am fearful that, if the Government decides, through the corporation, to start to buy large equity capital in existing companies, particularly as it would be only in companies that have come to the Government as the lender of last resort, this State, through the S.A.I.A.C., would be faced with having to meet ever-increasing losses for those companies. I think that is a fear that has been realised elsewhere. Experience has shown that it could occur here even with examples where the S.A.I.A.C. has bought in, although, to give it full credit, the two companies it bought into briefly and was then out of within 12 months did not run at a loss. Also, I understand there was no material gain in the value of those shares.

We as a State need to be careful about giving the corporation the power to buy equity in companies, not only as new shares but as existing shares, and then committing the State to meeting ever-increasing losses of those corporations or companies. That is a fear this House should take into account. We are looking at a Bill that will affect not just the immediate desires of the S.A.I.A.C., but the long-term policy of our State as operated through this Government.

I intend to vote against the clause allowing the corporation to buy existing shares. I will summarise what I think are one or two of the main arguments. Buying existing shares does not add to the financial position of the company, but simply is a transfer of money from one shareholder to another. There is a legitimate argument for buying new shares, but not old shares, and one needs to be careful in opening up and giving a blank cheque to a body which may start to cost this State a large sum of money. Although I am opposed to it, I see perhaps the reason why the S.A.I.A.C. went to the Government and requested these amendments.

I make a suggestion as to a possible alternative to the Government, because I believe that an Opposition should not merely oppose but should come up with constructive solutions. I understand that there may be cases of companies where the control of shares is outside the State and possibly even overseas, and if that subsidiary company, operating in South Australia, would like financial assistance, I believe the Government has an obligation, before giving that assistance, to force that subsidiary company to double or treble or increase its share capital and to create new shares, allowing the S.A.I.A.C. to participate in those new shares. By so doing, if it is absolutely the last resort to maintain that company, that proposal should be considered.

Frankly, I am opposed to Governments trying to venture into the area of private enterprise. It has not been successful. Where Governments have attempted it, generally they have run at a loss. I could cite numerous examples, but I accept your ruling, Sir, that I should not go through all the examples outside the State. There is no evidence that Governments, having purchased share equity in companies, are able to run them any more efficiently than has the existing management. As such companies were in financial difficulties beforehand, there is no proof that the Government, by buying existing shares, is able to get them out of their financial difficulties. Other avenues are open; I have mentioned some of them. I believe that the Bill generally should be supported: that is, I believe that the first five purposes for introducing it should be supported, but that the last one, the clause dealing with allowing the Government to buy existing shares, should be strongly opposed by the House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I shall confine my remarks briefly to the last point made by the honourable member, since he supported all other portions of the Bill. He has said that there is no justification for taking up share capital in an existing company. The S.A.I.A.C. has asked for this power, because it believed that it had it. In relation to a previous attempt of the S.A.I.A.C. to proceed upon the basis of that power, the matter was referred to the Crown Solicitor. I think it was in the Birdwood Mill case that that was so. I do not remember precisely at the moment whether it was that case, but there was an opinion by the Crown Solicitor that, in using the words "subscribe to share capital", the Act, as it stood, meant that we could subscribe only to freshly issued shares and not to existing shares previously allotted.

That inhibited the S.A.I.A.C. in its negotiations in relation to the Birdwood Mill Museum. The museum is something that the S.A.I.A.C. entered not as a commercial enterprise but as a service to the State. It was contemplated that there would be a continuing loss on the Birdwood Mill Museum for some time, but it was the Government's view, as a matter of public policy, that the museum should not be allowed to founder. Indeed, that view is most strongly supported by members of the honourable member's Party, and we had considerable representations from State and Federal members in relation to it. There were quite real difficulties in our making the arrangements with the Birdwood Mill Museum, because it was not possible to buy the shares of Birdwood Mill Museum Proprietary Limited which had been previously issued and allotted.

To give this power to the corporation, as it had believed that it had the power and the Government believed it had, was simply to provide it with greater flexibility in its arrangements. I do not accept the honourable member's view that this does nothing for a company. There are many internal arrangements with companies that can be better effected if, in fact, there is some transfer of existing

interests and the people who have interests in the company can be paid out in order that new initiatives are taken. In the company arrangements with which the corporation has to deal, that is not an uncommon feature of the applications which are made.

On that score, I do not believe that the House should follow what the honourable member has suggested and vote against that clause. He has supported all the other clauses, and in those circumstances I do not think there is anything to reply to there. I notice that the honourable member has a Contingent Notice of Motion. I cannot discuss that in detail at the moment, because it is not before the House. However, I can tell him that I find that the matter involved is not so far a departure from what the Government has introduced before the House that this House should not in those circumstances debate that, and therefore I propose to accede to his Contingent Notice of Motion.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to the composition of the corporation and related matters.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Powers of corporation."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

Page 2, lines 8, 9, and 10—Leave out all words in these lines.

The purpose is to delete the new power to be given to the corporation to purchase shares in any company. I have outlined the reasons for deleting this. The Premier has said that there are justifiable grounds on which the financial position of the company can be improved by the corporation's buying into the equity capital of the company. However, he did not elaborate on that, and I still cannot see how it could be done. I have discussed the matter with several persons. Certainly, an improved financial position of the company can be achieved by buying new shares, and I do not see why the Government does not use that power. In effect, there is a difference in the procedure necessary to buy these shares. The Government could buy, say, 20 per cent of the existing capital of the company without the approval of any other shareholders than the one who owns the 20 per cent, whereas, if the share capital in that company was to be doubled and new shares issued to the Government, it would need majority approval of both the board and the shareholders.

If the South Australian Government, through the corporation, is not prepared to put its policies and proposals to the board and all the shareholders of the company, I believe that it is trying to act in an underhanded way. I have brought forward a specific case of where the Government is interested in trying to buy shares in a company, and there are other cases. It would be difficult for the Government to do so if it had to get the approval of the majority of the shareholders, whereas this way it can go to one shareholder, offer a price well above the existing market value of those shares, and, in offering such a price, use public funds to obtain a minority interest in that company. I believe that that would be a gross misuse of public funds. I will give an example. Say the shares in a company were listed at 30c on the stock market and say the Government went to the largest shareholder who owned about 20 per cent and offered 60c a share. It would have no difficulty in getting 20 per cent of the existing shares, and I think that any such use of public funds is against the public interest and against the way money appropriated by this Parliament should be used. Therefore, I oppose this provision.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Obviously, the honourable member has not thought of the remaining provisions in the Act that require investigation and report. Obviously, the Industries Assistance Corporation, or Industries Development Corporation as it will be called, has no basis for acting in the way that he has proposed. Indeed, if I may refer briefly to what the honourable member has said earlier, his allegation in this place that it was the Government's policy at any time to develop a banking corporation and to incorporate S.A.I.A.C. in a development bank is quite wrong.

That has never been Government policy in South Australia. I rejected the document to which he has referred before it got into the hands of the Leader of the Opposition, and I stated that at the time. It has never been Government policy, and it is not Government policy now. It is clear that no board of S.A.I.A.C. could set out on the course that the honourable member has suggested in relation to this provision, and I ask honourable members not to accept the amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Premier has claimed that the policy to which I referred earlier was not Government policy and that he had rejected it. I do not believe that that stands up to examination, because whether or not it is carried out to the letter as outlined in that document may be disputed by the Premier, but legislation that we have put through this place clearly indicates that the Government is heading in that direction. If we look at the Bill and at that policy, we see that this is a step towards the policy outlined in the document.

Sure, the document states that 1980 is the sort of objective that the Government was looking at, and the Premier hopes that people will have short memories and, before 1980, forget what has been going on here this evening. I cannot see how he can deny it when so many other parts of the document have been partly implemented.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (15)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, and Wilson.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

New clause 9—"Auditor-General to report."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move to insert the following new clause:

9. Section 18 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the present contents thereof (which are hereby designated subsection (1) thereof) the following subsection—

(2) without limiting the generality of subsection (1) of this section the Auditor-General shall in every annual report made by him give full details of any actual or prospective liability or of any loss to the corporation arising or resulting from the bankruptcy, entry into receivership, liquidation or reconstruction of any person to whom or to which assistance has been granted under this Act.

In recent years there have been several cases in which companies that received assistance from the S.A.I.A.C. have gone into receivership or liquidation, and some of those companies have received very large amounts of

assistance. In the case of O'Neill Wet Suits Proprietary Limited, a loan of $300 000 was made to the company and then a bank guarantee of $700 000 was given but, within three or four months of that financial assistance being given, the company went into receivership. I will not go into the reasons. In these circumstances, where $1 000 000 of State funds was put at grave risk and when it was known that the company was in receivership, there is no harm in that fact being reported to Parliament. There is an obligation for that fact to be reported to Parliament.

I have strong personal views that if any company receives assistance, there is no harm in it being made public. Some of my colleagues have argued that, because the Government is the lender of last resort, it may place the company at a disadvantage commercially because it is known that it has gone to the lender of last resort. For the time being I am prepared to accept that argument, but once the company has gone into receivership or liquidation that fact can be ascertained from the companies office and there is no harm in revealing it publicly to Parliament through the Auditor-General's Report.

Incidentally, I point out that at present the Auditor-General's Report refers to perhaps a mining company or a clothing company that has gone into liquidation and that a certain liability has had to be met. That does not come up until after the assets have been sold, the company liquidated, and the liability paid up by the Government. I believe Parliament has the right to know, and there is an obligation on the Government to inform it every time a company that has received public funds is placed in receivership or liquidation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am prepared to accept the amendment.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): As the Bill comes out of Committee, I cannot support it, and I have indicated my reasons. Although I think that some parts of the Bill are acceptable, there is at least one clause that I cannot accept. I do not believe it is necessary, and it is against the original intention of the whole purpose of establishing the S.A.I.A.C. I refer the Premier to the speech given by the then Premier, Mr. Playford, when the Industries Development Act was originally introduced into this Parliament in 1941. One should read that speech to ascertain the ground on which he expected that assistance would be given to industry. It was not on the basis of allowing Governments to buy up companies, and become a major shareholder in existing companies by buying existing shares. Therefore, I will vote against the third reading.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Arnold, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (14)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, and Wilson.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): First, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your elevation to the important position of Speaker of the House of Assembly, a position I know you will hold with the dignity and impartiality that it calls for. I also offer my best wishes to the member for Stuart on his appointment as Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker. I have listened with much interest to the maiden speeches of all newly elected members in this House, and I congratulate them on their manner and on the subjects on which they spoke; and I include members from both sides.

My contribution to the debate centres around matters that should be raised as they deal with comments made to me by constituents of my district. First, I bring to members' attention the gratitude my constituents have expressed for the Premier's Department. They requested me at the first opportunity to pass on their appreciation to the officers of that department for their thoroughness, courtesy, and tolerance in dealing with the various requests and problems raised by these people. Incidentally, the subject of problems is something that applies to both sides of the House. Members would be aware that certain recognitions are made to people who have been married for several years, especially 50 years, which is a golden anniversary, in case some of you may not know.

The SPEAKER: Order! "Honourable members".

Mr. HARRISON: Sorry, "honourable members". Certain things have to be done through the Premier's Department for such an occasion to be recognised. The people concerned receive congratulations that they well deserve. Information I have received from the families of those congratulated is that the married couple receives a congratulatory telegram from the Premier and the Government, the Governor-General, and when occasion warrants it, from the Queen. One can imagine the delight when congratulatory remarks are received in such a situation.

Other occasions warrant the same sort of commendation from high State dignitaries; occasions such as reaching a certain age, say 100 years or 80 years. The commendations are received with pride and do not just involve the matter of a few words or the stroke of a pen; much time and effort is put into them. I commend the attitude and the manner in which the Premier's Department deals with that issue.

Another problem relates to tragedy hitting a family and the family calling for advice and assistance from somewhere. They sometimes go to their local member seeking that advice about where they can seek certain information or to whom they should go about this or that matter. Last weekend in my own district tragedy hit a family. The circumstances were such that they appealed to me, because they had no knowledge how to get in touch with their daughter and son-in-law, to do something for them.

Late last Friday afternoon I contacted the Premier's Department through my office and the information I gave the department was received sympathetically and the details of that information were used to contact the daughter and son-in-law who were stationed in Malaysia at the R.A.A.F. base. The family had a telephone conversation with their daughter and son-in-law and told

them of the tragic circumstances and asked whether it was possible for them to take leave of absence to come home for the funeral. This was arranged.

Certain circumstances necessitated the couple being flown from Malaysia to Darwin. Unfortunately, a delay occurred in Darwin in getting the couple home on a commercial flight. Again, officers of the Premier's Department came to the rescue and, I understand, sorted things out. Those people will be reunited with their family. Without the efforts of the Premier's Department I doubt whether that would have been achieved.

There are many other instances where the Premier's Department has assisted people in other circumstances. I would be failing in my duty as a member of this Government if I did not highlight such instances, particularly in view of the attacks that the Opposition has made on Government departments. I cannot speak too highly of the benefits received from Government departments. The next department that I commend for its assistance to constituents in all districts is the Community Welfare Department. I cannot speak too highly of the way in which that department deals with my constituents after I telephone to make arrangements for them to go to the department to state their case. Further, I get all the assistance and co-operation necessary from the Minister of Community Welfare. It does one good, whether or not people are successful in arguing a case, to have them say that they appreciate what one has done for them. They know that there is somewhere they can go to get a sympathetic hearing. My files are full of examples of this type. Most people are greatly assisted, and they are certainly not turned away.

Further, I cannot speak too highly of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. It was due to the efforts of this Government that that department was formed. Many people have telephoned me about consumer problems. There were many such problems in the early 1970's but since then the department has straightened out transactions involving used cars and hire-purchase, etc. It gives me great pleasure when people telephone me saying, "Thank you. I was not successful, but at least I received advice about the matter." Such people have gone away knowing that there is a department that gives people a fair go and clarifies the position. The member for Mitcham is absent again this evening; he is around somewhere, I suppose. He recently said that he had 10 Questions on Notice.

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

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to register my objection to the amazing charges made by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall in the other place. He has dealt with animals all his life, and that is all he is capable of dealing with. In asking a question on alleged electoral malpractice, he said:

> Recently it has come to my attention that there is a considerable degree of misrepresentation occurring in Alwyndor Nursing Home at Hove.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot read from debates in another place, nor can he reflect on another honourable member. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr MATHWIN: I intend to say something about this matter, because it happens to be—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will keep in line with Standing Orders.

Mr. MATHWIN: This matter relates to a nursing home in my district. Apparently, this person said that much malpractice had been going on at the nursing home, because of Liberal Party members going there and coercing the residents into voting for the Liberal Party. However, I deny that this has happened. I believe that it is a figment of the imagination of this person, who I sincerely believe is a peddler of untruths. True, two members visited the Alwyndor Nursing Home at 3.45 p.m. and remained there for less than an hour. Most of the residents there go to tea at 4.15 p.m.

Mr. Keneally: What were they there for?

Mr. MATHWIN: If the member for Stuart will hold his breath for 10 minutes, I will tell him. One lady was visiting her father who is a resident in the nursing home and, at the same time, she spoke to three people, one being with her father. The home has several units with their own front doors, and the units are similar to houses. When canvassing, a member of any Party is allowed to enter that section of the nursing home. I called to see the matron and staff members today, and they are upset by the mischievous tinkering of this gentleman—the Hon. Mr. Cornwall.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not mention the member's name. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are you ruling that a member of this Chamber cannot say "the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, in another place"?

The SPEAKER: I do not think that is any different. I cannot uphold the point of order, because the name is not allowed to be used in this Chamber.

Mr. Evans: I'll remember that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher is out of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: This unnamed gentleman in another place is trying to make political capital at the expense of the residents of the nursing home. He refuses to name his source, but prefers to hide in an ivory tower. Last week, the Federal Labor candidate (Dr. Gun) paid a visit to the nursing home, accompanied by a Mr. Hayden (we all know who he is, and I can refer to him; he is the one from Canberra who got us into the state we were in prior to the last Federal election). Dr. Gun and Mr. Hayden mingled with the staff and residents of the home. Dr. Gun left some applications for postal votes, and they were both made welcome when they visited the people living in the different sections of the home. Two days later, Grant Chapman (the Federal member for Kingston), accompanied by Senator Guilfoyle, visited the home, and they also were made welcome. They visited some of the residents and spoke with members of the staff.

So, we have a situation in which the Labor and Liberal candidates were allowed to go there. By implication this person claimed that there was electoral malpractice. Did he suggest that they were filling in ballot papers for postal votes? Of course, no ballot papers are back yet. The original applications for postal votes were sent in, the forms having been given out by the matron and the Labor Party's candidate for Kingston. Any member of this House would know that none of those ballot papers is back yet. Is he suggesting that no Liberals should have visited the home? Of course, it is all right for Labor Party supporters to visit the hospitals. Mrs. Gun, Dr. Richie Gun's wife, and a helper were all doing Flinders Medical Centre yesterday. Indeed, they went to every floor. I understand that one of Mrs. Gun's helpers was present and, when someone said that he was a Liberal Party supporter, she said, "It is about time that you changed your mind. You had better vote Labor this time." What is this? It is one rule for someone and another rule for someone else. Yet, these Labor supporters have been operating in Flinders Medical Centre with all their helpers, and this gentlemen, whom I am not allowed to name, says that in one of the

homes in my district—

Mr. Slater: Look, you know—

Mr. MATHWIN: That is all right. The honourable member can burst himself if he likes. Let him put his hand up and leave the room if he so desires.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gilles is out of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: Is he suggesting that no-one should give these people a lift? I suggest that the honourable member does not even know where the home is located. He says that these people said that they should have a postal vote because no polling booth was nearby. Does he know where the home is situated? It is in Dunrobin Road, Brighton, and the nearest polling booth is, at a guess, about half a mile away. These people must cross Brighton Road, which is nearly impossible for someone who is young and fit, let alone for someone who is old. There is another booth at the school in Keynes Avenue, which necessitates their crossing Diagonal Road, which, again, is difficult for young fit people to cross, let alone old people. I suggest that this person revert to his previous avocation of gelding cats and leave the finer points of political life to those who are better equipped to handle them.

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I should point out for the benefit of the member for Glenelg that malpractice, malfunction and Mal Fraser are fairly synonymous, and I find it difficult to see the difference between any of them. Also, there is a difference between State and Federal elections on which he should check. However, as no-one takes the honourable member seriously, I do not intend to use my 10 minutes discussing his contribution.

I should like to speak about a subject which concerns me and which relates to an interjection (I know that interjections are out of order) that I made on the Leader of the Opposition when he was making one of his economic contributions to the debate in this place. I referred to the former Federal Treasurer, Mr. Lynch, after which the Leader of the Opposition mentioned gutter politicking. The honourable member and members of the Liberal Party generally ought to look at their own activities in this area. One has to go back only two or three years to see a classic example of gutter tactics, and it ill behoves them now to feel hurt because someone has referred to their Mr. Lynch.

Let me make a comparison of the gutter tactics used on Mr. Connor and Dr. Cairns, as against the so-called gutter tactics used on Mr. Lynch. Whatever was done by Mr. Connor and Dr. Cairns, two great Australians, was done for the benefit of Australia. They did not make any financial gain from any of their actions. They wanted to improve the lot of Australians. What can we say about the present Treasurer and his activities?

Mr. Slater: The ex-Treasurer.

Mr. KENEALLY: The ex-Treasurer was charged with the responsibility of administering the tax laws of this country, and he took advantage of those tax laws to benefit himself. That would have been bad enough, and would have warranted his resignation. As Mungo McCallum said, the Prime Minister was prepared to accept the resignation, whether it was offered or not.

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Fisher is getting upset about this, because members of the Liberal Party believe that everyone has trust accounts and everyone evades taxation. That is not the case. If they think that is common practice throughout Australia, they are mistaken. Even worse than that, the then Treasurer, at the time he was requiring the average wage-earner in Australia to practise economy, to restrain his wage demands and to sacrifice the indexation to which he was entitled, was making hundreds of per cent profit from land deals. What in recent years has contributed more to inflation than has the cost of land? Here is our Federal Treasurer participating in a shady deal to make thousands of dollars at the same time as he is asking people earning one-fifth of his salary to restrain themselves and practise economy. That is disgraceful.

Mr. Evans: But—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher has had a fair go with interjections.

Mr. KENEALLY: It is interesting to me, at least, that members of the Liberal Party, while in Opposition, appear to be honourable. I am sure the Liberal Party in South Australia has been, but the conservative forces in this country in Opposition are a good deal more honourable than are the conservative forces in Government. I have commented on our Federal Treasurer and what he has been doing over the past 12 months—and it could well have been longer.

What about the situation in Victoria, with the Hamer Government and the shonky land deals, where Ministers have lined their pockets? Members of the Liberal Party in Victoria have been forced to resign from the Party and to bring to light before the Parliament the land dealings on the Mornington Peninsula and elsewhere. The Liberal Party generally should be ashamed of it.

What about the position in Queensland, where Premier Bjelke-Petersen, as was disclosed in a *Four Corners* programme, saw nothing unethical in the Premier of that State giving contracts to a company in which he held a majority of shares? If I had time (10 minutes is a very limited time), I would list the shares of the Queensland Premier and the companies to which the Queensland Government gave business. The purpose of this contribution, for the benefit of the member for Goyder, is to outline what Liberal Party members do in Government. It ill behoves them to be critical of people who are looking for benefits for Australia, and not lining their own pockets.

We all know about the Comalco scandals in Queensland in recent years, where all the Ministers of the Queensland Government were issued shares in the aluminium companies. Queenslanders, of course, see nothing wrong with that. Anywhere else in Australia or in the world, that Premier would be required to resign. The honourable gentlemen opposite know that, and yet we see them supporting a regime such as that.

I have mentioned the Federal Government, the Victorian Government, and the Queensland Government. The one other Liberal Government in Australia is that of Sir Charles Court. What happened recently in Western Australia? We know about Sir Charles Court and his company dealings of a few years ago, disclosed by a member of the Labor Party in Parliament in Perth. What happened in the recent State election in the Kimberley district? The Minister for Social Welfare in Western Australia won by 93 votes.

On challenge it was proved that 97 votes that he received were illegal, because the Attorney-General, with the co-operation of the Premier and the Minister involved (the local member), illegally used the Electoral Act to refuse legitimate voting rights to Aboriginal people who could not read or write. They took advantage of these people. The Minister for Community Welfare spoke about his electors, these thousands of Aboriginal people, as follows:

> It was a degrading experience to have to campaign amongst the Aboriginals to the extent that I did. It offended me to know that whilst I was concentrating my efforts on these simple people over the last couple of weeks, I was neglecting a more informed and intelligent section of the community.

It is to the everlasting credit of some members of the Country Party and, I think, the Liberal Party in Western Australia that they voted against Sir Charles Court (I think one of them was the Speaker) on a Bill that would justify and legitimise the action taken by these unscrupulous politicians in Western Australia. The instances that I have quoted are bad in isolation, but when they are grouped to show what conservative Governments in Australia are prepared to do and the contempt in which they hold the electorate and the Parliaments of Australia, the situation is disgraceful.

I want to finish by dealing with one more dirty trick campaign that the Federal Government has been prepared to engage in. It deals with the Division of Grey and the member for Grey, Mr. Laurie Wallis. About a week ago, the Minister for Post and Telecommunications (Mr. Robinson) sent a telegram to all Country Party members in Australia, telling them what would be done in their divisions regarding the provision of television. He did not send such a telegram to Mr. Wallis, who had to telephone the department. The department said that it would investigate the matter and that it was sorry the information had not been sent to him. He said that that was not good enough and that he wanted a telegram sent. The department was difficult and was not going to send him a telegram, and the reason is obvious: information was being given to Government members so that they could use it in the election campaign while it was being denied to Mr. Wallis. It is interesting that, in the State District of Eyre, a large part of the West Coast was not included in the proposal for television transmission. The dirty trick of giving that information to their own members but denying it to a member who represents one of the largest districts in Australia is disgraceful and typical of the dirty tricks and gutter tactics that the Liberal Party in Australia will use. I hope that, if ever members opposite make the Treasury benches again here, they will learn a lesson from their colleagues.

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

Motion carried.

At 9.13 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, December 1, at 2 p.m.