HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 23 August 1978

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

PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 389 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community.

Petition received.

PETITION: OPEN GOVERNMENT

Mr. BECKER presented a petition signed by 16 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to disclose full details of financial management of taxpayers' moneys and support the principle of open government.

Petition received.

PETITION: LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEVY

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE presented a petition signed by 34 ratepayers of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to discontinue the 3 per cent levy on local government authorities for hospital purposes.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

DRUG GAME

In reply to **Mr. BLACKER** (20 July).

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Newspaper references to the game "Freak Out" have been examined by the Crown Law Office, and it is considered that the sale of the game does not constitute any offence. Nor is it considered that it would be actionable under the law of defamation because of the game's penalty, "Pay $500 to the Drug Squad to prevent bust". The use of this expression in the make-believe world of the parlour game does not give rise to an inference that there are members of the Drug Squad who are prepared to accept bribes.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: My colleague, the Minister of Health, has informed me that the original concept for the Board of Management of the Whyalla Hospital was that there would be annual elections for a proportion of the board membership with the balance being appointed by the Minister. However, local feeling in Whyalla was that the old arrangement, whereby several different organizations could nominate members of the board, should continue. The current proposal is therefore as follows:

one member	Corporation of Whyalla
one member	Corporation Community Health Services Committee
one member	Combined Unions Council
one member	Chamber of Commerce
one member	Medical Staff Society
one member	Non-medical staff member
five members	general community representatives appointed by the Minister, including one with a business background and one with an educational background
11 members	(total)

These matters have been discussed with the Board of Management of the Whyalla Hospital and it has been agreed that the board should be constituted as proposed. It is considered that all the persons who are likely to be appointed to the Board of Management of the hospital will be directly representative of the community. The only difference is that they will be selected rather than elected and this has been accepted, as it was understood that this was the local preference.

QUESTION TIME

FROZEN FOOD FACTORY

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier explain why the Government is unable to make available full details of the operation of the Frozen Food Factory? Does this indicate that proper records and procedures are not maintained by that factory? Recently, inquiries were made on matters such as: on what date was work commenced on the Government's Frozen Food Factory; what is the current estimated completion cost; what was the original estimate of the cost; what staff reductions will occur as a result in other institutions; what staff reductions will occur or have occurred in each Government hospital or institution as a result of frozen food delivery; will frozen food be supplied to other organisations; and what was the profit or loss on the operations of the factory for the year ended 30 June 1978? The Government has been unable to provide the answers to these questions. It seems that the only explanation on these matters, which obviously should be matters of public record, is that the information is not available. That is a disgusting state of affairs and should not be allowed to happen in any business-like enterprise.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is commenting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Is the Leader referring to a Question on Notice that has not been answered?

The SPEAKER: If he is, he is out of order. I think the Leader asked several questions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not immediately apprised of the answer or lack of it to which the Leader refers. The Frozen Food Factory is proceeding quite normally. One or two queries have been raised with the Government about certain aspects of its accounts which are being investigated but which do not seem to be in any way particularly abnormal.

I now see the answer to which the honourable member has referred. I do not believe that the honourable member can draw the conclusions from it that he has given to the House in his explanation.

PORT PIRIE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Education advise me about providing a music suite at Port Pirie High School? The Minister would be aware that, until recently, that school had a music suite, which was used extensively. For departmental convenience that music suite has been transferred elsewhere. I understand that plans are being made to upgrade existing facilities in order to provide a replacement music suite at that school.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The unit to which the honourable member refers had to be removed to make way for the type A or B unit that that school now enjoys. There have been plans, as the honourable member indicated, to refurbish a part of the old solid-construction school building for use as a music centre. I can say that this matter has been put on the Regional Director's minor works programme for this financial year, and I should be able to give a target date to the honourable member once the Budget figures have firmed.

RIVER MURRAY COMMISSION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What has the Minister of Works achieved so far in his efforts to widen the powers of the River Murray Commission to control water quality, which is of vital importance to South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not want to repeat at length the things I have said so often in this House about what this Government has achieved so far in relation to this matter. At present the River Murray Commission, to all intents and purposes, has had its functions extended to take into account the quality of water in the Murray River. That was agreed to in October 1976 by all the participating Governments. The River Murray Commission recently presented a paper to each of the four Governments involved containing its recommendations as to amendments that should be made to the River Murray Waters Agreement that would give statutory backing to those extended functions.

Those are not the only things contained in the recommendations. There are recommendations for other amendments to do with the administration of personnel employed by the River Murray Commission and on other matters. The important thing is that it has made recommendations to give statutory backing to the extended functions of the commission to enable it to consider the quality of water. A recommendation from me, now being circulated to all Ministers and to come before Cabinet next Monday, is that the Government of South Australia accept the recommendations of the River Murray Commission in relation to those amendments. We are perfectly happy with them, but we would be much happier if it were an extension of power and not just function.

As I have explained to the House many times, this Government would have liked an extension of the power of the River Murray Commission, but it was not able to achieve that. Victoria and New South Wales would not tolerate any extension of power. They would, on the other hand, tolerate an extension of function. If that is difficult for the honourable member to understand, I will explain that there is a difference between function and power. The commission has power to regulate quantity and, whatever it recommends, the Governments that are parties to the agreement must act on.

In relation to the extension of function, in the past the commission has had no authority to comment on or to take into account the quality of water. The extended function would enable it to do this, but it would be powerless to impose its view on any one of the Governments. Whilst this extension is a step in the right direction, it does not go far enough. We have tried many times to go to that extent, but without success. At the moment, there is some hesitation on the part of the New South Wales and Victorian Governments, although they previously agreed to the function—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Not the power?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, the function. They agreed in 1976 to the function being applied to the River Murray Commission without statutory backing. Now that they are faced with having to decide on legislation (which would have to be complementary legislation in every Parliament), there are some second thoughts as to whether or not they should go so far. I hope that some result will be obtained at the meeting we have arranged prior to the meeting of the Water Resources Council, which I think is on 31 August, the venue having been moved from Darwin to Canberra, as the Federal Minister cannot get to Darwin because of Budget considerations. The meeting of New South Wales, Victorian, South Australian, and Federal Ministers will take place to try to finalise the agreements of the various Governments on this matter.

Following that, the Parliamentary Counsel of South Australia, whose services I have offered to draft the legislation, will draft it, if agreement is reached. I do not want him to proceed with that now, because it will involve consultation with the other States. Unless I am satisfied that all Governments agree, I do not want him to be involved in work that may never reach fruition. There is no trouble in relation to the Federal Government, which is only too happy to support the South Australian view on the matter. I think the Federal Government would support an extension of powers. Prime Minister Whitlam, in 1973, indicated that he would be happy about this, and I do not think the present Federal Minister would be unhappy about it, but it cannot be achieved without the agreement of the three States.

I am waiting for the meeting to take place, probably on 31 August, to reach final agreement on the drawing up of the legislation, which will need to be uniform, because it is complementary legislation. I hope that we will be able to introduce that legislation into this Parliament during the present session—if not this year, then probably early next year. Although some rumblings have occurred in the other States, I do not think great difficulties are involved, and I think we will overcome them.

PORT ADELAIDE ACCIDENT

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Transport urgently consider any legislation that may be required to ensure that heavy vehicles, especially those carrying flammable liquids, do not pass through the central business area of Port Adelaide? More than 400 tankers pass daily through the central area of Port Adelaide, and it is only a matter of time before a major accident occurs on the Black Diamond corner. Many tankers, including l.p.g. tankers, travel nose to end, three or four at a time, around the Black Diamond corner. There is another route the tankers could take—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. WHITTEN: The Minister would know that there are alternative routes, and I ask him to consider the use of those routes to prevent potential accidents. An accident occurred last night on the Birkenhead bridge, unfortunately involving the loss of a life.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Discussions have taken place over a period with the Port Adelaide council, Highways Department, and the local people regarding the problem of heavy vehicles traversing the Black Diamond corner. The danger to which the honourable member refers has been mentioned persistently. I will certainly take up the matter again to see whether an alternative satisfactory route is available, perhaps using the old causeway road, to try to prevent any serious accidents occurring.

MARIHUANA

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Premier and the Government consider holding, at the next State general election, a referendum concerning any change of the law in relation to the use of marihuana? Since the release of the discussion paper on cannabis by the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs there has been considerable public debate and disquiet concerning this issue. The general feeling reported to me is that public opinion is not being listened to, and concerned citizens are worried that a decision to relax the law may be made against the wishes of the majority of the community. I raise this question because I was contacted over the weekend and on Monday by several constituents who attended a public meeting last Friday which was organised by the Community Council for Social Development and was addressed by Dr. Nies, a member of the Royal Commission. If a referendum is held, the true wishes of all the people of this State will be known.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Any question of any change in the law could not possibly arise until after the recommendations of the Royal Commission have been received. I do not know what the Royal Commission will report, and I do not think it proper for me at this stage to speculate about it. The discussion paper to which the honourable member refers was a discussion paper for the precise purpose of getting informed, intelligent and rational public debate on this issue. I hope that the honourable member will contribute to it rather than speculate on what may be emotional responses to misunderstanding some of the things the Commission has suggested should be discussed.

COMMONWEALTH BUDGET

Mr. HEMMINGS: Does the Premier believe that it would be to the benefit of all Australians if he sought leave of the House to go to Canberra to assist the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Howard) to rewrite the Budget so that there would be no other cases of Budget decisions producing "unintended circumstances"? The Federal Treasurer said yesterday that his plan to means test family allowances on children's incomes exceeding $312 had produced "unintended circumstances". The *Australian* today in its cover story on the Federal Government back-down on the means test stated that it was a solid rebuke for the Government's Budget strategists and inner Cabinet planners who failed to see a simple flaw in applying such a means tests.

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Eyre to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think it is necessary for me to do that because satisfactory advice on how to rewrite the Budget has already been given to the Federal Treasurer by the Leader of the Opposition in Canberra.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Pretty weak!

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It accords with advice also given to the Federal Treasurer by members of the Liberal Party in Canberra. If the honourable member would only pay a little attention to Sir William McMahon and the more sensible economists on the Liberal side he would know what economics in Australia ought to be followed instead of the nonsense presently being followed by the Federal Treasurer.

STATE BUDGET

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier attempt to justify the major discrepancies that occur between the estimated expenditure outlined in the 1977-78 Budget and the actual expenditure and receipts as outlined in the Treasury statement for 1977-78? In addition, does the gross over-expenditure confirm poor and inadequate control of expenditure within the South Australian Government? Comparison of Budget estimates with actual expenditure and receipts for the year 1977-78 shows many major discrepancies, some of which are as follows:

Expenditure	Budget estimate	Actual expenditure
Water supply and sewerage	49 700 000	55 500 000
Education, science, arts and research	374 000 000	389 000 000
Medical, health and recreation	156 000 000	175 000 000
Debt services interest	135 000 000	140 000 000
Transfer to Loan Account	12 000 000	3 400 000

Receipts	Budget Estimate	Actual receipts
Succession duties	20 000 000	17 000 000
Pay-roll tax	153 000 000	146 000 000

The Budget Papers estimated that the wage rise would be inflated by 12 per cent during the year, and that could account for the lower receipts of pay-roll tax. Unemployment in this State, which has risen so dramatically, would also account for the lower pay-roll tax receipts. The increase in actual expenditure cannot be accounted for by increases in individual wages, because the wage increase was less than that actually budgeted for at the beginning of the financial year. The over-expenditure in the Engineering and Water Supply Department confirms the gross over-staffing that exists in that department. It is interesting that the Budget speech said that the transfer to the Loan Account was to finance petroleum exploration in the Cooper Basin. Does this mean that $12 000 000 was not spent on exploration and, if not, why was it not spent?

The Hon. D.A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether this is the first time the honourable member has ever looked at final Budget statements and the actual expenditures as against estimates. The estimates in South Australia are probably the closest of those achieved by any Treasury in Australia. If he proceeds to compare the discrepancies between the estimates in South Australia and final expenditure with those in the Federal Budget, he will find that the changes in South Australia are small, whereas those in the Federal Budget are gross, varying from 45 per cent to 150 per cent.

Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Davenport to order. He has asked his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member apparently, in looking at the transfers to Loan Account, has simply not taken into account all the statements, which

were made by the Treasurer to the House during the period of the year, in which the changes in respect of revenue transfers to Loan were outlined. I suggest that he go back and do some homework on that score. Regarding the Engineering and Water Supply Department, apparently he is not aware that we had a drought, and, consequently, we had to do some considerable extra pumping. Regarding succession duties returns, how the honourable member expects that he can load on to the Treasurer of the State the decision as to whether we have enough good deaths during the year to return the succession duties estimated, I am blessed if I know. I am not actually responsible for the rate at which people die and the proportion of good estates we get in for succession duties in the year. We can only estimate succession duty returns on what have been returns of previous years. Sometimes, the structure of estates during a particular year—

Mr. Chapman: People have gone to Queensland to die.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I do not think that that is the case.

Mr. Dean Brown: They've gone to Western Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If they had gone to Western Australia, they would have had to pay estate duty. I do not know where the benefit would have been to them. The honourable member cannot cite any instances of that happening; that is the normal sort of remark he makes.

I suggest to the honourable member that it is not possible in a Budget of $1 500 000 000 to get to complete accuracy within a few million dollars on the major lines. Inevitably, there are fluctuations during a year and from time to time with Supplementary Estimates. Those fluctuations are reported to the House. It has constantly been the practice of Governments of all political persuasions to introduce Supplementary Estimates, that catered for fluctuations in accounts during a year of the order the honourable member has mentioned. That has happened for as long as I have been a member of Parliament. If the honourable member is not aware of that, I suggest he should go back and look at the experiences of previous years and do his homework before he asks questions of the kind he has asked this afternoon.

Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to carry out my duties in regard to the honourable member for Davenport.

RUGBY GROUND

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Local Government obtain a report on whether a new playing area has been allocated for the Port Adelaide Rugby Union Club? Inquiries conducted by officials of the club with Port Adelaide council have so far yielded no satisfaction regarding the new area to be allocated adjacent to the Causeway at Port Adelaide. It is reported that construction of the road link with Grand Junction Road, that will pass through the present grounds, may commence within the next 12 months, leaving the club insufficient opportunity to seed the new area and construct clubrooms before the commencement of next season.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will seek information for the honourable member and bring down what I can ascertain.

FIREBUG REWARD

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the State Government will make available through the police a reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the firebug who damaged the Trades Hall, the Liberal Party headquarters and the Festival Centre last Tuesday morning? I refer to press statements about a firebug who set fire to the premises to which I have referred. In view of as concern in the community about attacks and damage caused previously to Liberal Party headquarters and an electorate office following the announcement of the Federal Budget, I ask the Premier whether the Government condones this kind of action and, if not, whether it will make available a substantial reward of, say, $5 000, to lead to the apprehension of these people who, it is believed, have been organised from interstate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the Government does not condone unlawful actions of this kind; it never has. It is not only electorate offices of the Liberal Party that have been attacked from time to time in this way; so have Labor Party offices, particularly mine, which has been subject to attack from time to time, its windows being broken repeatedly. The Government offers rewards, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police, for the giving of information leading to the discovery of a crime. We have uniformly acceded to a request for a reward to be offered. If the Commissioner believes that in this case the offering of a reward would possibly lead to the obtaining of necessary evidence no doubt he will make such a recommendation to the Government and, if he makes a recommendation, the Government will accede to it.

ADOPTIONS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare obtain an up-to-date report about the interest shown in the Adopted Persons Contact Register, which has now been operating for 12 months?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will endeavour to get an up-to-date report for the honourable member. I do not recall the exact figures, but the last time I saw the progress report on the operation of the register I remember that no contact had resulted from entering on the register the names of parties concerned in adoptions.

NEAPTR

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Premier believe that the Government, especially in the light (if that is the correct word) of the Federal Budget, will be able to finance the NEAPTR scheme either from Loan funds or other State financial resources? This is a question I would have asked yesterday if I had had the chance.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question is prompted by the reply given by the Minister for Planning to the Leader yesterday in answer to, I think, the first question asked, when for the first time (and it may have been a slip on his part, but it certainly revealed the truth) he admitted by implication that the future of Monarto is by no means certain, by saying "should Monarto start up again". He then went on to say (and this is the phrase he used) of the Federal Government, "the kind of filthy mood they are in over expenditure". I checked both of those quotes in *Hansard* today and found that my note was accurate.

Since last Tuesday week the Premier has taken a number of opportunities to criticise the Federal Budget. I must say that, by and large, I entirely agree with those criticisms. It is a heartless Budget.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not go on with that: I thought you would probably agree with me on that.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member continues in that vein, I will direct that the question be answered immediately.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to say something about NEAPTR. In answer to a Question on Notice on 1 August, the Premier said that the estimated cost for that scheme is $54 000 000 for construction, plus $20 000 000 for rolling stock. Some time ago, after appearing on a television programme with the Minister of Transport on which I asked him how the scheme was going to be funded and he could not answer my question, I wrote to the Premier giving him the opportunity to give me an answer as to how the scheme was to be funded. Not having received a reply, despite a number of promptings, I put a Question on Notice asking the Premier when I was to get a reply to my letter. The only answer I got to that question was as follows:

> As the honourable member has already made public statements on this particular matter, clearly having made up his mind on it, I saw no purpose in writing further to him.

In other words, he refused to answer my question as to how the Government will find money for the scheme. That confirms my suspicion, but I give him this last chance, in view of the Federal Budget and the difficulties he now says (quite rightly) the State is going to have to get money, to say whether, contrary to my firm view, there is any chance whatever of the State being able to finance the NEAPTR proposal out of its own resources. I personally think the scheme is far beyond this State's means.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has once again said this afternoon that it is his firm view that the State cannot finance this scheme. As State Treasurer, I disagree with that view. I believe we will be able, over the period forecast in the NEAPTR study, to make provision for the extra public transport expenditure in South Australia. This will mean, however, some constriction upon capital expenditure in other areas in which the Government has concentrated expenditure in the past.

I believe that it is within our resources to do what is necessary, and that it would be fatal for South Australia if we were not to undertake a major upgrading of public transportation in the immediate future. If we allow private motor car transport simply to build up and try to use the arterial road system, to which we have made great improvements since 1970, a great many people in South Australia will be badly disadvantaged by our failure to improve the public transport system. It means that there will be a change in the emphasis of Government capital expenditure, but the forward planning for that has been undertaken.

Mr. Millhouse: You can't give us any details?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member asked his question, and was heard in silence. I call him to order.

RAPE TRIALS

Mrs. ADAMSON: Does the Attorney-General propose to introduce legislation in this session to abolish the unsworn statement by defendants in rape trials and, if not, why not?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The matter is still under consideration following the report of the Mitchell Committee.

BEERWORTH REPORT

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Premier say whether he will now release the Beerworth Report for the year ended 30 June 1971 and, if not, what are his reasons for refusing to allow the publication of the only annual report of the Juvenile Court not to be made public since 1947? A number of reports are being held by the Government and placed on its secret list. There seems to be no reason why members in this House or the people of the State should not know the facts of the report. As legislation is now before the House to amend the Juvenile Court procedure, I ask whether the Premier will release that report.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member does not need the Beerworth Report for the judging of legislation that is before this House. There has been a full and complete public inquiry into the operation of the Juvenile Court, a Royal Commission inquiry, about which the honourable member has had the fullest of information. As to the reasons for the non-release of the Beerworth Report, it is not a report to this Parliament. The Juvenile Court magistrate did not make a report to Parliament; he made it to the Attorney-General.

Mr. Mathwin: And you didn't like it, so you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has asked his question, and he was heard in silence. I call him to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report was not released because it contained some quite irresponsible remarks in relation to other people elsewhere in the administration of juvenile matters. The Attorney-General at that stage quite rightly rejected that report and was not prepared to publish it, because he did not consider that the person concerned had exercised his responsibility properly. The Government would not take responsibility for issuing a report which had come in upon that basis. It is not a statutory report to this Parliament, but a report to the Attorney-General, and the then Attorney-General had a Ministerial responsibility to exercise, which he did. Historically, he was regarded as an Attorney-General who was quite in the forefront of Attorneys-General in the history of this Commonwealth. I believe that he exercised his responsibility as Minister properly, and with proper responsibility.

PITJANTJATJARA LANDS

Mr. GROOM: Will the Minister of Community Welfare inform the House what progress is being made in implementing the recommendations made in the report of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Working Party?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Fairly rapid progress has been made since the release of the report. The Chairman of the working party, Mr. Chris Cocks, S.M., has completed his discussions with Aboriginal communities concerned with the recommendations in the report, and he is able to say that a positive response has come from those communities as to what the Government intends. I received a report this morning that the Parliamentary Counsel and the working party have reached the stage that a first draft is in being. That will be further examined and no doubt will go before Cabinet for further consideration.

SOUTH ROAD CLEARWAY

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport assure the House that he will not proceed with the proposal to

declare a 12-hour clearway on the section of the South Road between Anzac Highway and Daw Road until the widening, laneing, appropriate parking, and overway and underway crossing improvements are provided in line with the request in the petition tabled in Parliament yesterday?

The petition referred to bears the signatures of 4 560 persons from within and near the Minister's own district of Ascot Park. As reported by the committee representing those people, the requests incorporated in the petition were formulated during the same period as the Minister approved discussions between those concerned residents and officers of his Highways Department and are the direct result of the expressed views of those people in the interests of improving traffic movement, pedestrian safety, commercial trading and residential welfare.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I never cease to marvel at the attempts of the honourable member to inject politics into something into which politics should not enter.

Mr. Chapman: What about—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already spoken to the member for Alexandra, and I now warn him. His question was heard in silence.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member should know, if he is worth his salt as a shadow Minister, that I have made many declarations in relation to clearways on behalf of the Government. I will repeat them again for the benefit of the honourable member in the hope that it will register with him on this occasion. The honourable member's Leader, prior to the last State election, was doing exactly what the honourable member is now doing in relation to Goodwood Road. The Leader was then trying to unseat you, Mr. Speaker, but he failed miserably.

Mr. Mathwin: Are you reflecting on the Speaker?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will reflect on you if you are not careful.

The SPEAKER: Order! If this continues, I assure honourable members that I will take action. The member for Glenelg has interjected three times but I have called him to order only once. The member for Alexandra, too, has been interjecting. I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, apart from his provocative remarks, the Minister was pointing and referring to the member for Glenelg and me as "you". I understand that this term is not acceptable to the Chair. I ask that on this occasion you make the same request to the Minister as you have consistently made to members on this side.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I think many people in this House have pointed fingers at members on both sides of the House.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The stand the Government has taken consistently on the question of clearways is that they will be introduced only with the concurrence of the local government body concerned. That was made abundantly clear when the honourable member's Leader was attempting to inject politics to unseat the Speaker, and the Leader failed just as miserably as will the honourable member in relation to South Road. It seems strange that the member for Alexandra can bring a petition into this House on this question from people to whom he quite properly referred as being in my district and in the district of the Minister for Community Welfare and the district of the Speaker. It is strange how he can introduce a petition which comes not to me as the reponsible Minister but which is brought in here by him, and he then has the gall to say he is not trying to bring in politics. That is so much codswallop.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Local Government say what progress has been made in the complete revision of the Local Government Act? If this will not be achieved soon, will consideration be given to the immediate consolidation of the Act? According to the Minister, the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee, which was brought down some years ago, includes recommendations that have assisted in the drafting of many recent amendments to the Act. These many amendments have caused the Act to become unwieldy. On behalf of local government, I will read the following paragraph from a letter received from a council that indicates the feeling of local government on this matter:

> You are requested to pursue an avenue of consolidation to enable easy access to the large legislative requirements that councils are required to police and assist in the ready reference to the information.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member would, I think, know that at present all Acts of Parliament are being consolidated. Once that task has been completed, the Acts will be produced in bound volumes; hence, we all have the start of the new volumes of the Statutes of South Australia. The Attorney-General has just informed me that the Local Government Act consolidation is now well under way and hopefully within two or three months it will be available.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say whether the Government has now examined the Miller Report on live sheep export and what steps it has now decided to take (and I quote the Premier), "to see that there is not a repetition of the confrontation which occurred earlier this year"? The Miller Report shows clearly that the live sheep export trade is of great benefit to the Australian community, including members of the A.M.I.E.U. During the previous dispute, the Government indicated that it had no power to take action on picketing, but examination of the law shows that possible avenues are open to it under the Police Offences Act, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, the Road Traffic Act, and at common law. Last week, the Premier indicated that the Government would use its best endeavours to prevent a repetition of the confrontation, which has now been threatened by the union. Does this include taking appropriate action at law if the confrontation develops again as threatened?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is certainly not our proposal to contribute to confrontation. The matter is still under examination by the Government. There has been no decision by the local union executive on this matter at this stage. There has been an announcement by a Federal officer of the union, but precisely what that portends for South Australia has yet to be seen. The Government still has the matter under examination.

COUNCIL RATES

Mr. WILSON: My question to the Attorney-General concerns the current controversy regarding the Elizabeth council's rates. I ask him whether, in view of the statement on 19 August by the Mayor of Elizabeth that he had the utmost confidence in the Town Clerk of Elizabeth (Mr. Jenkins) and, further, as the Elizabeth council had admitted responsibility for the mistake in striking rates, he now retracts his statement that Mr. Jenkins should be

dismissed, and does he now believe that the Mayor of Elizabeth should resign instead?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is not a matter within the competence of my Ministerial responsibilities, and I decline to answer the question.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what action the Government will be taking next summer to keep members of the public constantly aware of the risks and dangers of bush fires, in view of the Government's legislation that prohibits Apex clubs from displaying their very effective fire-warning signs? In view of the excellent agricultural season we are now enjoying there will undoubtedly be an increased fire hazard this summer. The District Council of Barmera has written to me on this subject and, in part, it has stated:

> The council is concerned that Apex clubs throughout this State have been required to remove their excellent fire-warning signs.

If that is the situation, I ask the Minister what new initiatives the Government will be taking to take over the role that Apex clubs have accepted in years past.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention, because I have not heard about it. I will check and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

SOLOMONTOWN BRIDGE

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say whether the Government has yet found a use for the $500 000 bridge over the Solomontown causeway, a bridge which the people of Port Pirie call "the bridge to nowhere"? The Premier will remember that during the 1975 election he announced the building of this bridge. The people of Port Pirie wonder what will be its future use. Recently, the member for Stuart was asked by the council whether he knew what was the purpose of the bridge and what was the future of Redcliff, and in his reply to the council the honourable member said:

> . . . all I can say is that the Government is playing its cards close to its chest this time around. I don't try to gouge information from the Minister, and I am no better informed than the members of this council on either of these matters.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find it a little difficult to know why the council should now be asking questions about the bridge, since the council requested repeatedly that the bridge be put in that area.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It wanted a much more expensive one.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Minister of Works to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The council had sought the use of RED scheme money for the construction of a bridge because it believed that it was possible to develop an industrial area on the other side of the river. At that stage—

Mr. Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question. That is the third time the honourable member has interjected. The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order and I call him to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We had many requests from people in the area to find community projects that would employ unemployed people in Port Pirie. The bridge proposal, having been put forward by a responsible local body, was assessed and proceeded with to provide employment for people in the area and to open up what Port Pirie had said constantly had a potential. We have had many times headlines in Port Pirie about the need to provide additional industrial potential for people in that area.

The honourable member was present, for instance, when I opened the natural gas pipeline connection to Port Pirie. When the original natural gas pipeline was built there was a great carry-on in Port Pirie about the fact that Port Pirie was somehow being by-passed and that we were not looking after Port Pirie because that pipeline was not built on the Port Pirie side of the Flinders Range and because there was no immediate availability of natural gas in Port Pirie.

The Government eventually provided natural gas to Port Pirie. It has not inevitably produced the kind of industrial development to which local people had constantly pointed as the inevitable result of the provision of such a facility. The Government has endeavoured to do everything it can to assist Port Pirie to develop any potential to which local residents constantly point. If residents in the area now feel that there is not the potential on the other side of the river that was there before they asked for the bridge, they have changed their minds. I know that the honourable member changes his mind fairly frequently: perhaps he is getting alongside people in Port Pirie in doing that.

SWIMMING POOLS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say what is the Government's current attitude to payment either directly or *ex gratia* for the use of community swimming pools in the learn-to-swim campaign? The many community swimming pools that are used for the learn-to-swim campaign are now increasing in age and require a greater degree of maintenance than previously. There has been an escalation in the cost of chemicals being used and the labour associated with the provision of swimming pools used for this purpose. The electricity costs have also markedly increased for filtration plants and other activities. I am interested to know also whether the department has addressed itself to this matter, because we are moving towards that time of the year when the programme will be arranged for the forthcoming season.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The only personal submissions I have received about this matter are in relation to the swimming lake (so-called) at Millicent. Other approaches may have occurred at departmental level. I will check that and bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

DEPUTY STATE LIBRARIAN

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made in advertising for and interviewing an applicant for the position of Deputy State Librarian, as it is about 18 months since the first applications for the position were called?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have not received any recent advice from the State Librarian about this matter. I will check and let the honourable member know.

SEED

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is a fact that Wright Stevenson, the agents in Australia for Waterman Lumis,

the American seed breeding firm, has 1 000 lbs of WL5318 strain seed available that can be brought to Australia if a clearance is given? If it has, is it proposed to give serious consideration to the introduction of this foundation seed from America as opposed to the introduction of similar seed which has been propagated in the Eastern States? If this foundation seed is available, and it is intended to introduce it, how soon can we expect approval to be given to its introduction into South Australia for propagation by lucerne seed breeders?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will convey the honourable member's question to the Minister of Agriculture and get a reply for him as soon as possible.

BRUKUNGA MINE

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister of Works say what is the current situation regarding the pollution of the Bremer River and adjacent waterways as a result of the possible overflowing of the tailings dam associated with the pyrites mine at Brukunga? Last Saturday the Minister released a warning about the dangerous condition of the Bremer River and its associated waterways. Since then, much concern has been expressed by people who live along that river and those waterways, because many people rely on those sources for water for both domestic and stock purposes. The Minister would also be aware that for some time action has been taken to overcome the problems of pollution in that area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I thank the honourable member for being good enough to notify my office this morning about his interest in this matter. The latest report I have from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief states:

> Acid drainage water from the Brukunga Pyrites mine was released into the Dawesley Creek during a high flow period on Friday (p.m.) 18 August 1978. A dilution of approximately 1:8 resulted and the stream is being monitored to determine the acceptability of the waters at various locations for stock use and irrigation purposes. Landowners and local district councils, Mount Barker and Strathalbyn, were notified by the Engineering and Water Supply Department through the news media of television, radio and newspapers.

I understand that personal contact was made in some cases as well, because I insisted that every step possible be taken to notify people of any likely dangers. The report continues:

> As the flow in the Dawesley Creek, a tributary of the Bremer River, had decreased by Monday 21 August, the discharge was stopped at 0900 hours on that day. No further discharges have taken place and only when flow conditions are suitable, following substantial rains, will further releases be authorised. As on the previous occasion, landowners will be advised.
>
> Reductions in the volume of stored polluted waters in the "tailings dam" will provide protection for the stream and users during the summer periods when flows have diminished, and when all seepage water can be pumped and stored in the reserve capacity of the dam system. Today (Wednesday 23 August), Mr. D. Lane, Chief Chemist, and Mr. R. Waite, Acting Assistant Engineer for Water Supply, are discussing some of the irrigation practices at Langhorne Creek.

I think that means that the matter is being discussed with the irrigators at Langhorne Creek. The report continues:

> Every endeavour is being taken to ensure minimum interference with normal practices of the landowners. Communication with the public is being maintained at various levels of council, committees and individuals.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S COMMENTS

The SPEAKER: Before the honourable member for Alexandra speaks, I remind him that he may explain matters of a personal nature, but he may not debate the matters.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I was about to seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. CHAPMAN: This afternoon, in answer to a question I asked about a situation occurring on the South Road adjacent to Ascot Park, the Minister of Transport, in his reply, whilst completely avoiding an answer to the question—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is making a personal explanation and must not stray from that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister reflected on my person and, indeed, in his reply went on to say that the subject I raised was raised purely for political purposes. I inform the House that the impression given by the Minister was quite wrong. My involvement in that situation arose from a personal invitation extended to me by constituents of the Minister, an invitation from persons whom I had never contacted previously and persons of whom I had never heard previously. As a result of that invitation, I attended the first public meeting held by the group concerned, at which you, Sir, and the Minister of Community Welfare were present. At that meeting it was explained that, although the Minister had been invited, he did not attend.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now moving away from a personal explanation.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The meeting from which the petition to which I referred emerged was a meeting to which I was directly and personally invited. It was clearly as a result of a request made at that meeting last week that I subsequently brought to this House a petition bearing those 4 560 signatures, expressing concern about the matter to which I referred today. No political motive was involved in my action in this issue, nor is there any political motive in my intended further involvement in it. I draw to the attention of the House the facts as outlined, for the purpose of negating the argument put forward this afternoon by the Minister and expressing complete disgust on the personal attack he made, whilst avoiding answering the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

At 3.12 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill is in fact that presented in another place by the Hon. Murray Hill. We all know the purpose of the Bill. It alters the procedure by which a Commissioner of Police can be dismissed by the Government of the day. The whole matter arose because of the most unfortunate

incident that occurred earlier this year in relation to the Salisbury affair.

Before seeking leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the remainder of my speech, which is in fact the speech given by the Hon. Murray Hill in another place, let me say that, where the first person is used, obviously it refers to the Hon. Mr. Hill, and not to me. I urge honourable members to support this Bill, which was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Hill, and which has my personal endorsement. I now seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its purpose is to give protection to the Commissioner of Police against his removal from office. Mr. Harold Salisbury, Commissioner of Police in South Australia, was dismissed from that office on Tuesday 17 January 1978. There was a great public outcry as a result. Strong public opinion was expressed, and South Australians who were incensed by the Government's action argued that the dismissal was not justifiable in the circumstances, that a Royal Commission should look into the matter, and that Parliament itself should have some say before the Commissioner was finally removed from office.

The intensity of public feeling on the issue was evidenced by the fact that a very large public protest rally occurred in Victoria Square on 25 January, petitions to Parliament on the issue contained 66 118 signatures, a great number of letters on the subject was sent to newspapers in this State, and the Premier's popularity plummeted from an all-time high to such an extent that his remaining supporters sought $50 000 from sympathisers for a public relations campaign to restore his credibility.

At the time, the Government finally yielded to one aspect of public opinion, and appointed a Royal Commission. That decision was taken after the Liberal Party members in the Council announced that they intended to appoint a Select Committee, which would have had comparable powers to a Royal Commission. Naturally, the Select Committee was not appointed.

Before the announcement of the Royal Commission, I announced publicly that I intended to introduce a private member's Bill, to give protection to a Commissioner of Police against arbitrary dismissal, in that Parliament would debate the issue before such removal from office. When the Royal Commission was announced, I did not proceed, and I held the matter over pending the Commission's report. The Royal Commission's report on this aspect (I refer to page 47, dealing with the third specific question before the Commission) was as follows:

> 3. Whether there is reason to modify the prerogative rights of the Crown to dismiss the Commissioner of Police. YES.
>
> The Police Regulation Act 1952-1973 should be amended to provide that the Commissioner of Police may be removed from office by the Governor for any of the causes to be specified in the amendment.

Later (on 2 June), the Premier announced in the press that the Government would legislate in this session to provide grounds on which a Police Commissioner may be removed from office, and that these grounds would include incompetence, mental instability, bankruptcy and misbehaviour. He went on to point out that these grounds would mean that any Commissioner dismissed in future would have the right of appeal to the courts on the grounds that he had been wrongfully dismissed. I have noted that, in the long list of proposed legislation for this session, as announced by His Excellency when opening this session, no mention was made of amending the Police Regulation Act. With respect, I disagree with the Royal Commission's finding in this matter, as I also disagree with one of the other two findings, namely, that Mr. Salisbury's dismissal was justifiable in the circumstances. Accordingly, I am proceeding with the Bill, which is in the same form as my original Bill.

Whereas under the present law dismissal from office is initiated and carried out by the Government (through the formal procedure of the Governor acting on the recommendation of Executive Council), the Bill requires either one of two procedures.

First, the Governor, in Executive Council, may dismiss the Commissioner upon the presentation of an address by both Houses of Parliament, or, secondly, the Government may suspend the Commissioner on the grounds of incompetence or misbehaviour, and then a full statement of the reason for suspension is laid before both Houses of Parliament. In this latter instance, if either House presents an address to the Governor, praying for the removal of the Commissioner from office, the Government may dismiss him. If neither House so acts, he must be restored to office. Appropriate time limits are specified for these procedures. Similar protection exists for the Public Service Commissioners, the Auditor-General, the Valuer-General, and to a greater extent the Ombudsman, the Electoral Commissioner, judges of the Supreme Court and judges of the Local Courts, and the Commissioner of Highways.

By a greater extent, I mean that such officers cannot be removed without addresses from both Houses of the South Australian Parliament, whereas in my Bill a petition need be passed only by one House, and this is the same procedure as in the case of the Public Service Commissioners, the Auditor-General and the Valuer-General.

I submit that the procedure in my Bill, which ensures Parliamentary discussion and debate on all matters relative to a Commissioner's suspension, is better than the Premier's announced intention of providing cause for dismissal and an appeal against wrongful dismissal to a court. Incidentally, this latter machinery applies to the Solicitor-General, members of the State Planning Authority, the Credit Tribunal, and the S.A. Land Commission.

Early this year, when I first announced my intention to introduce this Bill, the Premier rejected the proposal, and was reported in the *News* of 25 January as saying that both the Auditor-General and the Ombudsman were, in the nature of things, Parliamentary officers, and that Supreme Court judges were part of an independent Judiciary. He said that the Government would not hand over the executive function of government to the Parliament, and "The Police Commissioner is part of the executive arm of government." I pose the question, "What about the Public Service Commissioners, who have exactly the same protection as I am trying to give the Police Commissioner? Are not the Public Service Commissioners part of the executive arm of government?"

What about the Valuer-General, who has the same protection as I am endeavouring to achieve for the Police Commissioner? Is he, the Valuer-General, not part of the executive arm of government? Of course he is, as are the Public Service Commissioners, and as is the Highways Commissioner, who has the added protection of both Houses having to agree to his proposed removal. This added protection may be related to the fact that the Highways Commissioner administers his own Highways Fund. On the Premier's own admission on 25 January, the

Police Commissioner is part of the Executive and therefore should be protected, as are other executive officers to whom some independence is essential.

A Police Commissioner might at some stage, for one of a number of reasons, be subjected to pressure by a Government. He must be entitled to some independence. I believe that a very large majority of South Australians accept that a degree of independence is an essential factor in the office of Police Commissioner: this applies to his Special Branch activities, as well as his traditional responsibility of law enforcement. I quote paragraph 53 under the heading "The duty to the law" of the Royal Commission's report:

> Of course, the paramount duty of the Commissioner of Police is, as is that of every citizen, to the law. The fact that a Commissioner of Police 'is answerable to the law and to the law alone' was adverted to by Lord Denning, M.R., in *R. v. the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis; ex parte Blackburn.* That was in the context of the discretion to prosecute or not to prosecute. No Government can properly direct any policeman to prosecute or not to prosecute any particular person or class of persons although it is not unknown for discussions between the Executive and the police to lead to an increase in or abatement of prosecutions for certain types of offences. That is not to say that the Commissioner of Police is in any way bound to follow Governmental direction in relation to prosecutions. Nor should it be so. There are many other police functions in respect of which it would be unthinkable for the Government to interfere. It is easier to cite examples than to formulate a definition of the circumstances in which the Commissioner of Police alone should have responsibility for the operations of the Police Force.

If a question of suspension or dismissal arose, and the questions of political pressure or undue interference by a Government against a Commissioner are involved, I firmly believe that the people of this State would want all that dirty linen hung out here in Parliament, rather than in the courts.

If this Bill is passed, and those circumstances arose in future, then the suspended Commissioner's version and point of view would be disclosed and argued by the elected representatives of the people. The Government's view would also be submitted, no doubt supported by some members and critically questioned by others.

Let us make no mistake; the issue of the removal of a Police Commissioner affects the people with a depth of feeling, emotion and fear, as perhaps no other decision by a State Government can arouse. *Advertiser* journalist Stewart Cockburn's now famous headline "I start to feel a bit scared" was a true indication of the thinking of most South Australians when they opened their morning newspaper on 18 January this year. If that situation occurs again in this State, the Premier wants the dismissed Commissioner to have the new right and privilege to appeal to the court, and the best decision which could be handed down in favour of the Commissioner would be that he was wrongfully dismissed, and damages assessed against the Crown.

Under this Bill, the best decision in favour of the Commissioner would be that neither House would agree that his suspension was warranted, and he would return to his desk. The Royal Commission argued that in such a case the relationship between the Government of the day and the Commissioner would be untenable. However, the Legislature has accepted the proposition that such a relationship would not be untenable in the case of the other executive officers whom I have mentioned.

If a situation arises in which a large number of citizens gather to protest against the dismissal by the Government of a highly respected and admired senior member of the Executive (and the number who gathered in Mr. Salisbury's support in Victoria Square appeared to be about 10 000) then those citizens are entitled to the right to endeavour to influence the Government, and their respective Parliamentarians, to reverse the decision against which they are protesting. The same can be said of the 61 000 people who signed petitions. That demand by protesters and petitioners would be echoed within Parliament if this Bill is passed. If the Premier's proposed change occurs, all he can then say to those who protest and petition is that the Government has washed its hands of the matter; the dismissed person can appeal to the courts and perhaps obtain damages. That procedure is by no means as democratic as one in which the subject matter is brought to Parliament.

The reference of the suspension of the Commissioner to Parliament is in the nature of an appeal: the suspended Commissioner would undoubtedly make out his whole case and a member or members of Parliament supporting his point of view would submit that case on the floor of both Houses of Parliament. The Commissioner could be brought to the Bar, if members approved of such procedure.

It is of some interest that, in the relatively modern history of Australia, the only other public upheaval against a Government for dismissal of a Police Commissioner occurred in New South Wales. In 1935, the Police Regulation Act of that State was amended to include the procedure that suspension of the Police Commissioner had to be reported to Parliament, and both Houses had to concur, or else the New South Wales Commissioner was restored to office. The reason for the amendment was the charge that the previous Government, the Lang Government, had sacked a Commissioner for political reasons.

I reject accusations which will be made by some who will claim that the introduction of this Bill is motivated by Party-political consideration. In all probability, all this Bill would have achieved had the Salisbury issue been brought to Parliament (and if the law then had been in accordance with this Bill) would have been that after considerable debate one House would have approved and the other House disapproved the suspension of Mr. Salisbury, and he would still have been dismissed. I make that assessment because one House has a majority of members from one major Party, and the other House has a majority of members from the other major Party. However, each House would have been a proper forum for debate, and those debates would have provided the people of this State with an opportunity to be heard through their elected representatives, an opportunity to judge those representatives on the particular issue, and an opportunity for the individual so deeply involved (namely, Mr. Salisbury) to have his viewpoint submitted and discussed publicly.

There is also, of course, a probability that, in such a case, the Commissioner would never have been suspended, anyway: the problems between the Government and the Commissioner might have been resolved by discussion and compromise, if the Government knew that the whole issue had to be referred to Parliament.

I have not previously stated publicly any personal views regarding the Salisbury affair. I say quite unequivocally that this honourable, respected and dedicated former police officer did nothing whatsoever to deserve having his life and career shattered as it has been by the Dunstan Government.

I say it would never have happened under a Liberal Government, which would have negotiated and erased inevitable misunderstandings and conflicts as they arose,

so that a proper balance between necessary security and civil liberty would have been established. The manner of his dismissal has shamed South Australia, but I am sure that the vast majority of citizens hope that both he and his wife gain some recompense from the undoubted admiration and respect which so many hold, or have expressed, towards them.

Clause 1 of my Bill is formal. Clause 2 amends section 6 of the principal Act by the insertion of two new subsections. The first gives the power to the Government to remove the Commissioner upon presentation of an address from both Houses of Parliament praying for his removal. The second provides for the possibility of suspension of the Commissioner, as explained earlier, and the subsequent action of either removal from, or restoration to, his office.

The attention of honourable members is drawn to the fact that the Government's full statement of reasons for suspension must be laid before Parliament within three sitting days of suspension, or three sitting days of the commencement of a new session, if Parliament is not sitting on the date of suspension. Either House has 12 sitting days in which to move for removal, after the Government's full statement of reasons has been tabled. These periods vary slightly from comparable periods in the other Acts to which I have referred.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill was prepared by the Hon. John Burdett, M.L.C. Like the previous speaker, I shall seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. Before doing so, however, I wish to correct an impression given by the Minister of Health. The Minister has accused Dr. John Court of saying that, in relation to the visual display of pornography, the position was better here than in other States. I am not a member of the organisation of which Dr. Court is a member, but I think he has a right to have his explanation heard in this House. I shall quote from a letter I have received from him on the subject, as follows:

> While the quotation conveys what I said, it was with no approval of current practice that I said it. Nor should it be used by the Government to defend its present position in relation to classification. I was drawing the important distinction between what is visible to the public and what is available for sale. The board is concerned with both aspects. I was expressing the opinion that the classification policy in this State has meant that offensive magazines are less prominently on display in public places than in some other States. If the board is simply interested in seeking to avoid offending the sensibilities of the Premier's "blue rinse brigade", it has gone some way to achieving this in relation to point of sale.
>
> My comment was intended to highlight the more serious matter of material being able to circulate in the community. The fact is that almost anything can be bought by those who seek it out. Much of this, if more visible to other citizens, would be the subject of outcry. By allowing these publications to filter into society without it being evident, there is a self-righteous hypocrisy which appears to offer protection while actually failing to do so. The present policy has effectively made hard-core pornography clandestinely legitimate.
>
> In speaking to the *Advertiser,* I was emphasising that, if people knew what was on sale, there would be a great deal of objection. Public outrage has been muted by the restrictions which in no way prevent circulation of material which an increasing number of people are recognising to be intrinsically destructive, and in a civilised society, barbaric.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its first purpose is to repeal the Classification of Publications Act. Many of the existing provisions have been retained but the changes I propose are substantial and are scattered throughout the framework of the existing Act. It was therefore not practicable to proceed by way of amendment to the existing Act. The second main purpose of the Bill is to repeal section 33 of the Police Offences Act and to re-enact it, with some alterations, in the Act proposed by this Bill in order that the proposed Act should provide a complete code in regard to indecent publications.

At the present time the control of indecent publications is not effective. Publications depicting acts of bestiality and the so-called "bondage" publications are classified and are readily available. Publications, at the very least bordering on child pornography, are being classified. I have no wish to ban matter which is genuinely educational, artistic, or even funny, but much of the material which is being classified is merely pornographic. It has nothing to commend it. To allow some of the material which is being classified today to be readily available in the community is to corrupt society. Much of the material sold is completely degrading to women and is certainly sexist. Very few of the publications available degrade men (apart from those designed for the homosexual market) but there is grave discrimination against women.

Some time ago the Government was asked for an inquiry into the incidence and causes of rape, including the effect, if any, of pornography on sexual offences. This has not been done and there are no statistics available. But the grave increase in the crime of rape has certainly happened at the same time as the great increase of pornography. Much of the bondage material virtually instructs people of that turn of mind how to subject women to the grave indignities which are depicted in classified material. There are several elements in controlling pornography. One is the legislation. I consider that the present legislation is defective. This was said when it was first introduced in 1973.

The second element is administration. Some few months ago, the Hon. Mr. Burdett, who introduced this Bill in another place, examined the operation of the control of pornographic material in Western Australia. It was very apparent that there are no legal, legislative or administrative problems. If the Government wants to control indecent material, it can easily do so. The present Government clearly does not want to control indecent material but it would appear, as he said elsewhere, that the very purpose of the Classification of Publications Act was to allow indecent and obscene material to be sold with comparative impunity.

I cannot make this Government want to control indecent material but I can, at least, attempt to strengthen the legislation so that there is some likelihood that the flood of hard-core pornography which we are enduring in

South Australia, certainly more so than in any other Australian State, is stemmed.

Vital, of course, to the administration of any legislation of this kind are the personnel appointed to the board. This Government has scrupulously appointed personnel who are likely to follow the permissive line which the Government itself wants to adopt. The ideal, of course, could be that the Government, when making its appointments, observed a balance between moral conservatives, moral radicals, and moderates, but this has not been done. It seems to be too difficult to spell out the bodies who should have the right to nominate members of the board. Therefore, the only amendment I propose in this area is to include on the board a representative of the National Council of Women.

However, as the Government is in fact in control of the situation through its appointments to the board, it must accept this responsibility. The present Act is a travesty of the principle of responsible government. The Government should be responsible to the Parliament and therefore ultimately to the people for the important matter of controlling the dissemination of hard-core pornography. The present Act is a complete denial of that principle. The board makes the classifications. The Government has no control over the board and can completely wash its hands of what the board does. It has completely abdicated its responsibility.

This Bill seeks to place the responsibility with the Government. This field is one for the Executive Government. If the Government does its job well it should get the kudos and if it does it badly it should get the brickbats. The Bill gives the task of classification to the Minister after considering the recommendations of the board.

One of the most distressing aspects of hard-core pornography is the likelihood of its getting into the hands of minors. I am not talking about blue cartoons. I am talking about photography of near naked girls lovingly placing the anus of a hen on a male's penis, a woman bound and having introduced into her vagina, mice and other objects, naked (and apparently young) boys in clearly homosexual positions and so on. All of these have been classified. It is not enough to consider the point of first sale. Much of this material finishes up, by accident or design, in the hands of children. This matter must be considered in regard to legislation and administration in this area.

On the matter of child pornography, honourable members know that the Hon. Mr. Burdett three times introduced a Bill to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to make the photographing of children in pornographic situations a specific offence. It also provided severe penalties for the sale or distribution of such material. The only serious argument which the Government advanced against the Bill was that it was claimed that this matter was already covered by the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. He claimed that this was not clear and that, in any event, when dealing with a specific and prevalent problem, such as child pornography, the matter should be specifically dealt with.

Let us look at what bodies other than the South Australian Government have said about this issue. Before the last occasion when this Bill was introduced the Mitchell Committee had reported on this matter but the Government, for some inexplicable reason, decided not to release the report until the Bill had been defeated by Government members. The committee reported that the offence of photographing children in pornographic situations was probably covered by the Criminal Law Consolidation Act but recommended that to put the matter beyond doubt suitable legislation should be introduced. On the first day of this session the Premier, who had previously said that such action was unnecessary, said that the Government would introduce the requisite legislation.

In America, the United States itself and the State of California have passed legislation to prevent the manufacture and sale of child pornography. A Bill introduced in the Parliament of the United Kingdom to do the same thing and with much more severe penalties than I had proposed passed the House of Commons by an overwhelming majority and is at present before the House of Lords. Most notable of all perhaps is that, while the previous Bill was still being debated, the Labor Government in Tasmania took a similar step. The substance of the previous Bill is reintroduced into this present Bill and I trust that the Government will no longer oppose it.

I note that in the Governor's Speech no mention was made of amendment to either the Classification of Publications Act or the Police Offences Act, yet on the very day of the opening of Parliament the Premier said that the Police Offences Act would be amended so that the definition of indecency would include acts of explicit sadism. I certainly would have no objection to a proper amendment of this Bill to cover this matter.

For many years, and prior to the present Classification of Publications Act even being introduced, one of the main problems with section 33 of the Police Offences Act has been that it requires the certificate of Ministers before a prosecution is instituted. This had not been forthcoming. This Bill repeals section 33 of the Police Offences Act and re-enacts it, with some alterations, as clause 19. One major alteration is to remove the requirement for a Minister's certificate. I certainly believe, as I have said, in Ministerial responsibility in the matter of classification, but where the police consider that they have evidence to justify a prosecution, in a matter to be dealt with summarily, they should be able to proceed in this case, as in any other case, without requiring a Minister's certificate.

In 1953 when the Police Offences Act was first enacted, when there was not much pornographic material readily available commercially and when it was no doubt feared that there might otherwise be oppressive prosecutions, this may have been reasonable. In the present context this requirement has made it difficult for the police to prosecute because the certificates are not given and there is now no reason to distinguish this from any other offence punishable summarily.

An important concept which the Bill introduces is that of a prohibited publication. At the present time no publications, however much they offend against the guidelines laid down by the Act, are prohibited. The most severe action which the board can take is to refuse to classify. This means that the unclassified publication must take its chances under section 33 of the Police Offences Act. That is all!

If it is intended to make it possible for the board virtually to prohibit publications which it considers completely unacceptable on the guidelines laid down, this should be simply and honestly done and that is what this Bill does. I do not think that many people perusing the publications which the board has refused to classify would have any objection to taking the simpler, more honest, more direct, and less tedious course of prohibiting these publications.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 sets out the necessary definitions. Clause 4 repeals the present Act and makes transitional provisions. Clause 5 sets out the

constitution of the board and differs from the present Act in including a nominee of the National Council of Women. Clause 6 provides the terms and conditions of office. It differs from the present Act in providing for a fixed term. Clause 7 fixes the quorum. Clause 8 validates the acts of the board notwithstanding a vacancy.

Clause 9 provides for allowances and expenses. Clause 10 sets out the powers of the board. Clause 11 provides for a Registrar. Clause 12 provides for classification by the Minister and stipulates that before classifying he must consider the recommendation from the board. Clause 13 sets out the criteria to be applied by the Minister. Clause 14 provides the basis for classification as prohibited. restricted or unrestricted classifications. Clause 15 lists the restrictions which may be imposed by the Minister. Clause 16 enables the Minister to review any classification assigned either of his own motion or upon request. Clause 17 requires that classifications and conditions be notified in the *Gazette.*

Clause 18 prohibits the making or distribution of child pornography on penalty of imprisonment not exceeding three years or a fine of $2 000 or both. Clause 19 sets out the offences and the penalties of selling, delivering or exhibiting indecent publications, and prohibited publications and for selling, delivering or exhibiting publications in contravention of a condition. Clause 20 gives the power to seize where an offence is suspected. Clause 21 sets up certain defences to charges laid under the proposed Act. Clause 22 provides for summary disposal of proceedings for offences except proceedings for a breach of clause 18 which establishes a misdemeanour. Clause 23 is the regulation-making power, and clause 24 provides for the repeal of section 33 of the Police Offences Act.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND VALUATION

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I move:

> That this House recognise the fact that the Government by persisting with land valuation methods which fail to relate the prescribed value to actual land use is condoning claims for rates and taxes which under existing land usage are manifestly unjust and not recoverable by the owner either in production returns or rental income, thus resulting in forced subdivision and general development (including clearing), which acts have destroyed the existing environment leading to a loss of the general amenity of considerable areas for the public.

In putting forward this motion, I seek the unanimous support of the House. The motion is a distillation of the two previous motions of this nature that I have brought to the attention of the House since 1976. I make no apology for that. On 8 September 1976 at page 887 of *Hansard,* under the heading "Land Tax", there is the report of a motion which I moved in the following terms:

> 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.

On 30 November 1977, as recorded at page 1121 of *Hansard,* under the heading "Land Valuations", I moved the following motion:

> 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.

The debate on both occasions indicated a wide degree of acceptance of the difficulties produced by the present system. It in no way reflected against land valuers in the exercise of their professional duties.

It was not intended so to do but it indicated that, by virtue of the system which is forced upon land valuers in the application of the general principles of land valuation, inevitably many areas of difficulty followed. Those difficulties were outlined in detail in my previous speeches. I intend to proceed further than the information given on those two previous occasions, and I look forward to a contribution from many members on both sides, which may eventually lead to a resolution of this difficult and complex situation in which the people of South Australia find themselves involved.

I believe that the general principle I enunciated was accepted by the Minister for Planning in a speech which he gave to the Australian Institute of Valuers in August 1977 when he outlined many of the difficulties he saw. Whilst in the balance of his address he discussed the difficulties he saw in the Willunga area, he accepted that difficulties existed and that they must be faced eventually. I believe one of the major reasons why Mr. Hart was asked to look at planning in relation to development in urban areas was based on this difficulty.

Many people in the community are concerned with this matter. I doubt whether there is one member in this place who has not received representations from constituents or persons owning land in their districts. The matter goes far beyond what has generally been considered to be a rural difficulty: the problem relates to the metropolitan area just as much as it does to the rural area.

Whilst many of the examples I will give tend to be based on fringe and rural areas, I have no doubt that other members will relate issues in connection with suburbia. Quite recently I received from the Taxpayers' Association of South Australia a four-page document dated 29 July 1978. One of the articles in that document, under the heading "Some surprisingly unfair features exist in South Australian land tax", states:

> In the 1976-77 year (the latest one for which figures are available) the land tax collected in South Australia was over $18 500 000. We would like to tell you something about the way your land-taxable value is fixed, and how under the present law you cannot even lodge an objection on some factors in it.

The article then proceeded to outline the manner in which land was valued and lauded the fact that within the court system there was a means by which an appeal could be lodged. The next point it raised is an anomaly to which this House should direct its attention. When a factor is used to determine the valuation for a particular year, there is no right of objection or appeal. The factor I speak about is the equalisation factor, which is published annually and which relates to the valuations in specified areas of the State. An example is as follows: the 1974 value of some land was, say, $10 000 (a valuation that may have been right at the time or the amount of tax involved then was not worth worrying about) but if the Valuer-General used the equalisation factor, which may be three (there is evidence that this factor has been used many times), the land tax is charged this year on $30 000. Even if the owner can demonstrate that this is an excessive amount, he has no right of appeal or objection. The article also states:

> Another problem: Valuations are often based on the potential use for some land, ignoring that the owner may not either want to spend the money to put it to its ultimate best use (or he may not have the money). But meantime he is forced to pay exorbitant tax. The land tax law should defer the amount of tax attributable to potential use—especially

through rezoning—and if sold (or put to that use) only then should some deferred tax be payable.

The association is referring to the introduction of the old 12 *(c)* principle, which applied in the land tax legislation when rural land tax was a fact of life. Section 61 of the present Planning and Development Act provides for a similar situation, but I will deal with that later. The United Farmers and Graziers Association has consistently made the point that land use is an entirely different matter from the value of land as expressed in the various methods of taxing which apply. In a letter it circulated on 22 September 1976 the U.F.G. reported that its Western Australian counterpart had passed a resolution, No. 22, which states:

That U.F.W.A. ask the State Government to amend legislation regarding property valuations with a view to eliminating where possible the many anomalies which now exist and are causing property owners considerable hardship through unrealistic valuations, mainly caused by inflated prices now paid for some small holdings, and that landowners be given prior notice by the Valuer-General before inspection.

Obviously that pinpoints the anomalies they recognise in the area. In another document the Western Australian association addressed itself quite directly to valuations in relation to council rates, because land tax is not a problem in that State. The U.F.G. also sought information from its colleagues in other States and it was pointed out that in Queensland there is a method of solving the problem, but the evidence coming from Queensland indicates that, even though that benefit exists in the legislation, it is not necessarily being applied to their satisfaction and it may not be the answer to this overall problem.

The U.F.G. document which was circulated also drew attention to a new valuation method which is being considered in Victoria and which is called the "site value". Much material is available on the grave difficulties associated with replacing "unimproved value" with "site value" the mistaken belief being that site value might better reflect a current value, but evidence from other States would suggest that that is not necessarily so.

Many agricultural bureaux through the years have indicated to members the difficulties they see in the non-nexus as between land usage and land valuation. I refer also to the ratepayer organisations and the land user organisations that have constantly made representations to members, I believe, from all areas, not only those from the country. One organisation that was vocal a short time ago on this matter was the Mount Lofty Ranges and Precincts Regional Park Association, which wrote through its Research Secretary (Mr. Moriarty) on 11 February 1976 in the following terms:

Conclusions were that the present laws of land tax and of the Planning and Development Act are harsh, extortionate and destructive of the rural environment and of the productivity of our most fertile land in its best and true use, food production. The harshness and extortion are the result of levying land tax, council rates and water rates at high levels beyond the capacity of the land to produce to pay the taxes and rates.

I refer members to the nature of my motion to see how closely it aligns with those statements in the document issued by Mr. Moriarty. He continues:

The end result is that the rural landholders who alone have the experience and knowledge to husband the land are forced to sell out and the land goes to hobby farms and even to harbours for weeds and fire hazard.

I do not want to go into the argument regarding the place in society of hobby farmers. I genuinely believe that they have a place; I have indicated that in the House previously, and I will come back to it later. I retract from Mr. Moriarty's comment in which there is an implied criticism of the existence of hobby farmers, but I accept the value of his point. He continues:

For two-and-a-half decades the South Australian Governments and their bureaucracies have followed a policy of industrial development, putting factories and houses on very fertile land which should be reserved for primary production and consequent rural beauty and recreation. By first valuing the land for industrial or housing purposes, and then levying high taxes and rates accordingly, the husbandmen and women are forced off the land.

That situation certainly applies in many areas. It is apparent today in the so-called hills face zone where a valuation based on subdivision that is not permitted completely destroys the ability of the owner to continue in his current occupation. If he stays, he is forced further to clear or farm the area to its detriment. That reflects directly back on the comment contained in my motion regarding the destruction of the amenity of the area.

Recently, the House accepted the passage of a Bill dealing with South Australia's heritage. It was stated on that occasion that we saw a distinct advantage. We wanted to know that there was a means of controlling and containing the better aspects of the amenity of our land, and we saw in that measure a way of doing it. I trust that the Government, having supported that measure, will look seriously at the matters I have been relating this afternoon and will continue to relate, because they have a distinct similarity and are important in a retention of the amenity.

Some months ago, a submission was prepared by Ian R. Lewis for the Agriculture and Fisheries Department of South Australia. The submission was entitled "Rural-Urban Land Use Conflict in the Adelaide Hills—a discussion paper on problems and possible solutions". This is not a document from which I wanted to quote at length, but I take up the point made on page 7 of the document under "Guidelines for preserving rural land in the Adelaide Hills", as follows:

As a basis for the consideration of a number of possible solutions to the rural-urban land use conflict in the Adelaide Hills, the following assumptions and guidelines are made:

Although this is directly related to the Adelaide Hills, it could be applied to practically every other area of the State. The thrust of the argument may be slightly different, but the general purport of what he is saying in these guidelines is the same. The submission continues:

Open land used for agriculture is an efficient means of conserving natural resources that constitute important physical, social, aesthetic and economic assets.

Landholders should be considered custodians of the land for future generations. They should have no right to exploit or mismanage land against the community's interest. This implies the proper management of agricultural and bushland areas.

Good agricultural land (especially land suitable for growing horticultural crops) with adequate water is a finite resource in South Australia.

The preservation of agricultural land will require more stringent land use controls and regulations than are in use at present. This will be essential if the gradual erosion of agricultural land to urbanisation is to be prevented. The land to be preserved will need to be clearly defined.

The legislation aimed at preserving good agricultural land needs to offer incentives (and remove disincentives) for bringing about and maintaining the viability of farmers and their families.

The assembly of titles and the amalgamation of small rural holdings need to be encouraged. Many Adelaide Hills farms comprise a number of separate sections with separate titles

> which lend themselves to being sold off—so further fragmenting and reducing the size of farms. A prosperous and viable agriculture is not favoured by reductions in farm size. It follows that there is no justification for further subdivision of rural holdings in the Adelaide Hills (except in outer areas where grazing land is converted to horticultural uses).
>
> Land speculation should be curbed.
>
> Multiple land use should be encouraged for maximum community benefit. However, such uses should not seriously threaten the natural beauty of the ranges, lead to environmental problems or be at the expense of prime agricultural land.

I referred earlier to the provision relating to the proclamation of private land as open space, as contained in section 61 of the Planning and Development Act. Guidelines exist which the Director of the State Planning Authority considers in relation to that matter, as follows:

> 1. The land, by reason of its appearance, location and extent, adds appreciably to the amenity of the area;
>
> 2. the land is, or is to be used for a sporting or recreational use which should be retained for the convenience of the public;
>
> 3. access to or through the land is enjoyed from time to time by a proportion of the public either by membership, payment of a fee or otherwise.

If one examines those three conditions conjointly, one can see quickly how difficult it is for a person to be duly considered under section 61. To give an indication of the value of consideration under section 61, I refer again to the position of Mr. Moriarty. In a letter to him, dated 29 August 1975, from the State Taxes Department, the then Acting Commissioner of Land Tax wrote:

> In the case of your own property, I have been advised by the Valuer-General that, if the land was proclaimed under section 61 of the Planning and Development Act, a valuation of $10 560 would apply for land tax purposes. The amount of tax payable on that value at current rates would be $16·40 as compared with the 1974-75 land tax of $619·75.

There is a mammouth difference between an annual charge of $16·40 and $619·75. That is the nature of the benefit that accrues by land being proclaimed under section 61 of the Act. I have indicated that it is not possible for everyone to come under that provision, but some people have a decided advantage for the maintenance of the amenity of an area if that person has access to a provision like section 61.

The other feature which should be considered and which is a natural follow-on from my reference to the old section 12 *(c)* of the Land Tax Act is that, if the purpose for which the land is used is changed, a sum of money will be extracted from the owner at the time the change is introduced. That matter is again taken up in the Lewis Report at page 9 under the heading "5.1.2. Preferental land valuations for good agricultural land". Let us extend it beyond agricultural land but accept the manner in which the comment is presented by the author. Under that heading he states:

> Such land is said to have an assessed value reflecting existing agricultural productivity. This land use is deemed to be the best use of the land. Alternatively, only well managed holdings or those owners with an acceptable plan for the improved management of their properties should be allowed this concession. It is argued that reduced land values with the resultant rate and tax concessions would be sufficient incentive for a landholder to maintain the management of his property at a sufficiently high level.

Other comment is made to which I do not wish to refer now. Another important aspect is that a definite changed socio-economic attitude has occurred, this time to what might be referred to as "part-time farming". I am talking about part-time farming not on the basis so much of the hobby farmer but in the sense that many people in agricultural pursuits find that it is necessary to go outside for employment to keep body and soul together or to help provide for their family.

I refer members' attention to a document that has just been made availabe to members through the Parliamentary Library service. The document which is headed "Part-time Farming", is taken from the *O.E.C.D. Observer* of May 1978 and deals at great length with non-farming employment, as follows:

> The concept of a person combining farm and non-farm work is not new—in many areas it has been the normal pattern of rural life for centuries. In the Scandinavian countries and Canada, for example, forestry and farming have always been closely linked. This dual use of labour suited both operations, as the peak labour requirement on the farm is during the spring and summer, while autumn and winter are the peak forestry months.

Referring to the socio-economic aspect, it states:

> The change from full- to part-time farming in areas where not many people have off-farm employment does sometimes lead to a re-adjustment of relations with neighbours. There is often an element of suspicion about the change. Will the farmer, with this new source of income, introduce a new element in price bargaining with authorities? Will his farm income lose interest for him and lead him to undercut his neighbours in selling his produce? And often the most important question: will the new source of income enable a farmer with a non-viable farm to stay in agriculture and thus hold on to the land which his neighbours had hoped they could aquire to enlarge their farms?

I believe the latter point is important, and I therefore wish to refer further to it. There is a distinct advantage to a community when a farm operation can be continued as a viable exercise and money is introduced into the community because of the continuance of that viability. The document then refers to the outlook for the future and states:

> Also in the future, farmers who cannot make ends meet on the farm will be faced with a difficult choice: either to stop farming or to take a second occupation as well. The speed and direction of the structural change involved will depend on the differential between farm incomes and incomes in other sectors of the economy, as well as on the availability and location of the non-farm jobs.

I make that point because I believe it is the crux of the motion. It is important that the ability of people to remain on their property, be it large or small, is not destroyed. The valuation system which now applies and which bears no relationship to land use is forcing many people off their properties and is forcing subdivision and the clearing of land which would be better for the amenity of the State to be left as it is; it is the centre of the problem and the gravamen of the motion. I seek the support of all members in further debate on the motion and hope that it is carried.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion, and congratulate the member for Light for his fight in this area. I am glad that he has taken it up after I, in my early days in this House, attempted to fight the same principle, which I believed was wrong. The principle that the Government and Governments of the past have used is to attack people who have property from which they are trying to get a living. They attack those people on the potential of the property for another use rather than the existing use. I failed in my effort, but hope that the member for Light can succeed.

The problem is greater now than it was in the early

1970's and in late 1968. More people are being affected now. Some may say that some of these people with more push who claim to be academics and who have moved into the area are suddenly feeling the pinch. The starry-eyed wisdom that they used to espouse is changing because they are feeling the financial burden of trying to retain land they believe should be retained for the preservation of the amenity, or for bushland, open space for the rest of the community or which they believe should be retained because on the property there may be a large house.

In my district (Stirling, Aldgate, Bridgewater and associated villages around those towns) some properties have one large house on six or seven acres of old-established gardens, which were established before the turn of the century and which people believe should be kept because of their aesthetic beauty and their general benefit to the community.

Let me deal with the latter matter first because, in all probability, the Government and the community at large believes it has less significance. I am talking about a large property, and I can think about one that came up recently in the Stirling area. The property contains a large house that has been held by a family for many years.

These people suddenly found that, because of their age, or because of illness, they could not stay on the property, so they placed the property on the market. They were forced to do that because other sections of the family could not afford to keep a property which, according to the Valuer-General, might have a market value of $250 000. It consists of seven or eight acres, which has a subdivision potential, if it were divided into half-acre allotments, of $20 000 an allotment, giving it a subdivided value of over $200 000. Added to that valuation is the value of the house, with the result that the Valuer-General's figure is $250 000 to $300 000. Only a few people will pay that price nowadays for a property on which they have to maintain the garden and pay the rates and taxes, just so that the rest of society can look at it. It costs much money to maintain the garden, and to maintain an old property, and there is no real benefit to the owner except environmentally because he has a bit of open space around his house. The owner is therefore forced to subdivide the property.

Some members might say that that is all right; a few more houses will be built on the piece of land, so it does not matter. But, with this subdividing, some of the best gardens we have ever had in our community will disappear. I believe it will not be many years before people are saying that we should have preserved those properties under the National Trust, or some other scheme. That is just one example of where this type of valuation has had an adverse effect.

There are families in the Hills who have owned land for many years (and some for only a few years), that is natural bushland. It may have a potential for agriculture, or for subdivision into smaller areas, but the families have never wished to subdivide the properties, preferring to keep them as bushland. The community and the various Governments of the day have said that we should preserve that type of land, particularly in the Adelaide Hills, so that it is there for future generations. Yet, because of this system of valuing, the Government places on the owners of that land a burden that the owners cannot bear.

The owners of that land cannot produce anything on it, and they cannot rent it; it is just a piece of natural bushland that has been preserved for the benefit of the community. The owners have not tried to capitalise on the land by destroying the bushland and planting some sort of crop. However, next door to them there might be a person running a native plant nursery on three acres of land and making a good living. One could possibly put 20 families on 100 acres who could make a good living from native plant nurseries. So the valuers tend to look at the potential of the land instead of its use. This is disastrous in the long term.

The Government claims it has abolished land tax on rural land. That is not true. An example of that is the family which has a small agricultural property in the Hills. I know of one such family where the income for the family, with three young children, is less than $4 000 from rural pursuits. The wife works and earns $5 500 in another pursuit. The Government says that the property is not a rural property in real terms because, although the husband and wife have a partnership in the farming operation, the wife goes out to work and earns more in her job as a cook than the husband earns with her helping him to milk the cows. They are not getting the majority of their income from the rural pursuit. Although they are saving the amenity, they have to pay land tax of $2 800 out of their overall income. In the end, how can they survive? If they stay on the farm, they cannot survive, and, if the wife goes out to work they cannot survive, yet the Government says it has abolished land tax on properties used for rural pursuits. That is an untruth, and honourable members should be aware of that.

At the same time there are people who have properties, some of them quite large (200 or 300 acres), who, if they were taxed on what they could earn from the property from horticulture and agriculture (agricultural market gardening, dairy farming, beef cattle or sheep), would have much lower land and council rates and could survive. However, those people are taxed on the potential of the highest income that could be obtained from the land by comparing it to neighbouring land used in some other pursuit, whether it be as a nursery or something else. That is where the Government goes wrong.

In addition, the Engineering and Water Supply Department decides that it wants to take a water main, which will serve an urban community, small town or village, past an agricultural property. The property is automatically taxed by way of water rates based on the potential value of the property if it were sold and not on its rural value or existing use. It is taxed at the highest possible value, so the water rates are at the highest possible level, even though the person who owns the property, or a previous owner, has put in bores, a reticulated water system and dams and does not need the mains water. Again, those persons are taxed to the hilt by way of water rates. What this is encouraging people to do, particularly in near urban areas, is to subdivide their land, if they can, in an attempt to survive, or to move out altogether in other cases and sell their property to somebody who will have to subdivide the land or clear it. Is that really our aim?

Another area of valuations that makes me angry applies in the metropolitan area. There can be two houses which were built at the same time, which are identical in structure and material, and which are on the same size allotment. One owner looks after his property, creates a beautiful garden which is a credit to the family and the community, whilst the next-door neighbour, who may be a bit of a no-hoper, lets his garden become a jungle, and does not worry about repairing or painting his house. Yet the valuer values the neglected house at a lower figure because it is neglected, while the responsible citizen is slugged because he has taken pride in his property. That is the sort of law that has been operating in this State for many years. I believe that is wrong in principle and cannot be justified. People should not be more heavily taxed for taking pride in their properties, while no-hopers who neglect their properties receive lower valuations.

I have no doubt that, if we could hold a secret ballot in this House on this matter and ask members to vote according to their conscience without worrying about monetary matters or anything else, the vote would be that the principle is wrong and that we should change the system. I support the motion moved by the member for Light; I believe it is a proper one.

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member can make the sort of sly dig that he has just made if he so wishes; it does not worry me. I say that we should change this law and the principle on which we operate, taking into consideration the real use that is being made of the property at the time of valuation and using that as the basis for the assessment of rates and taxes. I ask honourable members to think about the matter, and to make representations to the Treasurer, so that we can get justice, instead of bleeding those who can ill afford to pay the bill, whilst at the same time destroying the environment we all wish to protect.

Mr. GROOM secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINORS (CONSENT TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL TREATMENT) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 16 August. Page 576.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I do not support the Bill. I oppose the concept that we should take away any rights from the families within our community. There has been a trend in recent times for Parliament to pass laws that tend to take up some of the family responsibilities, at the same time taking away some of the rights. This Bill is a step in that direction. In introducing the Bill, the member for Ross Smith made the following comment:

> The fourth report of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia, known as the Mitchell Committee, has been published, and in matters concerned with the criminal law it has recommended the age of 16 years as being an appropriate age of consent for minors.

I do not even accept that. It is easy for the Government of the day, regardless of its political persuasion, to appoint people to committees, perhaps having some idea of the views of those people. I do not know whether the Government knew what Justice Mitchell or others on the committee might be thinking, but it is easy for such a situation to arise. People appointed to committees may have some thoughts on what the system should be. As Parliamentarians, we should assess things as we see them as individuals, bearing in mind how people in the community approach us and ask us to recognise their viewpoint.

The member for Ross Smith said that very few people gave evidence against the proposal, and that there appeared to be not much concern in the community about it. I do not know where he sought views, but in my community not one person has asked that I should support the reduction of the age to 14 or 16 years. The original Bill provided for consent from 14 years upwards, and the proposal has been amended, following the hearings of the Select Committee, to provide for an age of 16 years. No-one in my area expressed support for the age to be lower than 18 years.

In common law, it is accepted that a child can leave home at 16 years, telling the parents he wants nothing more to do with them. Do we have to make it easier for children to take such actions? Do we have to take away more family responsibilities? What if a minor who leaves home at 16 years of age incurs a large debt? Do we say that the parents will carry no responsibility for that? Is the Government saying that the parents do not have to worry once their children leave home, that all the responsibility is with the children, with the Government, and, in this case, with the doctors or the dentists?

Recently, I asked some questions of the Minister of Community Welfare and I shall refer to the replies I received. In relation to the Community Welfare Department, the Minister admitted that doctors have a confidential relationship with patients and prescribe treatment or assistance to patients according to their ethics. Some doctors in Government hospitals might prescribe contraceptives for children under the age of 16 years, without the consent or the knowledge of the parents, if they consider it necessary for the child's wellbeing and if there are valid reasons, the Minister said, why the situation should be dealt with in that way. In other words, we would be saying that, as a Parliament (and the Minister is saying it anyway), we believe that doctors can take such action without consultation with the parents and without asking their opinion. If something goes wrong in the community, we say it is not the job of the school to discipline the children, but that it is the responsibility of the parents. Automatically, we are condoning a situation encouraging a lack of discipline within the family. The Minister's reply continued:

> The Women's Community Health Centre Incorporated, which might be regarded as a semi-government agency, has a policy that, if a minor attends seeking information and help, every encouragement is given to the minor to discuss the matter with his/her parents and/or family doctor. Circumstances occasionally arise in which a minor refuses to follow this advice and in which, in the judgment of professional staff concerned, it is held to be reasonable to provide contraceptive advice directly to the minor. Parents will only be informed of the transaction with the consent of the patient concerned.

I can quote a case that occurred in my own area. A child left home before reaching the age of 16 years, and the department refused to make the child's address known to the parents, when they sought that information. It said that the child was in a house with others, was in good hands, and that the parents did not have to worry. What sort of mental trauma does that produce for the parents?

Mr. Bannon: What's this got to do with the Bill?

Mr. EVANS: It has to do with the point the member is making about parents having some say in what their children are doing and the common law aspect of minors being able to do certain things before reaching the age of 18 years, without the parents' consent. I asked a further question, as follows:

> Is it the Government's policy to take over parental control and guidance of children in cases where departmental officers recommended regardless of the parents' opinions?

The Minister gave the following reply:

> No, but a few children over the age of 15 years are admitted to temporary care and control at their own request. Any opinions expressed by parents are given full consideration.

The department is concerned only to the extent that the parent is told the child is in good hands, but cannot be told where the child is. I object strongly to that. When things go wrong, we say parents should have greater control over their children. The provisions of the Bill would allow doctors and dentists to carry out treatment on minors between the ages of 16 years and 18 years, without the consent of the parents, if the minor gives permission. We decided that 18 years was the age of majority for contractual purposes. If we say that a minor between the

age of 16 years and 18 years can be treated by a doctor without the consent of the parents, the situation could end in disaster. Young people of that age can be emotional, as can older people. The member for Ross Smith said:

> The free and informed consent of a responsible minor should be possible in such situations, and this Bill seeks to provide the statutory authority.

Is he saying that all children who wish to seek such treatment are responsible and informed? Is he saying that the ones that are likely to be in that position are the more likely to be responsible and informed?

Mr. Bannon: That would be a judgment of the practitioner.

Mr. EVANS: That is the very point I am making. The Bill does not say that the practitioner has to be convinced that the minor is responsible or informed. The medical practitioner does not have to make that decision if he or she does not want to. Surely the more responsible and informed minor would go to the parent and ask, "Do you believe I should have this treatment the doctor has recommended?" Surely it is more likely to be the reverse, and those who are perhaps irresponsible, or who have left home, will be arguing that they should be able to get treatment without the consent of a parent. I agree that in some cases doctors would have to act and perhaps there should be a group of people who could make a decision quickly.

If this Bill is amended to make it more acceptable, that could change my attitude, but to give the blanket approval for a doctor or a dentist to make a decision without the parents' consent for children between the ages of 16 and 18 is not acceptable to me as an individual, and I will oppose the Bill in its present form. If an amendment makes it more acceptable to me and the majority of people in my district, I may be able to accept the Bill. I do not believe it is true to say:

> The free and informed consent of a responsible minor should be possible in such situations, and this Bill seeks to provide the statutory authority.

Nowhere in this Bill is it stated that the minor has to be responsible or informed. The Bill refers to any minor in a particular age group. For that reason I oppose the Bill in its present form as strongly as I can.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the remarks of the member for Fisher. All the representations made to me by people in my electorate have opposed the Bill. It has been said that no evidence opposing the Bill was given to the Select Committee. That does not surprise me because a large number of people would not know much about how Select Committees operate; and such people give their point of view to their local member. On many social issues, people in my district are not reticent in approaching me. In the past I have received correspondence about abortion, and I am receiving correspondence about homosexuality and prostitution, as well as about this Bill, which I understand is the result of a compromise reached in another place. Originally the proposition was to lower the age from 18 to 14 years. I have received many representations from people within my district opposing this Bill, but I have had no representations supporting it. That is reason enough for me to oppose this Bill.

The second point I make is that I believe this Bill would be another blow to the strength of the family, and I believe that is probably the reason for the representations from my electorate. In my district there are strong family ties, and the family is still considered by most people in the district to be a vital component of a coherent and strong society. Quite unashamedly the outlook of the vast majority of people in my electorate is conservative in relation to social questions. Their view is that some things in our society are worth conserving, particularly in relation to social questions. I, too, unashamedly endorse that view.

It has never worried me unduly to be tagged a conservative because that label is usually used in relation to one's social attitudes. I think it is a blinkered attitude to label people because of their attitudes towards social questions, such as capital punishment, the age of majority, abortion, and so on. I am always amazed that, although we get a variety of opinions expressed by Government members on such matters as abortion, some Government members are not labelled "conservative". Some Government members are particularly conservative in relation to social questions. If there were no other arguments against the Bill, I would oppose it because I believe I would be truly reflecting the sentiments and conviction of my electorate. I am not interested in the compromise that has been reached in another place. If I am convinced by the views of the people I am trying to represent in this place, I should not and will not support this Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I could not support the Bill in principle. I have to make my point clear. As President of the Epilepsy Association of South Australia, I believe those who propose this legislation and who have made emotive speeches in support of it are not aware of the facts, particularly in relation to epilepsy, which is one area in which this legislation would be extremly damaging. The member for Ross Smith introduced the Bill by saying:

> First I say what the Bill is not: it is not a Bill to reduce the age of consent in relation to medical and dental treatment of minors. It is a Bill to define at what age and in what circumstances broadly such consent shall be given.

To a lay person that is nothing but a play on words and is simply twisting the facts, because the Bill is doing what it is stated that it is not doing. I am sick and tired of solicitors coming to this place and twisting words and facts around and taking the public for fools. That is what Government members are trying to do.

Mr. Bannon: That's what DeGaris said.

Mr. BECKER: You introduced the Bill into this place. We are dealing with this in the House of Assembly, and if the honourable member wants to quote someone in another place that is up to him. If you are going to say something, be honest about it and give a clear definition. The member for Ross Smith also said:

> It is quite clear, concerning adults, that consent eliminates the possibility of the medical or dental practitioner being sued for the tort of assault.

If the member for Ross Smith had any experience of life at all he would know that, before a parent or adult gives consent for a medical practitioner or a surgeon to carry out a certain operation or treatment on their child, the treatment is fully explained to the parents. If the average type of parent is not satisfied with the answers given by the specialist or general practitioner, he seeks further information, and has the right to obtain a second opinion. The second reading explanation states:

> An example of that, perhaps, is the commonly cited case of that religious body of belief that opposes blood transfusions.

That is the crux of the issue, as I see it. As the founder and President of the Epilepsy Association, I do not believe that any member of the Select Committee or any person who has spoken in favour of the legislation has considered what he is doing. I had the good fortune to be a member of the mental health Select Committee some time ago. If anyone has studied or has tried to study and understand the problems associated with mental illness and with the most unfortunate complaint of epilepsy, he will realise that such people are subject to great discrimination in the

community. About 100 types of epilepsy exist. Once a person is informed that he suffers from epilepsy, he is labelled for the rest of his life, whether or not the epilepsy is controlled. There is epilepsy and epilepsy plus, and the plus are those who are mentally retarded and who have suffered so much brain damage that there would be no way in which they could make decisions on their own behalf, let alone that the decisions be made by someone of 16 or 17 years of age.

There are many forms of treatment for epilepsy. Many types of surgery have been performed on epileptics. A person could have suffered measles and be left with a scar on the brain. The surgeon suggests surgery to remove the scar, thus possibly causing epilepsy. It is a dangerous operation, and a slight mistake could leave the patient a human vegetable or dead. If the operation is successful, it is a 50-50 chance whether the patient may be cured of epilepsy. I would not like a person 16 or 17 to make such a decision, certainly not a member of my family. The House is not in a position to make that judgment for them. We will be guided by the best medical advice available in the State.

Unfortunately, many types of medication used in treating epilepsy cause side effects. One medication is a tablet known as dilantin, and those who take it experience inflation of the gums. The gums will grow over the teeth, and they have to have surgery to strip the growth from the teeth. Again, that decision is not made lightly. Often, the medication can be changed, and the inflamed gums can be reduced to normal size with other treatment. A person 16 or 17 could decide to go along to a dentist and have his gums stripped from the teeth, when there could be an alternative treatment without surgery.

It is a great problem for parents to look after epileptics. During the past two years, I have come in contact with hundreds of people in this area who have been looking for guidance and assistance. We have about 650 members in this State who are in constant contact with the association. There are three categories of concern: children, adolescents, and adults. The adolescents cause many problems and heartaches. If this legislation is passed, it will add to the concern and problems of parents who are experiencing sufficient difficulties and who need help and back-up support from the Community Welfare Department. The department does a magnificent job in this regard in helping people, no matter who or what they are.

But it is wrong to give these people the option to make the decisions themselves, when they could be misinformed, or their own frustration might lead them to undertake treatment that could have disastrous effects for the rest of their lives. I have clashed with my colleagues in the Legislative Council, because I believe that they did not understand what the legislation provides. I do not think that anyone understands what we are doing to certain people in the community who could easily be misled, without the guidance of their parents. Furthermore, we know that many young people are immature at the age of 16 or 17, whereas others are advanced. Irrespective of whether this legislation operates in New South Wales, for goodness sake let us not make the role of the parents any more difficult than it is at present.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I oppose the Bill and support previous speakers by saying that I reject any legislation that in any way detracts from the authority of the family and the rights and responsibilities of parents. I refute some of the arguments put up by the member for Ross Smith in his second reading explanation of the Bill. In justifying the Bill, he said:

> An example of that, perhaps, is the commonly cited case of that religious body of belief that opposes blood transfusions. The situation at present is that minors cannot consent and thereby eliminate the possibility of the practitioner being sued for the tort of assault.

I believe that the Bill is made unnecessary in relation to those special cases, with which we would all sympathise, by virtue of the Emergency Medical Treatment of Children Act, 1960-1971, because that Act clearly provides legal protection for medical practitioners. The Act provides:

> A legally qualified medical practitioner may perform an operation upon a child without the consent of the parents or surviving parent of that child or any other person legally entitled to consent to that operation if such parents, parent or other person having been requested so to do, failed or refused to consent to that operation, or after such search and inquiry as is reasonably practicable in the circumstances, such parents, parent or other person cannot be found.

That Act goes a long way towards refuting arguments which were presented in another place in justification for this legislation and which were put forward here by the member for Ross Smith. The Bill seems to me to be a classic example of the old adage that hard cases make bad laws. If, in supporting the legislation, Legislative Council members and the mover have been trying to cover those few rare instances where children whose parents will not give consent to medical or dental procedures are at a disadvantage, they are actually putting most families in this State at a far more serious disadvantage by detracting from the rights and responsibilities of parents.

Any member of this House who supports legislation that in any way detracts from the authority of parents is performing a great disservice to the people of South Australia. Many petitions have been presented to this House and representations made to members of both sides of the House by concerned parents who are desperately worried that the Parliament, which should be trying to reinforce all that is good in family life, seems, in many instances, to be detracting from it. What I have said may seem to relate to small things. This may not seem major or as affecting a vast number of children, but it is the principle that, if accepted, will affect a vast number of children and a vast number of families. I believe that it is not only bad legislation but that it is unnecessary legislation, and I oppose it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of **Mr. Max Brown:**

> That this House condemns the Federal Government for its continuing policy of creating massive unemployment throughout Australia. The House further condemns the current attitude of the Federal Government in accepting ever increasing figures of unemployment with complete disregard for the plight of the people that unemployment has seriously affected and calls on the Federal Government to immediately instigate as a matter of extreme urgency a "Get Australia working programme".

(Continued from 16 August. Page 581.)

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): Before I sought leave to continue my remarks on 16 August I was talking about the Leader of the Opposition's credibility or, perhaps I should say, his lack of credibility. I remind members about what he said concerning the Budget and low income and socially disadvantaged people. He stated that it was a good Budget

for South Australia and that low income earners and the socially disadvantaged would be least affected. All I can say to that is that it again shows the Leader has no idea of what the Budget inflicted on the people of this State. That attitude does not surprise me, as the Leader has shown time and again that he has no feeling for the people of this State.

When the Leader and the member for Chaffey went to Melbourne to see Mr. Howard in relation to the problems of brandy producers in this State (for which I commend them), did the Leader mention anything at all about what the Budget had done for the unemployed, low income earners and the socially disadvantaged? I doubt whether he even brought up that question. The Leader had already gone on record as saying that those people would be the least affected by the Budget.

Who else, along with the Leader, supported the Budget? I have been studying the newspapers fairly closely to see whether any other organisation may have supported Mr. Howard's Budget. The only organisation I could find was the Australian Bankers Association, which is reported as follows:

> Australia's major private banks are happy about the Budget. "This is a responsible Budget," Australian Bankers Association Research Director, Mr. Ron Cameron, said today. "It is clearly aimed at assisting further reductions in inflation and improving Australia's capacity to compete in world markets." Mr. Cameron added, "The Budget will give confidence to overseas investors in the basic strength of our economy. The strategy provides for some scope but monetary conditions will be restrained."

The association says nothing at all about unemployment. I can understand why the association was pleased with the Budget and was not concerned about the unemployed. On Wednesday and Thursday, in the Stock Exchanges all over Australia, stocks rose at a rapid rate. That rise will not be reflected in industrial growth. All that that means is that people who play the Stock Exchanges will benefit from Mr. Howard's Budget and that the unemployed in this country will suffer more. The Leader of the Opposition is in fine company when he supports what the Australian Bankers Association says about the Budget.

Apart from a reduction in sales tax on motor vehicles, what has the Federal Liberal Government done to increase job possibilities and to alleviate unemployment? On Wednesday 16 August Mr. Howard made a statement in the *News* about "Project Australia". He was not referring to "Get Australia working again" to which the motion refers. The *News* report stated:

> Government spending announced in the Budget includes money for a new "Project Australia" to make people better aware of Australia's industrial skills, and $10 000 000 for the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane in 1982. "Project Australia" will be launched with a budget of $1 100 000. At several points in his speech Mr. Howard referred to a need to make Australia's industry and the economy generally more competitive. It will not be sufficient for us merely to hold our own with the average performance of our trading partners. We must do better.

It seems to me that the Liberal Party places more importance on and is more concerned about winning medals at the 1982 Commonwealth Games than about getting jobs for Australians. The Federal Government has allocated $10 000 000 to Brisbane for the 1982 Games but only $1 100 000 for "Project Australia" to get more people working. The term "socially disadvantaged" is the new trendy term to embrace the unemployed and their dependants. Perhaps members of the Liberal Party, especially the Federal Liberal Party, are finding it embarrassing to refer to thousands of people who have been reduced to a level below the poverty line. They are finding it extremely uncomfortable to do so, so they had to invent a nice phrase that would not make them feel uncomfortable. If one is in the category of the socially disadvantaged, one—

Mr. Gunn: Don't you—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I should point out to honourable members that there is a score card that indicates the number of times that the Speaker has to draw members' attention to the fact that interjecting is out of order. I do not want to add to that score card, but I shall be forced to do so if members continue to interject.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Is the member for Napier allowed to talk in the way he is doing when he cannot even draw up a suitable budget in the Elizabeth council area?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Napier.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. If one happens to be in the category of the socially disadvantaged one has one thing in one's favour: if one goes to the doctor one can get free medical treatment. All people who are unemployed and have dependants can lift up their heads every time they go to a doctor's surgery and say, "You are going to give me free medical treatment."

Let us now consider the confortable phrase "socially disadvantaged". They are the lucky people who, according to the Leader, will suffer least from the Budget. However, they do have a few things with which they must contend. Average studies by welfare agencies have shown that the unemployed, apart from suffering from a loss of self-esteem and finally becoming fatalistic about their capability of ever getting a job, face a financial impact that may mean living in poverty or a reduction in their standard of living. They suffer from deteriorating physical health and psychiatric illness, and either their intake of alcohol and drugs will increase or they will take up these things out on sheer desperation.

I now point to the kind of attitude that they will be facing, which is based on a six weeks period of unemployment; that period is normally regarded as a crisis point in an individual's physical and mental health.

At the moment the average period of unemployment has increased to 19½ weeks, with particular groups, usually of those people in the lower income groups, who bear the brunt of unemployment more than others. Turning to the point of order the member for Fisher raised regarding my speech in relation to the Budget and to the problems faced by the Elizabeth council, I point out that the same kind of thing happened in Mr. Howard's department when he tried to place a means test on paper boys and people who help in service stations who earn $6 a week. The Elizabeth city council admitted its mistake and Mr. Howard admitted his.

Unless this House supports the motion condemning the Federal Government for showing complete disregard for the plight of people seriously affected by unemployment and calls on the Federal Government to implement immediately, as a matter of extreme urgency, a "get Australia working again" programme, the situation in this State and this country can only get worse and we will have a complete breakdown in family stability and an increase in suicides and in crime and violence. It has been shown, especially in Victoria, that the rate of attempted suicides is in line with the rate of unemployment. Unless the Federal Government is made to see all the problems that unemployment is bringing to the people of Australia, all I can say is "God help Australia".

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith): I seek leave to amend the notice of motion standing in my name by adding after "South Australian Board of Advanced Education" the words "which it withdrew".

Leave granted.

Mr. BANNON: The amendment was necessary because, as the motion stands on the Notice Paper, it does not quite make sense. I am sure our friends opposite would have pointed out quickly that the motion as it originally stood called on the Commonwealth Government to restore its funding for reasons which show a total misunderstanding of their nature and function, and I did not want to be in that position. I now move:

> That this House calls upon the Commonwealth Government to restore its funding of post-secondary co-ordinating bodies such as the South Australian Board of Advanced Education which it withdrew for stated reasons that show a total misunderstanding of their nature and function. The decision was made public without any prior consultation with the States yet, by its very nature, it distorts the States' budgeting procedures. The House notes that this is yet another example of the Fraser Liberal Government's abdication of responsibility in the areas of health, education, and welfare.

I would like to analyse this motion in its component parts. The first part calls on the Commonwealth Government to restore its funding of post-secondary co-ordinating bodies such as the South Australian Board of Advanced Education. I do not think anyone in this House who knows anything about education, or in fact any area of Government, would reject the concept of co-ordination in Government services. In education and post-secondary education it is probably more important than in any other field, so the existence of bodies such as the South Australian Board of Advanced Education, which has responsibilities with which I will deal in a few minutes, is not called in question at all. We must have such a body. What we are really arguing about is whether or not the Commonwealth Government should fund it or contribute to its funding.

The financial implications of not having proper co-ordination are quite enormous. Wastage would be involved not only in the facilities provided but also in a way in which finance is disbursed amongst the various competing institutions that operate in the field. So, for all sorts of reasons, co-ordination is necessary; a body must exist to do this, and it must be funded.

The recent report of the Committee of Inquiry into Post-secondary Education, headed by Dr. Don Anderson, deals with this question of co-ordination in considerable detail. The report, I understand, is to be released today by the Minister of Education. Two chapters of the report have been circulated and widely discussed in recent months. What is being released now is the body of the report, which does not deal specifically with the institutions involved in post-secondary education but deals with wider questions such as co-ordination in that area. The Government has not adopted the recommendations of the report. I understand it is being circulated for comment among those involved and interested in this Bill. The report will provide a vital basis from which to look at the future of the co-ordinating arrangements in South Australia in the area of post-secondary education, which is the subject of this motion.

In the chapter headed "Present co-ordination" the committee of inquiry deals with institutions as they exist and their functions. It then goes on to look at the situation of post-secondary co-ordination in other States. Paragraph 29, under the heading "Post-secondary co-ordination in other States", states:

> As a result of the recommendations of the Martin Committee, there is provision in all States for the co-ordination of advanced education by a statutory authority. In Tasmania, where there is only one college of advanced education, the college council acts as the co-ordinating body for that State. In Victoria, there are two bodies for co-ordinating advanced education: the State College of Victoria for all the metropolitan teacher education colleges and the Victorian Institute of Colleges for the remaining colleges of advanced education. Both of these bodies have considerable powers in relation to their constituent colleges and the two systems are in a number of respects like multi-campus colleges. Elsewhere in Australia the co-ordination of advanced education is concerned mainly with providing the Commonwealth Government with advice on the financial needs of colleges and the approval and accreditation of courses.

Later, at paragraph 32, the report states:

> All States appear to be moving towards bringing all post-secondary education into a single system in which each sector retains its identity and in which the State and Federal agencies have complementary roles.

I draw particular attention to the section I quoted, in which reference is made to bodies in Australia as a whole being concerned mainly with providing the Commonwealth Government with advice on the financial needs of colleges.

There is the further statement that, while post-secondary education is moving towards a single system, it is doing so so that each sector retains its identity, but in which State and Federal agencies have complementary roles—the involvement again of Federal agencies should be stressed.

Taking a step backwards to the decision made by the Federal Government, it was announced to the Senate by the Commonwealth Minister for Education, Senator Carrick, on 9 June, dealing with the report of the Tertiary Education Commission, and under the heading, "Universities and colleges of advanced education", as follows:

> The Government has decided that from 1 January 1979 State co-ordinating authorities in advanced education should no longer be funded by the Commonwealth. This change will also apply to any new co-ordinating body in tertiary education established by a State. It is considered appropriate that the States themselves should finance their own operations in this respect.

It does not include just existing co-ordinating authorities, such as the Board of Advanced Education in South Australia. It goes on to the question of any new co-ordinating body, and it is significant that the Anderson Committee in South Australia has recommended the formation of just such a body: the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia (TEASA). The Government has under consideration the establishment of such an authority and the range of powers it will have. The Commonwealth decision by Senator Carrick anticipated that situation when he referred to the change applying to any new co-ordinating body in tertiary education.

In the motion, I have referred to the stated reasons given by the Federal Minister which show a total misunderstanding of the nature and function of co-ordinating bodies. The reasons are extremely scanty—just one sentence:

> It is considered appropriate that the States themselves should finance their own operations in this respect.

Trying to read some added meaning to that, one feels, perhaps, that Senator Carrick is saying that this co-ordinating role, as is presently carried out by the Board of

Advanced Education and which may in future be carried out by a tertiary education authority, is something which applies only at State level, to the State education system, and that it is therefore appropriate that the States should finance their own operations in this respect.

This is a total misunderstanding of the extremely vital role played by these co-ordinating bodies as agents and facilitators for Commonwealth education initiatives. As my quotation from the Anderson Committee pointed out, the role played by these bodies in relation to the Federal authorities is extremely important, but let us look in more detail at our own Board of Advanced Education. Under its Act, the powers and functions of the board are spelt out in section 14. The board, in the exercise and discharge of its powers and functions, shall collaborate, where it is appropriate to do so, with a series of institutions, including the Australian Commission of Advanced Education and the Australian Council on Awards and Advanced Education, the bodies in existence when the legislation was enacted.

It is quite clear that in promoting, developing and co-ordinating advanced education in this State, attention must be paid to its relationship with the Commonwealth Government and with the Commonwealth initiatives and Commonwealth funding of education. It is essential that the board should play a role as a co-ordinator, in concert with the Commonwealth Government, and that, far from simply dealing with some domestic co-ordination of education at the State level, the board is acting as an agency for the Federal Government, which makes the total co-ordination of education at this level feasible, inexpensive, and therefore, we would argue, it must attract Commonwealth funding and assistance.

If the Board of Advanced Education did not exist, the Commonwealth would have to deal directly with every college and institution at this level. There would be no gathering together at the State level of the various submissions, no evaluation on a State basis which could go in processed form to the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth would be in a position where it was making grants or looking at the accreditation of courses, or whatever other general overall role it would play, having to set up in each State a separate office with a separate function to do detailed investigations throughout the country, involving tremendous manpower and tremendous effort.

The logic of Senator Carrick's position on this is that the South Australian Government should wash its hands of the whole question of co-ordination in relation to colleges of advanced education and universities, bow right out of the field, and say to the Commonwealth, "You will not fund our board. Do it your way." The result would be great inefficiency. It would be bad for educational policy and practice, and it would be bad in purely financial terms. Senator Carrick seeks to say to us that really these co-ordinating bodies have no value at Commonwealth level, because he is not prepared to put money into them. It is unreasonable, and it is that sort of attitude that the motion seeks to attack. It is a petty attitude.

In terms of value for money, the boards of advanced education and their equivalents in other States return far more than the expenditure on them. The processing work they do, the co-ordination work, saves enormous time and effort. If it were done by the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth would have to put in considerably more resources than it does at present.

The South Australian Board of Advanced Education costs about $350 000 a year, and when that is set against the total expenditure on education in that sector in South Australia, one can clearly see that it is a drop in the bucket in the area of administrative arrangements.

Looking at the overall figures for co-ordinating arrangements, one finds in the various States that co-ordinating funds as a proportion of total funds expended and recurrent expenditure in this area amount to about 1 per cent in each instance. That is not very much for the sort of return in terms of efficiency that comes from this expenditure. It is, like many of the decisions taken by the Commonwealth Government in the recent Budget, a fairly petty saving of money. The big things, by and large, are left untouched. Small things, of the nature of the family allowance proposal which was removed and replaced by the news boy tax, or the tax on children's earnings, do not save much money but can cause considerable hardship and inefficiency, and it is on those things that the Commonwealth Government seems to have centred its budgetary policy. Those are prime examples. With the small amount of money spent, the Commonwealth is getting tremendous value at State level. In terms of the State Budget, it is a little more significant, and that is why we need this Commonwealth funding.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What's the ratio in South Australia?

Mr. BANNON: As I have it, 1·05 per cent is devoted to funding co-ordinated authorities. If the money is not to be provided by the Commonwealth (and, under its new federalism formula it says the State has more freedom to spend this money in the way in which it wants to), clearly one must look at the fundings of the Board of Advanced Education or any replacement for it and ask whether we can afford to do without it. The answer is that we cannot. We have to find the money from our State resources.

Bearing in mind the necessity to provide that facility in education administration and its important role in the Commonwealth, if the Commonwealth is not to make direct grants in this area surely it can raise our general revenue sufficiently to cover it. This could be said, too, of so many other areas. Consider the way the decision was taken. The first news the States had of it was when Senator Carrick made his announcement on 9 June. The strength of the reasons he gave was the one sentence I have quoted. There was absolutely no examination by the Federal Government and consultation with its State counterparts on what effect this move would have on their education financing and what effect it would have on the administration of education. It is not only a petty decision; it is also an inefficient decision, taken without consultation and without good reason.

The last part of this motion refers to this decision as being an example of the Fraser Government's abdication of responsibility in the areas of health, education and welfare. There are so many examples of programmes which have been undertaken by the State on a co-operative or partnership basis with the Commonwealth, dependent on that Federal input, and which are now in jeopardy because one of the contracting partners, the Federal Government, has unilaterally withdrawn from the agreements. This situation of funding of the Board of Advanced Education or its equivalent is one example. Another example is the breaking of all the promises on the pre-school programme. The State was encouraged by the Federal Government to embark on an ambitious pre-school programme, and it has now been told the money is not available and that we will have to find it ourselves. That puts the State in a hopeless dilemma. The member for Newland covered that situation in great detail and extremely effectively in his contribution last week.

Another example which is close to home and which touches on that final part of the motion concerns the funding for The Parks Community Centre. When that centre was established, an agreement was reached

between the Federal and State Governments as to joint funding of aspects of the project. The Commonwealth Government was particularly interested in the recreational facilities and in some of the sporting facilities provided. The agreement provided that the Commonwealth contribution to capital works should not exceed $3 196 000, unless otherwise agreed. At the time, certainly a fixed sum was stipulated, but that fixed sum was related, first, to the total cost of the project, and secondly to those specific aspects of the project in which the Commonwealth was interested. In the nature of any such project costs have escalated. Some of the calculations made at the time the project began as to what was needed in the way of furniture and other facilities have proved inaccurate. The result is that the project will cost millions of dollars more than was envisaged. It seems quite reasonable, particularly as those costs have increased not through wastage or inefficiency but purely because of increasing costs generally (the effect on inflation and the effect of finding that certain practical estimates have not proved to be sufficient), for the State Government in those circumstances in the terms of this agreement to approach the Commonwealth to see if it would agree to raise its share of the expenditure to maintain it at the proportion of the total expenditure that it had agreed to originally.

Accordingly the Minister of Education wrote to the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development, who has these community centres under his charge, to see whether or not he would agree to such an increase. The answer, I guess, is predictable. In a letter to the Minister of Education, Mr. Groom said:

> I have taken careful note of your comments on the significance of the project, the difficulties facing the South Australian Government as a result of the substantial cost-escalation on the centre, and the degree to which my department has been kept fully involved with the progress of this important development.
>
> The intergovernmental agreement on the Parks Centre provided that the Commonwealth contribution for capital works should not exceed $3 196 000, unless otherwise agreed; no provision was made for recurrent expenditure. These arrangements are consistent with the Government's policy, in the present economic situation, to limit specific purpose community assistance programmes to existing commitments only. Accordingly, I regret that I cannot agree to an increase in the level of Commonwealth assistance to the Parks project for either capital or recurrent purposes.

That sort of letter is being written almost daily by just about every Commonwealth Minister to his State counterpart, and the statement made, that in the present economic situation the Federal Government is limiting specific purpose community assistance programmes to existing commitments only, can mean in effect that those community assistance programmes that were embarked on as a joint venture between the States and the Commonwealth just will not be completed or will have to be abandoned because the Commonwealth is not meeting the increased commitments arising out of those programmes. It is very simple for the Commonwealth to stand pat and say its original agreement was $3 196 000 for The Parks and that it is not prepared to increase that sum, without recognising that that might mean that buildings already under construction might have to be stopped in a part-finished state (and that is enormously wasteful) or, alternatively, if they are finished, they will not be able to be staffed, in which case they will be put into mothballs. Again, that is enormously wasteful.

The whole of the argument made by the Commonwealth revolves around the question of value for money and the present economic situation requiring such value for money, and yet actions such as this in relation to The Parks and such as the substantive matter contained in the motion, the funding of the Board of Advanced Education, will result clearly in great financial distress to the States as we try to find the money to make up the shortfall and ensure that the buildings are completed and the organisations kept operating. It will also result in financial waste and loss of the kind the Commonwealth is supposedly so keen to avoid. It does not make sense that the Commonwealth should be behaving in this petty way over a wide range of programmes. Supposedly acting in the interest of efficiency, it is in fact actively encouraging and creating gross inefficiencies in this case in the post-secondary co-ordination area.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): If there was an argument several weeks ago on this question, it surely must have changed considerably in light of two things that have happened today. First, we note that at last the member who moved the motion recognised that his original motion contained an important grammatical error, which in fact reversed the whole tenor of what he was going to say, and to have debated the motion that is on the Notice Paper would have made a laughing stock of this House. However, the Opposition does take some credit for not having opposed the change to the motion as we had every right to do, so that now at least the motion reads as the member wishes it to read.

The second, more important thing happened during Question Time today when the importance of this motion clearly dribbled away to nothing. We are arguing about $350 000. In a question today the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry asked the Premier to comment on overspending of Budget estimates. The estimate for water supply and sewerage, was overspent by $6 000 000, and the estimate for education, science, art and research was overspent by $14 000 000. These statistics are from the State Treasury release earlier this year. Medical, health and recreation was overspent by $9 000 000, and debt services interest was overspent by $5 000 000. When we put the whole argument of the motion in its true perspective against a State education budget of over $300 000 000, against a Federal education budget of over $2 500 000 000, and against a total State Budget of about $1 100 000 000, $350 000, essential though it may be to the State's well being, is still a relatively small sum to quibble about.

Mr. Bannon: You agree about its being petty.

Mr. ALLISON: I agree that it is being petty. I was going to transfer the pettiness from the Federal Government to the members of this House. The motion was introduced some weeks ago in anticipation of a rather harsh Budget, but at no time have we been promised anything other than that. So, it did not come as a surprise. Knowing that we were faced with a harsh Budget, and that we would have to cut our cloth considerably if we were to be reasonably dressed after it, the Government finds it difficult to come up with motions concerning education that have much substance in them. This is the second motion in two weeks in which we have been quibbling over a relatively minor sum, and I pointed that out last week during a similar debate on childhood services. If the Government is finding it difficult to pin down major issues from a harsh Budget, one can only conclude that the matters before us are petty and quibbling.

We have been told that the expenditure on the Board of Advanced Education, which is in itself out-dated now in the light of the Anderson Committee report, is important. I would like to think that the Government will continue to fund the Board of Advanced Education in its present form

or in its new form, irrespective of whether the Federal Government allocates a trifling amount out of that massive Budget towards it, because it will be important.

Although the mover suggested that it had been important, I would raise one or two doubts about that. In saying that the board has been doing such a magnificent job, let us bear in mind that the Federal Government may have some doubts, when we look around the whole length and breadth of Australia and find that over the past 10 years we have managed to build 26 colleges of advanced education too many. Moreover, we have already in Australia at college level and at university level considerable duplication of courses, something these boards were essentially there to prevent. Universities and colleges, in that burgeoning period when they thought that the bounty would never end, went ahead and competed for students and courses, and provided for courses for staff who were appointed, and generally went mad.

There has to be some restraint, and I cannot see that the boards of advanced education really contributed greatly towards slowing down that mad progress in the early to mid-1970's. We find in South Australia, too, that we have a question of accreditation and standardisation of courses. Only a few days ago, I had the case of a young man who wanted to join the Australian Armed Services on an officer training course at Duntroon, and I found that South Australia's Matriculation standard was inadequate to get him accepted, for the simple reason that South Australians have been permitted to matriculate and qualify for university and college entrance without English. The Army is not as silly as to admit people without some recognised standard in English. The Army wants a pass in English at Matriculation level so that their officers (and, I suggest, this applies to our university students, too) might communicate adequately when they are studying. There is no doubt that many university professors and academics across the length and breadth of Australia have already decried the relatively low standards in English communication among entrants, even in those States where English is a prerequisite.

Dr. Eastick: Regrettably, some of them are in the same boat.

Mr. ALLISON: I agree; it is an overall problem. South Australia has accepted this lesser standard than applies in other Australian universities.

In addition, we have chapters 9 and 10 of the Anderson committee report quoted to the House today. I am also questioning whether the South Australian Board of Advanced Education has not to some extent been a rubber-stamping machine for the Minister, because the matter contained in the Anderson Committee Report is closely related to the kite-flying Board of Advanced Education release of last year. I am sure that this was a Ministerial impression put forward to the board and, therefore, through to the Anderson Committee, which has come forward finally for this Parliament to make some decision on. Denials were made when the board's report was released that it was anything to do with the Minister. The outcome of the Anderson Committee Report indicates clearly where most consideration was given, and that was to the recommendations of the Board of Advanced Education.

To what extent has the board in the past justified the expenditure of considerable sums of money? We hope that the future board, or the T.E.A.S.A., which may be formed after the Anderson Committee Report has been studied, will function more effectively to do what the honourable member implied that it had already been doing.

The tenor of the honourable member's remarks was addressed largely to the matter of the Board of Advanced Education. The terms of his motion are wider. The motion seeks to be all embracing, since it asks the House to note that this is yet another example of the Fraser Liberal Government's abdication of responsibility in the areas of health, education and welfare. I believe that other Opposition members will debate more effectively the issues of health and welfare, but I mention in passing that I believe that the conversion of the Medibank scheme, back to a scheme where the Federal Government is now responsible for the first 40 per cent of the cost, is more closely allied to the Medibank concept introduced by the Whitlam Government. It is interesting to note that the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition, in his shadow Budget, also left that factor in. So, he has not seen fit to attack that particular section of the Medibank change.

That change will give patients 75 per cent of the doctor's fee. Let us remember that doctors in the past, before Medibank, at least in my district (and I give them great credit for this), used to treat pensioners free of charge. This represented a large portion of their annual turnover of patients. Medibank has changed all that, thus throwing a greater burden on the public purse and reimbursing the medical practitioners for what they had previously been doing out of the kindness of their hearts.

The same Medibank scheme will now give the patients rights to extended Medibank treatment in hospitals, without paying any charges. Here again, we have the Government trying to blow up the issue, but failing miserably, because the scheme, as put forward by the Federal Government, is much closer to the original Medibank scheme that the Labor Party so strongly espoused and for which it was so critical of the Federal Government for changing.

Mr. Tonkin: They've tried to take attention away from their own mismanagement of the State.

Mr. ALLISON: Exactly. This point has been made time and time again: when the State Government is in a time of crisis, it flails around, picks small issues out of the air, and blows them up out of all proportion in an attempt to take the heat off its own mismanagement of the State's finances.

Many questions will be asked during the State Budget debate about where quite considerable sums of money have gone. Attention will certainly be brought back to the spot where it belongs. There is nothing in this motion that says that the piddling sum of $350 000 will distort (and that is the word used here) the State's budgeting procedures, because only today the Premier stood before this House and said that no Government was in a position to allocate money as finely and precisely as that. "That" was referring to many millions of dollars. I am sure the Premier would agree that $350 000 is minor in either State or Federal budgeting.

At no stage have I heard members opposite draw attention to the fact that the Insitute of Teachers has put forward a 20 per cent ambit claim for an increase of salaries, which alone would have added $50 000 000 a year to the State's education expenditure. They are the really significant sums about which we should be talking and to which we should be drawing the attention of unionists, trade union leaders, Parliamentarians, and the public, but we are not doing that. Instead, we are quibbling over relatively small sums in an attempt to denigrate the work of a Federal Government, which inherited a vast deficit, a deficit that Australia should never have entered into, a deficit which the Federal Prime Minister of the day, Mr. Whitlam, acknowledged was too large and about which he said he would have gone much more slowly had he had his time over again.

We are being asked to spend our way out of difficulty. Again I draw the attention of the House to a matter that I have raised before. The former Federal Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, in an interview with Mike Walsh, was asked "Would you spend more money on education?" He replied (and I quoted the reply previously and it is in *Hansard)* to the effect, "No, I would not necessarily spend more money but I am not going to say exactly where the money should be spent." In effect, he was prepared to see some transfer of the education budget from one sector of education to another. That is precisely what has been done to a small extent by the Fraser Government. It has built some element of stability into the education budget.

Senator Carrick has undertaken to increase expenditure this year. The overall increase this year will be about 6 per cent, and he has undertaken in triennial funding for primary, secondary and tertiary education to increase the real allocation by at least 1 per cent. Built into this year's Federal Budget, as a statement of good faith, is an extra $45 000 000 simply to allow for escalation on recurrent costs. Again there has been some nit-picking by the Government saying, "Yes, wages have escalated but there is no escalation for capital costs." Let us consider capital costs.

The escalation for which the Federal Government allows is simply an escalation that allows for an increase in costs. During the current year, are we really expecting a massive increase in building costs? If members opposite were as aware of what was happening in the building industry as they should be, they would realise that the State Government is guilty of asking tenderers to put in a pegged price without an escalation clause so that wherever possible that tenderer will get the contract. This is a move by both State and Federal Governments to peg costs in the building industry, costs that have been rising at a rapid rate.

The escalation that one might have expected from the Federal Government is small for capital expenditure compared with the escalation that has come forward in wages and salaries. What proportion are we considering? On education, 85 per cent of the expenditure is in the form of salaries. The major expenditure is well and truly covered. The value of the dollar will remain constant. The sum of $45 000 000 has been set aside for escalation, and therefore the State will not suffer unduly. That is far more important to this State, which overspent in education by, I think, $11 000 000 last year. The sum of $350 000 about which we are talking for the Board of Advanced Education pales into insignificance by comparison. I suspect that the State Government is a little disappointed that it has not had more important issues to debate following the release of the Federal Budget.

I draw attention to the statement made by the Premier, when he was referring to the expenditure for health, which is one of the items included in this motion. He said, "Yes, there has been some cut in school dental services." The Premier, in a press release dated 15 August, was replying to the Federal Government Budget, and said:

> South Australia's school dental scheme has been cut by almost $2 000 000 compared with 1977-78.

That is correct, but the sum asked for by the State Government was only $800 000 more than was allocated by the Federal Government. The Premier further stated:

> The national cut is 20·3 per cent compared with 35·5 per cent for South Australia.

South Australia asked for $4 410 000 for school dental treatment and received $3 680 000, the actual cut therefore being not 35·5 per cent but 17·48 per cent. That was a deliberate manipulation of the facts, something at which the Premier is extremely adept and on which he can be pulled up only if someone goes away to do his homework to ascertain what occurred. I am sure that, among the other claims of the Premier, similar overstatements would have been made of the harm that would occur to South Australia. I do not just suspect it; I am sure of it, because the Premier said that he was not going to increase State taxes. Perhaps we are not in the dire straits that the Premier predicted when he made that statement after the Federal Budget.

The criticism of the Federal Government completely ignores the good things that have emerged from the Budget. I assume that the statement "The House notes that this is yet another example of the Fraser Liberal Government's abdication of responsibility in the areas of health, education and welfare" was so sweeping that it must embrace the whole of the Federal Government, and the whole of Australia rather than just dwelling on South Australia's problems, which are relatively minor. What really happened? The motion completely ignores the fact that in the critical area of unemployment the Federal Government has made additional sums (considerably larger for the "sweet pea" scheme and the E.P.U.Y. scheme) available in the hope that employers will take advantage of the schemes. I suggest that if employers have not taken advantage of the schemes it may be because members on both sides of the House have not drawn employers' attention to the fact that these funds are available. The funds have not been applied for at the same rate that the Federal Government thought they might be.

Mr. Bannon: How much did they increase the E.P.U.Y. by?

Mr. ALLISON: The amount was increased from $2 000 000 to $3 600 000 (I think those figures are fairly accurate). That is an increase of about 75 per cent. That is only one part of the Federal Government's increase to assist young people leaving school. The increase in the technical and further education field, where we might get young people trained for jobs, is quite considerable. Across the whole of Australia it amounts to an additional $41 400 000, an increase of about 19½ per cent. Compared to the previous year's increase of only 9 per cent, that is quite a significant step forward.

I consider that the matter falls into three sections: the mental health, education, and welfare of young people. If money is spent on unemployment relief schemes and technical and further education to get the unemployed young or old people retrained for a more suitable profession (and there is a shortage of skilled people in Australia) all the more power to the Federal Government if it is looking to that part of human endeavour constructively. I suggest that that is something we should be doing in this State, just as much as the Federal Government is doing it, because small amounts of money are committed in the State Budget at present for such things as link courses between secondary and further education. Lip service has been paid to the idea for three years, but so far very few of these link schemes have been put into operation.

To blame the Federal Government for that sort of thing is quite specious and airy fairy, because the real problem is found at the grass roots level. Children have not been able to enter into apprenticeships because fewer apprenticeships have been available. Many children wishing to enter into apprenticeships have not been able to meet the increasingly high standards required. In addition, unionists themselves seem to be increasingly protective about letting children enter into work participation schemes, so much so that a directive was sent by our State Minister through the trade unions, which agreed with the scheme, that if students worked for longer than one day in

job participation they were considered to be productive. If a person told any employer that one of his apprentices would be productive after one day, he would soon put him in his place. That is the extent to which unions have prevented young people from gaining work experience. I have only touched on many of the subjects I could go into. I therefore seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

HEALTH ACT

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I move:

> That the regulations under the Health Act, 1935-1976 relating to the pasteurising and packing of milk at Port Pirie, made on 4 May 1978 and laid on the table of this House on 13 July 1978, be disallowed.

I move this motion for many reasons. Port Pirie has a city council and a district council. A city council by-law seeks to prohibit the sale of scalded cream in the city area. Across the road, in the Port Pirie district council area, scalded cream will continue to be sold to the public. Press reports state that farm cream has been available to the people of Port Pirie for almost a century without causing any known health problems. The report states further that people prefer farm cream to the thin product of milk processors.

The sale of farm cream has been an avenue whereby many primary producers in the hundred of Port Pirie have been able to exist. Many farmers have come through three years of drought and now, with the tide turning, this imposition is being placed on them. Press reports about this issue at Port Pirie which appeared in the *Advertiser* and the *Recorder* made interesting reading. It seems that the corporation has mixed views as to what the procedure should be in moving this by-law and regulation. A report in the *Advertiser* headed "2 288 sour on Pirie cream ban" states:

> A petition with 2 288 signatures protesting at a ban on farm cream sales has been presented to the Port Pirie local board of health.

The report also states:

> Councillor F. R. Smith presented another petition from 14 farm cream producers in the Pirie district council area.

One can see that there is much dissatisfaction about the whole matter, which relates to a situation that has existed for almost 100 years.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the member for Rocky River in the action he has taken on behalf of the primary producers and the suppliers of cream at Port Pirie. The honourable member has pointed out that this practice has gone on for 100 years, which is a long time. Dairy farmers have had a hard time in the Port Pirie area. One does not have to go far from the seafront to find this productivity, which may be by State comparisons a small thing but which is an important thing to the people of the district that the honourable member represents.

The honourable member does not move this disallowance lightly; he has looked at the matter in great depth. I do not know why members on the other side are laughing, because making a study in great depth is commendable. I am sure that the people in Port Pirie know that, if this regulation is not disallowed, it will upset the equilibrium. A number of those people are represented by the member for Stuart. I am sure that he, too, would not want to see these people disadvantaged. I know that he lauds the member for Rocky River for the steps he has taken to see to it that the *status quo* is maintained and that the people who have enjoyed this practice over the years will continue to do so. I commend the honourable member for bringing the matter forward, and I support his motion.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): It is interesting that the member for Victoria suggests that I would be supporting the member for Rocky River on this or any other subject. The member for Rocky River is apt to quote in this House some of my statements made in other places.

Mr. Tonkin: To great effect.

Mr. KENEALLY: I guess that he quotes them accurately. I do not know that he gets the sort of mileage out of them that he seeks. However, I must take up one point made by the member for Victoria, who said that the member for Rocky River has not introduced this matter lightly. I suggest that that is the same attitude as that adopted by the Port Pirie council when it sought the implementation of the regulation to which disallowance has been moved. The Port Pirie council knew that it was a difficult decision to make. Many people were customers of the primary producers referred to. The member for Rocky River seeks to defend and protect the interests of those who sell cream in Port Pirie. My interest in this matter is to protect the health of the people who buy the cream, and the very best evidence available to the Port Pirie council had been that there are some dangers in selling cream that has not been treated correctly.

Mr. Tonkin: But—

Mr. KENEALLY: The Leader seems to suggest that the council has not done that, or that there are no dangers in the cream. I suspect that his expertise in this matter is no greater than is mine. I am prepared to accept the evidence of the experts. They have supported the action taken by the Port Pirie council; in fact, they recommended the action taken.

So that I will be better prepared to inform the House on all matters surrounding this very contentious subject (and there are views on both sides), and so that I can present the reasons why the Port Pirie council sought this regulation, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SALES TAX REDUCTION

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I move:

> That this House congratulates the Commonwealth Government on the significant reduction in sales tax on Australian manufactured cars and station waggons, which action will provide great benefit for the industry in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: I am delighted to think that Government members find this motion cause to laugh and smile, knowing that the Federal Government is doing something for the benefit of the motor car manufacturing industry.

Mr. Tonkin: Grandstanding—

Mr. BECKER: In the plans they made, two months before the Budget was announced, to have these disruptive meetings, they did not gamble on the fact that the Federal Government would prove that it was good at housekeeping and could offer rewards and incentives to industry. A summary of the Budget in relation to manufacturing industry and what the Federal Government aims to do and how it has arrived at its decision shows the following aims:

> The Government regards its continuing attack on inflation as being crucial to the maintenance of business confidence and the thrust towards lower interest rates. A strong and profitable private sector is the best method of creating wealth and prosperity for Australia, and employment opportunities for Australians.

Mr. Slater: Who said that?

Mr. BECKER: It is a report of the summary of the Federal Budget. This is the point I want Government members to bear in mind: having a strong and profitable private sector is the best method of creating wealth and prosperity for Australia and employment opportunities for Australians.

Mr. Groom: Who told you that?

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member cannot understand this sort of philosophy or the benefits offered to the car industry in South Australia, as the Federal Government has done, to try to create employment. The member for Morphett should be the last member in this place to be critical of this statement. He and I share Mooringe Avenue as a common boundary in our electoral districts. On my side is the firm of Castalloy, which is greatly dependent on the car industry, and the number of employees has been reduced dramatically over the past four or five years. The company has been forced to look overseas, and register companies and subsidiaries in Hong Kong. If the position further deteriorates in this State, we will lose Castalloy to one of the Asian countries. The Federal Government is trying to do something to retain that company in my district and to provide employment for the constituents of my district and that of the member for Morphett. The summary continues:

> This Budget underlines the Government's commitment to build on achievements already gained. Consistent with the Government's desire to assist and promote economic recovery, no new taxes or tax increases have been imposed on the business community.

The Federal Government is trying to promote growth. The real growth of both manufacturing and primary industries will be promoted by the Budget. The summary continues:

> It is anticipated that with a return to more seasonal conditions there will be a significant recovery in farm production and income.

The Budget summary in relation to manufacturing and other industry assistance makes the following points:

> This Budget further demonstrates the Government's continued support for Australia's manufacturing industry. The Government has shown that it has pursued a course of sound economic management. Inflation has been significantly reduced, and a further reduction will remain the Government's top priority. The policies incorporated in the Budget, together with measures introduced in the recent past, such as the new export incentive grant scheme and the Australian Overseas Projects Corporation will encourage further investment, inventiveness, production and international competitiveness. There has been no increase in company tax.
>
> There has been no increase in sales tax. A 12·5 per cent customs duty has been imposed on imports of certain finished goods subject to tariff quota and import licensing controls.

Dr. Eastick: That includes imported brandy.

Mr. BECKER: That is right.

Dr. Eastick: The variation between imported and local brandy is about $1·50 a bottle.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. The Budget summary continues:

> The Motor Industry: In recognition of the vital importance of the motor vehicle industry to the national economy the Government has decided to reduce the rate of sales tax on motor cars and station wagons from 27·5 per cent to 15 per cent an annual cost to revenue of $200 000 000. (This represents a saving of $530 on a domestically-produced car costing $7 000.) The proposals outlined in the 1978-79 Budget indicate the Government's commitment to a policy of further developing a thriving and prosperous manufacturing sector.

The reduced sales tax means that on a Holden Kingswood SL sedan a saving of $531 will be effected, whilst on a Chrysler Valiant the saving wil be $517. It is significant that not many members of this House drive Holdens or Valiants. I drive an Australian car, and I wish the majority of members in this House would do the same.

I am concerned about the position taken by the State Government for stamp duty on the purchase of a new car. Whilst the Federal Government is giving a lead with the benefit of reduced sales tax, over the years the South Australian Government has capitalised on stamp duty on new cars. That duty is assessed not on the price the new owner pays but on the recommended purchase price. Here again, there is conflict between the retailers and the Government. We believe that new vehicle purchasers in this State are being ripped off by having to pay stamp duty on the recommended retail price of a new vehicle. If the dealer is prepared to work out a deal or if he offers a discount, a commission, or a considerable trade-in, the purchaser does not get the benefit. He must pay stamp duty on the full price.

Mr. Slater: There's a reason for that.

Mr. BECKER: There is no reason at all. There is little incentive for the average worker to buy a new motor vehicle. The State Government makes it quite difficult.

Mr. Groom: Where did you buy your car?

Mr. BECKER: From Chrysler. The State Government makes it difficult for the average worker to buy a car on terms equal to those available in other States. In Tasmania, the stamp duty on a Holden Kingswood SL is $97·50; in New South Wales, it is $130; in Victoria, it is $165; in Western Australia, it is $49·50; in Queensland it is $65; and in South Australia, it is $200. We are thus $35 worse off than the Victorians, and about $150 worse off than Western Australia and Queensland. If a person happens to be a Chrysler fan, as I am, and own a Valiant, in Tasmania, the stamp duty is $94·50; in New South Wales, it is $126; in Victoria, it is $160; in Western Australia, it is $48; in Queensland, it is $63; and in South Australia, it is $192. So, again, the average worker in South Australia is considerably disadvantaged compared to his counterpart in Queensland or Western Australia—anything up to about $150 added to the price of the vehicle. If a person is fortunate enough to live and work in the Australian Capital Territory, he is subject to only a $25 surcharge, thus benefiting by at least $175.

All of this must be considered, when we are trying to do our best to create employment and opportunities for South Australian manufacturers to produce in this State and to sell in this State, as well as in other States. We want to retain the motor vehicle manufacturing industry, but we will be unable to do so if the State Government does not play its part. It is all very well to blame the Federal Government for making it difficult but, at the same time, we have to bear in mind that the State Government must play its part as well, and stamp duty is an area in which the State receives a considerable sum.

I think that stamp duty is the second highest tax-raising revenue item in the State Budget. There is room to move, if the State Government wants to move. At present, over 45 000 South Australians are relying on the moter vehicle industry for their jobs. If the Government is genuine about its concern for employment (as I am), we must do all we can to assist this industry and all the associated industries and suppliers, particularly the small businessmen allied with the motor vehicle industry.

I have been informed that the estimated financial assistance to the manufacturing industry will amount to $437 000 000 this financial year, not including the benefits of the $200 000 000 a year reduction in sales tax on passenger motor vehicles; this represents a 130 per cent

increase over the levels of assistance in 1975-76. As I am awaiting additional information from Canberra, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.]

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The extended drought that we have experienced in this State over the past few years has highlighted the need to institute vigorous programmes of soil conservation in order to protect our agricultural industries. The present Soil Conservation Act contains many of the necessary controls, but the application of the Act is dependent on the creation of soil conservation districts. The present mechanism for creating such districts is cumbersome and unwieldy.

At present, soil conservation districts are created at the request of occupiers of land in a given area, who may petition the Minister to constitute that area a soil conservation district. The petition must be signed by three-fifths of the occupiers of the proposed district. If this condition can be met, the petition is referred in due course to the Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation appointed under the Act. The committee, in turn, is empowered to recommend that the area which is the subject of the petition, or another area, be declared a soil conservation district, and, provided that three-fifths of the occupiers of land in the recommended area consent, the Governor may then declare the area to be a soil conservation district.

In districts which contain a large number of small landholders, it has proved difficult in the past to obtain the consent of the required three-fifths; this difficulty arises not so much from opposition of the landholders, as from the difficulty in ascertaining exactly who are the potential petitioners within a given area. It is proposed that the procedure be modified, first, to place initiative for the creation of soil conservation districts more directly in the hands of the Minister and, secondly, to enable the Minister to obtain consent to soil conservation proposals through local government bodies, as well as by direct reference to the landholders.

The Bill also provides for registration of orders requiring the preservation of vegetation. At present such orders are binding only on the owners and occupiers of the land as at the time of the making of the order. Thus, if there is a change of ownership or occupation, the successor in title, or the subsequent occupier, may ignore the order with impunity. The Bill provides that where the order is registered it is to be binding not only upon the original owner and occupier but also upon their successors. The Bill also increases the penalties prescribed by the principal Act. The increase is necessary in view of the decline in the value of money since the penalties were originally fixed. It also facilitates proof of service of notices under the principal Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts definitions of "council" and "local government area" in section 2 of the principal Act. The former means a municipal or district council within the meaning of the Local Government Act, 1934-1978, and includes a body corporate vested with the powers of a municipal or district council. The latter means the whole or a part of a municipality or district as defined in the Local Government Act and includes the whole or any part of an area in relation to which a body corporate is vested with the powers of a municipality or district council. These definitions are made necessary by the new procedures for creating soil conservation districts discussed above.

Clause 4 removes an obsolete reference to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925, in section 3 of the principal Act, and substitutes a reference to the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972. Clause 5 deletes subsection (4a) of section 4 of the principal Act. This subsection became obsolete in 1946. A reference to the old Public Service Act of 1936 is also amended. Clause 6 repeals sections 6a, 6b and 6c of the principal Act and enacts, in substitution, a new section 6a. This amendment establishes the new procedure for creating soil conservation districts. Under the new section, the Governor is empowered to constitute, divide or abolish a soil conservation district on the recommendation of the Minister. The Minister's recommendation must be supported by the Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation, and, in addition, be approved by either the council or councils of the area in question or a majority of the owners or occupiers. Where the approval of the owners or occupiers is sought, provision is made for the Minister to conduct a poll.

Clause 7 effects an amendment to section 6d of the principal Act consequential on the amendments to sections 2 and 6a. Clause 8 amends section 6h of the principal Act, which relates to the powers of district soil conservation boards to secure evidence. This is the first of several penalty provisions in the principal Act in which the amount of the penalty is converted to decimal currency and increased, in this case, from the equivalent of $100 to $500. A reference to the old Public Service Act of 1936 is also amended. Clause 9 amends the penalty provisions of section 6j of the principal Act, which creates an offence of causing sand to drift from one area of land to another. The penalty of £50 is increased to $500.

Clause 10 amends section 7 of the principal Act which sets out certain powers of entry upon land. The penalty of £50 is increased to $500 and reference to the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972, is substituted for reference to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925. Clauses 11, 12 and 13 amend the penalty provisions of sections 9, 12 and 12a, respectively, of the principal Act. These in turn relate to the power to declare soil conservation reserves, the control of roads and stock routes and notice of intention to clear land. In section 9, a penalty of £50 is increased to $500, and in the case of the other sections a penalty of £100 is increased to $1 000.

Clause 14 amends section 13 of the principal Act, which provides for the protection of trees and other plants. The penalties prescribed by this section are increased to

$1 000. In addition, new subsections numbered (8), (9) and (10) are enacted providing that orders for the protection of trees and other plants are to be registrable upon the titles to the relevant land and thereupon become binding on successors in title to, or subsequent occupiers of, that land. Clause 15 effects essentially formal amendments to section 13h of the principal Act. This section provides that soil conservation orders shall be registrable and binding on successors in title to the land which is the subject of the order. This amendment brings section 13h into conformity with the new provisions enacted by clause 14.

Clause 16 amends section 13j of the principal Act, which deals with the enforcement of orders. The penalties are increased to $1 000. Clause 17 amends section 13k of the principal Act, which provides that fines resulting from contraventions of soil conservation orders, and expenses incurred by the committee in the carrying out of works specified in an order, shall be a charge on the relevant land. The section also provides that interest fixed by the committee and approved by the Minister at a rate not exceeding 4 per cent a year shall accrue on the amount owing in respect of such charges. This amendment removes the percentage limitation, which is considered to be both inflexible and out ot touch with prevailing monetary values.

Clause 18 enacts a new subsection (3) to section 17 of the principal Act. This subsection provides that a statement in writing under the hand of an officer of the Public Service certifying that a notice or order has been duly served for the purposes of the Act shall, if tendered in legal proceedings, be evidence of service, in the absence of proof to the contrary. As section 17 presently stands, it is necessary to call the person who actually served the notice or order. This has proved inconvenient at times, and, in at least one instance, impossible. Clause 19 increases the penalty that may be imposed by regulation from £50 to $500.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (AGRICULTURE) BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill removes obsolete references to the "Department of Agriculture", and the "Minister of Agriculture" from various Acts. The amendments are formed in such a way as to avoid reference to a specified Minister or a specified department. This should avoid the need for further statutory amendment as a result of any further changes in nomenclature.

Part I is formal. Part II amends the Agricultural Chemicals Act. The definition of "Minister" is removed. The result of this amendment is that references to the "Minister" in the principal Act will be interpreted in accordance with the definition contained in the Acts Interpretation Act. Section 27 of the Act is also amended. This provides for the results of analysis carried out in pursuance of the Act to be published in the *Journal of the Department of Agriculture of South Australia* or in such other manner as the Minister thinks fit. The reference to the *Journal of the Department of Agriculture* is removed by the amendment.

Part III amends the Artificial Breeding Act. The definition of "Minister" is removed. Section 24, which provides that the Artificial Breeding Board is to have access to the herd production records of the Agriculture Department, is amended. The specific reference is removed and replaced by a general provision requiring the Minister to make available to the board such records as it reasonably requires for carrying out its functions. Part IV amends the Fruit Fly Act. The amendments relate simply to references to the Minister of Agriculture and an officer of the Agriculture Department.

Parts V, VI and VII make parallel amendments to the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act, the Red Scale Control Act and the San Jose Scale Control Act. Here again, obsolete references to the Agriculture Department are removed. Part VIII amends the Stock Medicines Act by removing obsolete references from section 11, which relates to the contents of labels that may be attached to packages of stock medicines. Part IX amends the Swine Compensation Act. A reference to research undertaken at any pig industry research unit conducted by the Agriculture Department is recast in rather more general terms.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 663.)

Clause 2—"Powers of inspectors."

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported, an amendment was to be moved by the member for Victoria. However, we had at that stage passed the line to which the honourable member wished to move his amendment, the Minister having already moved an amendment to a later line. To enable the member for Victoria to move his amendment, progress was reported. I therefore ask the Minister to withdraw his amendment so that the Committee can revert to the earlier line to enable the member for Victoria to move his amendment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I seek leave temporarily to withdraw my amendment to lines 12 to 15 to enable the member for Victoria to move his amendment to line 10.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr. RODDA: I move:

Page 1, line 10—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

(*a*) by striking out subsection (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(2) Where an inspector proposes to carry out an inspection under this section, he shall, before entering the land on which he proposes to carry out the inspection, give reasonable notice, orally or in writing, to the occupier of the land of his intention to carry out the inspection.

I express the Opposition's thanks to the Minister for the courtesy he has extended to enable me to move this amendment. We are indeed grateful for his consideration. My amendment is moved in the interests not only of the industry but also of the inspectors involved. Inspections may have to be made in remote areas, and it may not be

possible for an inspector to find the manager or his agent at home. The Opposition agrees that there is a need to ensure that accommodation is suitable for shearers to enable them to live decently. As the amendment improves the Bill, I hope the Minister will accept it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I support what my colleague has said. It has been the Opposition's desire to ensure that proper facilities are provided for the work force in the shearing industry. It has been, and should continue to be, recognised by the House that the Opposition has from time to time been reluctant to accept the proposals put forward by respective Ministers in relation to demands in this direction when they have been, in the Opposition's view, more than is reasonable for these employees, bearing in mind the short-term nature of the work involved. However, bearing in mind the right of entry and the need for reasonable warning to be given of intention to enter, and as the matter has been fully canvassed previously, I support this amendment.

This involves more than a warning to the grower, his manager or agent that an officer of the department or union concerned is seeking entry. It involves a matter of courtesy, so that a person intending to enter a property for inspection purposes should give fair warning of his intention so to do.

When this matter was canvassed previously, it was suggested that it might not be practical for an accommodation or hut inspector to give such notice of his intention to do so, and that perhaps in the far outback there was no opportunity to communicate. However, that argument was not at the time, nor is it now, acceptable to the Opposition. The lines of communication available to inspectors are wide and varied, and on that basis the amendment is reasonable. I therefore hope that the Government will accept it so that warning of intention to enter is given in a proper and courteous manner by an inspector or, for that matter, by anyone else who may be interested in entering a certain property.

Mr. BLACKER: I support what the members for Victoria and Alexandra have said about the amendment, which I regard as important. This proposal has been opposed in the past on the ground that it is not always practical for one to warn in advance of one's intentions in this regard. However, this works in the reverse. On many properties, particularly those that are a long way off the road, farmers, for the protection of their properties, leave dogs unleashed and, if an inspector entered such a property, he could be savaged by a dog and all sorts of complications could ensue. We cannot blame a farmer or anyone who lives many miles off a highway for leaving his dogs unleashed. The regulations do not state that a dog must be kept tied up, particularly in station country.

I wonder whether the Minister's concern is that, if prior notice has to be given, the owner can race around and fix up his property before the inspector arrives. We do not ask for notice to be given three weeks or a month in advance; the day before or even the same day would suffice. It would just be common courtesy for the inspector to be obliged, before entering a property, to give prior notice of his inspection, and he could do it possible by telephone.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am absolutely amazed that the Opposition can pretend that the provision is not already in the legislation. Either the Opposition has not bothered to read it or it is grandstanding for an ulterior motive of which I am not sure. Bearing in mind the amendment moved by the member for Victoria, I quote section 8 (1) of the Act as follows:

> Subject to subsection (2) of this section an inspector may at any time enter and inspect any shearing-shed or building used for the accommodation of shearers for the purpose of determining whether any requirement of this Act has been contravened.
>
> (2) Where an inspector proposes to carry out an inspection under this section—
>
> (*a*) he shall, before entering the land on which he proposes to carry out the inspection, give reasonable notice, orally or in writing, to the occupier of the land of his intention to carry out the inspection;
>
> or
>
> (*b*) if it is not reasonably practicable for him to give notice before he enters the land, he shall, as soon as practicable after doing so inform the occupier that he is an inspector and that he intends to carry out the inspection.
>
> (3) Every inspector who is a member of the Police Force shall not later than the thirty-first day of March in every year make a full and detailed report to the Minister of all inspections made by him during the preceding year.
>
> (4) An inspector shall at the request of an employer produce for inspection the certificate of his appointment or, where the inspector is a member of the Police Force, his warrant card.

The Opposition's amendment is surely nothing more than an attempt at grandstanding. Clearly, the provisions of the amendment are already in the Act. I do not quarrel with the provision: it is a proper course to adopt. Where a property is isolated there is a need that the employer be advised if possible that an inspector is coming, and I accept all the reasons advanced by members opposite, but I see no need for the amendment.

Mr. RODDA: I believe that our amendment is more specific than the provision contained in the Act. The member for Flinders has made a cogent point. The amendment is not frivolous. We have no quarrel, in this modern day and age, with an inspector ensuring that conditions on a property are all right. We are talking about an industry and the people who work in it. I have no objection to giving shearers who work on my property the best conditions. My amendment is specific and goes further than the existing provision.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

> Page 1, lines 12 to 15—Leave out all words in these lines.

Mr. RODDA: I raised in debate the question about a person not being obliged to answer questions. I again raise that point with the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I gave you an assurance when I replied.

Mr. RODDA: We would not be discussing this Bill had the Minister not met a difficulty in a specific instance. The inspector whom the provision is meant to cover may not even be in the department at this juncture, and I want to be assured that a manager is not placed in a situation where he finds himself on the wrong side of the law.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

> Page 1, line 16—Leave out "any such inspection" and insert "an inspection under this section".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

> Page 1, lines 20 to 22—Leave out "(whether the question is put directly or through an interpreter)".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

> Page 2, lines 6 to 8—Leave out all words in these lines.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

AUSTRALIAN MINERAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 August. Page 586.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill. If one examines the Minister's second reading explanation, at first glance the Bill appears to be fairly straightforward. Amdel is a co-operative effort between the Commonwealth, the State, and the mining industry. It has been operating for some years. It went through a fairly lean period five or six years ago. There was some criticism of Amdel's operations which came to our ears, anyway. Adverse references have been made to Amdel's operations in the Auditor-General's Reports for some years. The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1977 states:

> Although operating income increased by $94 000 to $2 677 000 this was insufficient to recover costs and an operating loss of $423 000 ($345 000 in 1975-76) resulted. The total net losses for the past five years have amounted to $1 525 000.

That illustrates the point I am making, that Amdel has been through torrid times. These operations would be a cause of concern to all the people involved. However, the participating parties engaged a consultant to examine Amdel's affairs, and it is as a result of the consultant's recommendations that this Bill has been introduced. The Opposition would have found it more helpful if the consultant's findings had been made public and if we had had access to those findings.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You could have the report confidentially.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We are not particularly interested in getting a report confidentially because, if it has valuable information that we may wish to use, we are precluded from using it. So, that sort of offer is not particularly attractive to us. If the consultant's report had been made available freely to the Opposition, we would have been in a better position to judge whether this Bill accurately reflects the consultant's recommendations. If one takes the Minister's second reading explanation at face value (and we have little other option), the Bill deserves our support. I have referred to the difficulties in which Amdel found itself. I understand that some management and staff changes have already been made. Those changes have alleviated some of the problems. It is to be hoped that this Bill will give effect to the remaining recommendations and that Amdel's affairs will be made viable, this being one of the stated aims of the Bill. The Bill, which is fairly straightforward, sets up a council of six members, two of whom will be from the State Government, two from the Federal Government, and two from the industry. The organisation's activities and the council's activities are delineated. A board of management is set up under the aegis of the council.

There is no reference to the Chairman of the council in the Bill. I take it that the council is free to appoint whom it likes to chair its meetings. Because the Bill provides that each member shall have one vote only, it is clear that the Chairman does not have a casting vote. The functions of the Chairman are not delineated in the Bill; that may be an omission or it may be deliberate. The board's functions and the organisation's functions are set out in detail. I intend to move amendments when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. I certainly hope that this Bill will achieve the aims that the Minister seeks to achieve, because we cannot afford in South Australia to be putting money into enterprises that are incurring losses, and I repeat that Amdel has incurred losses for some years. I support the Bill and trust that it will achieve its stated aim of making Amdel a viable organisation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I was approached by the member for Davenport to make available the Scott Report to the Opposition. I was happy to make it available, but it was necessary to check with the Commonwealth Government and with the Australian Mineral Industry Research Association whether they would be happy if I complied with the honourable member's request. They replied that they would prefer the report to be made available only on a confidential basis. I reported to the member for Davenport yesterday that the Scott Report could be made available to the Opposition only on that basis. It should be made clear to the public generally and to members that that is the position in relation to this matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You were happy to make it available?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I did not mind. It is important to understand that Amdel is set up as part of a tripartite organisation, and it is not possible to act effectively on matters such as that request without the agreement of the three parties. Following a reorganisation within Amdel at the end of April 1977, Mr. Brian Hickman was appointed Acting General Manager, and he was responsible for carrying through the reorganisation. Retrenchments in Amdel were involved in that reorganisation, and further commitments were required prior to that reorganisation, particularly from the Commonwealth.

Mr. Hickman did a very good job and, as a consequence, Amdel turned in a surplus of $400 000 for 1977-78. So Amdel has already returned to a profit situation. Mr. Hickman's appointment was only temporary for an initial period of six months. During that time applications were called for a new General Manager, of Amdel, and we were lucky to get the services of Mr. Norton Jackson, who had been the General Manager of Cyanamid in Amsterdam, Holland. So, we now have a very able man as head of Amdel, and we are confident that the organisation will go ahead effectively.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Repeal of s.13 of principal Act and enactment of sections in its place."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Clause 12 deals with the membership of the council and refers to voting powers and so on. I mentioned in the second reading debate that there is no mention of who shall chair the council; section 13 of the principal Act is repealed and the duties of the council delineated, but there is no mention of the Chairman.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): Section 9 of the principal Act, which is not amended by this Bill, provides:

> (1) The members of the Council shall appoint one of their number to be the chairman of the Council and one to be the deputy chairman thereof. A chairman or deputy chairman shall hold office for a period of two years after his appointment and shall be eligible for reappointment.
>
> (2) If for any reason the chairman is unable to act in his office the deputy chairman shall act in his place and while so acting shall have all the powers of the chairman.
>
> (3) If for any reason both the chairman and the deputy chairman are unable to act the members of the Council present at any meeting of the Council shall elect one of their number to preside at that meeting.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Bank accounts, etc."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

Page 8, lines 1 and 2—Leave out subsection (4) and insert subsection as follows:

(4) The organisation may—

(a) with the consent of the Treasurer;

and

(b) if the amount of the proposed borrowing exceeds one hundred thousand dollars—with the consent of the Industries Development Committee,

borrow moneys upon terms and conditions approved by the Treasurer.

I think this amendment is self-explanatory. I believe one of the functions of the committees of this Parliament is to keep a close eye on borrowing by organisations such as Amdel, to which the Government makes money available. The purpose of the Industries Development Committee is to keep an eye on money borrowed by organisations. For that reason, it is my view that the Industries Development Committee should authorise any money made available in excess of $100 000.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I cannot accept the amendment. I think it needs to be recognised that Amdel is an organisation set up jointly by the Commonwealth Government, the State Government and the Australian Mineral Industry Research Association. The changes that had to be brought about as a consequence of the reorganisation following the Scott Report had to be agreed to by all parties to the establishment of the organisation. Members will note that the clause to which we refer deals with borrowing powers. Obviously, on a council that consists of two members from each constituent authority and a board of management which is chaired by a representative from AMIRA, the situation is very much that the State is in a position of reaching an agreement in relation to borrowing and then implementing the agreement.

If the State, in its dealings with the Commonwealth and AMIRA with respect to Amdel, has to say all the time that it is sorry that it cannot make a decision because it has to refer matters to the Industries Development Committee, or it has to do something else in relation to the matter, then the ability of the organisation to act quickly and properly in the light of changing circumstances is reduced. If we want Amdel to act as a commercial organisation and run itself as a viable operation, we have to be prepared to make executive decisions and take responsibility for them.

I do not believe that it is at all appropriate in those circumstances for one of the parties to the agreement on Amdel to say that when money is borrowed it has to get a further approval. That sort of arrangement does not apply to the Electricity Trust, the Housing Trust or to virtually any other statutory authority that is wholly the responsibility of the State of South Australia. Therefore, I do not see why it should apply in relation to an organisation which is not wholly our responsibility, even though during a period of difficulty for Amdel, when the Commonwealth refused to take on any additional responsibility, the State had to pick up the tab. Nevertheless, in the reorganisation it is important to make it effective and it is important to be able to take an executive decision and make it stick and not have to muck around excessively in a bureaucratic way.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If one looks at the provisions under consideration it is perfectly obvious who has the oversight of the operations of Amdel: it is the Treasurer of South Australia who makes the guarantee. It is perfectly obvious that the Treasurer is charged with seeing that Amdel is financially succeeding. For the Minister suddenly to argue that it is a tripartite organisation, and that therefore we have no right as a Parliament to be sticking our nose into financial decisions, is rather belied by the fact that the Treasurer is the only one who has any financial responsibility. New subsection (3) refers to the consent of the Treasurer, and that is the Treasurer of South Australia. It also refers to terms and conditions approved by the Treasurer. New subsection (4) provides:

. . . with the consent of the Treasurer, borrow moneys upon terms and conditions approved by the Treasurer.

New subsection (5) provides:

. . . guaranteed by the Treasurer and this section is, without further appropriation, sufficient authority for the satisfaction of the liability of the Treasurer in respect of the guarantee out of the General Revenue of the State.

That means this State. The whole thrust here is that financial responsibility lies with the Treasurer of South Australia for borrowings that Amdel may undertake.

For the Minister suddenly to call on the tripartite aspects of the organisation is hardly relevant to the financial transactions envisaged here. It seems to me, in view of the rather chequered background of Amdel, that it would be a good idea for the Industries Development Committee to have a look at borrowings of this magnitude. For that reason I am not impressed by the Minister's argument and believe that the amendment is desirable.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: However impressed or not the Deputy Leader may be by my argument, I can assure him I am even less impressed by his amendment. First, there is a guarantee of work for Amdel of $500 000 a year from the Commonwealth, AMIRA and the State of South Australia. However, the Commonwealth has made clear that its guarantee extends, I think, for a period of five years and that it will not continue beyond that point.

It is true that the State of South Australia has to be the financial backstop, the financial wicket-keeper, for the organisation. That has been our experience. Certainly, the amount of work provided for Amdel in the financial year just completed exceeded our guarantee. I think the provision in last year's Budget was for about $900 000, far more than the $500 000 guarantee. Nevertheless, the framework of the organisation involves AMIRA and the Commonwealth Government, and they were involved in getting agreement to this Bill and in giving the work guarantees for Amdel.

Now the Deputy Leader, in relation to an organisation in the form of a public authority, not an industry, set up by two Governments and one outside organisation is not prepared to allow the Treasurer of South Australia to act executively in the matter. That is patently ridiculous. Secondly, he wants to refer certain matters to the Industries Development Committee. Anyone would think, if he got this through, that the next thing would be that any loan borrowing by ETSA would be referred to the Industries Development Committee. Why the Industries Development Committee? Why not the Public Accounts Committee? It is not an industry in the traditional sense of the Industries Development Act. It is, in effect, a statutory corporation set up in South Australia.

It is absolute nonsense that the Industries Development Committee should be asked to investigate this matter. If this is the attitude of the Opposition, to be consistent, I suggest that every time a statutory authority in South Australia borrows a cent more than $100 000, the matter would have to be referred to the Industries Development Committee. What possible logic is there in that? It is not related to industries development in the sense of being a private firm applying to the State of South Australia for a

guarantee. It is a statutory corporation. The Deputy Leader is just indulging in a penchant for red tape and bureaucracy. He wants to allow members of the Industries Development Committee to earn another buck or two, and the amendment is crook.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This would not make the slightest difference to the remuneration of members of the Industries Development Committee, as the Minister knows. As to his comment about bringing statutory organisations under the review of Parliament, with the number of statutory authorities the Premier talks about forming in this State so that they can borrow $1 000 000, that might not be such a bad idea.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 20 to 22 passed.

Clause 23—"Annual report."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

> Page 8, after line 33—Insert subsection as follows:
>
> (3) The Minister shall, as soon as practicable after his receipt of a report furnished under this section, cause copies of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

The amendment is self-explanatory. We have complained from time to time that reports of various authorities are not made available to Parliament. The Bill does not contemplate that the report will be made available to Parliament, and we believe that it should be.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The operations of Amdel are reported on each year in the Auditor-General's Report which is laid before Parliament, so that Parliament gets information about the work of the organisation and its financial position. The principal Act provides for an annual report, but does not make specific provision for it to be laid before the Parliament of South Australia. I have no objection to that being done. It just means printing a few extra copies, with printing costs rising but if it makes the Deputy Leader happy—

Mr. Tonkin: It might make the people of South Australia happier.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader should know that the people of South Australia are already delirious because the financial accounts of Amdel are reported on each year in the Auditor-General's Report, which is available as a public document. The people of South Australia, in relation to their stake in the enterprise, have full protection from the Act we are amending. However, the Deputy Leader must have something to do, and it is better that he should have a small success in this matter, so I shall be pleased to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 24 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SIR JOHN BARNARD'S ACT (EXCLUSION OF APPLICATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 3. Page 325.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill.

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

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 August. Page 324.)

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill, which seeks only to amend section 7 of the principal Act so as to allow the State Transport Authority to draw from within its ranks a Deputy Chairman, in the absence of a Chairman from meetings of the authority. Section 7 (3) already provides for the Governor to appoint a suitable person to be a deputy of a member of the authority, but it goes on to provide that such a person, while acting in the absence of that member, shall be deemed to be a member of the authority.

The words "shall be deemed to be a member of the authority" imply fairly clearly that the person appointed by the Governor shall only be drawn from outside the ranks of the appointed members, and the amendment will allow the appointment to be made from within the authority. That seems logical and reasonable. After referring to the details of the Act, the Bill, and the Minister's explanation, we on this side are satisfied that only that specific intent is incorporated, and we have pleasure in supporting the Minister's desire to allow the action to be taken within the authority and allow its functioning to proceed without difficulty in future.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

> That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak this evening about some matters that concern me. I was intending to read an editorial in today's *News* headed "Taking a poor view". I think I should read it to the House, and it is as follows:

> Results of the survey into South Australian manufacturing prospects by two leading firms of consultants make depressing reading and so does the Premier's response to them. The most worrying finding is that nearly all the executives surveyed believe the industrial outlook is at best static.
>
> An alarming number also believe they are significantly disadvantaged here either by location, higher costs or State Government interference. Mr. Dunstan commented with-some indignation that many of the critical statements made by those surveyed did not bear analysis. That may be so. But to assert simply that is either missing the point or evading it.
>
> What matters is not so much that it is true or unture in fact, but that it is perceived to be true. If key executives think the Government is anti-business they will act accordingly. And that means South Australia will suffer.
>
> The Premier also blames the Liberal Party for bad-mouthing the State. He is culpable himself. He has promised since 1970 to reduce dependence on cars and white goods. He has headed off overseas and returned with glittering promises that later evaporate.
>
> He has presided over the erosion of South Australia's once keen cost advantage. He has lauded such deeply unpopular measures as industrial democracy. The survey results should not be a matter for political buckpassing. They should be a goad for deep analysis and remedial action.

I have read the report, and it is alarming, to say the least, to find that leading manufacturers in this State have such a gloomy outlook regarding the future development of South Australia. It concerns me that in the Whyalla region the prospects would be even gloomier. The Premier appointed a working party to examine the possibility of building rolling stock there for the Australian National Railways. As usual, he was high in his praise of the recommendations, because he was not going to have to

finance the proposal. However, the Prime Minister had the matter investigated and when, unfortunately, the Government had to reject the proposition, he said:

> In reaching that decision the Government had before it the advice of an inter-departmental committee which indicated that the future effective demand for rolling stock is likely to be well below that indicated in the South Australian report, and also that the existing production capacity is greater than estimated. In short, it appears that the most optimistic demand projections could be met from existing capacity.

That is a reasonable answer but, while the Premier talks about a rolling stock plant, he does nothing to develop South Australia's uranium resources. In the past few weeks in this House, the member for Whyalla has spoken at length about unemployment, and all in the Liberal party are concerned about unemployment. We want the uranium deposits developed so that hundreds, if not thousands, of jobs can be created directly. I believe that the Whyalla region is one part of South Australia that could participate in this development. The member for Stuart has fallen out with the Mayor of Port Pirie, and the Mayor of Whyalla has called for the building of a uranium plant there. I do not know what the Federal member for Grey (Mr. Wallis) has said: he has been rather quiet, I think. We have not heard the views of the Hon. Mr. Blevins, but probably they will, as usual, desert that area as they did regarding the shipbuilding industry. When the Whitlam Government set out to destroy the shipbuilding industry, they did nothing. It is only since the Fraser Government was elected that they have made noises to show how concerned they are about that industry.

Let us consider the situation regarding uranium. In the past four years the price of oil has increased enormously, having increased from about $2 a barrel to $11. Energy consumption has increased astronomically and it will increase further in future. In Belgium, 21 per cent of the total electrical energy is produced from nuclear power stations, and it seems that most leading industrial nations already have decided that they will have to rely on nuclear power to meet their increasing energy needs. There are 184 nuclear power plants operating in 20 countries, and it seems that 214 such units are under construction.

In a further 27 countries, an additional 102 nuclear power units are on a firm-order basis. This totals more than 500 nuclear power units, either operating or under construction in 34 countries. The savings that could be achieved in relation to nuclear power should be clearly understood. A typical large nuclear power station generating 1 000 megawatts of electricity annually consumes about 30 tonnes of enriched uranium each year, which could be derived from 200 tonnes of yellow cake. It takes 3 000 000 tonnes of coal to produce the same amount of electricity.

Mr. Allison: With far less fall-out.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. We have heard of people suffering lung damage from mining coal, but the Government unfortunately fails to appreciate the benefits that would flow from this type of development. I remind the House that an authoritative report commissioned by the South Australian Government concluded that employment opportunities on statistical data for the already established North American uranium industry were such that a fully-developed uranium industry in Australia could support directly or indirectly about 500 000 persons, starting with a mining work force of about 5 000. Unfortunately, the Government has not seen fit to release all the reports, because I believe that it is frightened to give the people of South Australia the information. I believe that most people would support the proper development of our uranium resources.

Much is said about the safety aspect, but I suggest that people should read the reports of Mr. Justice Fox, who clearly indicated that he believed that mining could take place on a proper basis. I quote his first recommendation, as follows:

> The hazards of mining and milling uranium, if those activities are properly regulated and controlled, are not such as to justify a decision not to develop Australia's uranium mines.

The policy and development of a uranium industry, as laid down by the Fraser Government, would have more stricter controls operating here than operating elsewhere in the world. I believe that South Australians want to have our resources developed. It is interesting to note the change of policy both by the State Labor Government and the previous Federal Labor Government. The Whitlam Government statement on uranium development, tabled in Parliament on 31 October 1974, stated:

> This statement is to outline the Government's programme for the rational development of uranium resources in the Northern Territory; a programme which will return substantial economic benefits to Australia from our supply of this vital energy resource to our overseas trading partners who face such grave difficulties in securing their energy requirements.

Mr. Les Johnson on 16 October 1975 stated:

> International assurances have been provided by Ministers that Australia will meet the uranium requirements of our major trading partners, which could amount to a total of about 100 000 tonnes of uranium by 1990.

I could go on at length and quote other statements made by Mr. Hurford and other Labor members. Mr. Hurford is too busy trying to increase interest rates.

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

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): A few weeks ago when I spoke in the adjournment debate, I referred to the Leader of the Opposition and to other Opposition members who continually denigrate South Australia. It seems that the Leader has not accepted my advice given on that occasion, and the member for Eyre has given it another repeat in connection with a survey conducted by two firms of management consultants (Eric White and Associates and W. D. Scott) into the manufacturing industry in this State.

I recall another survey that was conducted a few months ago. The Leader would have been wise to heed my advice, because that survey showed that his popularity rating at that time was 29 per cent. Had he heeded my advice, his rating may have gone to a record 30 per cent!

Mr. Chapman: Did you take the trouble to compare the popularity of other Opposition Leaders in Australia?

Mr. SLATER: I did not. I merely compared the Leader's popularity with that of the Premier, who had the highest rating in the survey. The Leader's exercise yesterday conveyed to me—

Mr. Chapman: You should compare the Premier's figures with other Premiers' figures, and the Leader's figures with those of other Opposition Leaders. The point is that he is a very popular Leader.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member for Alexandra is overdoing his interjections.

Mr. SLATER: —his continuing delight in knocking South Australia. As I have said previously, he has earned the reputation in the community (this has been referred to many times) of being called "Ocker the Knocker".

Mr. Gunn: Who wrote this nonsense for you? You couldn't write it yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. I can hardly hear the member for Gilles.

Mr. SLATER: Of course, the press has taken up this survey and the remarks made by the Leader yesterday. One notes the heading "Economic gloom for South Australia—survey" on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser.* The member for Eyre referred to this during the course of his remarks on the *News* editorial, so I will not refer to that again. However, that involved the opinion of the *News* Editor only, and his opinion does not carry much weight with me.

Mr. Chapman: No, but it does with the people.

Mr. SLATER: Nor, for that matter, does it carry much weight with anyone else. We do not need the Leader, the members for Alexandra or Eyre, or senior business executives to tell us that South Australia is in some degree of economic difficulty. The hundreds of thousands of unemployed people throughout South Australia and Australia are testimony to that situation.

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already told the honourable member for Alexandra that he is interjecting too often.

Mr. Mathwin: How popular is the member for Napier in Elizabeth?

Mr. SLATER: The member for Napier is as popular as he can be, and his popularity will be proven when he comes up for re-election as Mayor of Elizabeth next year. It is unfair for the Opposition to isolate South Australia against the other States, because those States are suffering from the same sort of economic difficulties facing South Australia, simply because of the economic policies, or lack of them, of the Fraser Government. Business confidence in this State and throughout Australia can be restored only by a change of economic direction by the Federal Government in the public and private sectors. Unfortunately, this is not happening. The member for Rocky River probably knows this, but is not willing to admit that the Federal Budget will not assist the economy but is more likely further to depress it.

I now refer to the survey which the Leader mentioned last evening and which was carried out by Eric White and W. D. Scott. The Leader carefully did not tell the House who commissioned the survey. The member for Eyre said that he had been privileged to see it, but no-one else had done so. I suspect, therefore, that the Liberal Party commissioned it, and that the people who were interviewed were specially selected.

Mr. Chapman: Do you think it was a rigged survey?

Mr. SLATER: I do.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has had a fair chance in relation to interjections.

Mr. SLATER: As I say, the Leader did—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre and the honourable member for Alexandra must cease interjecting.

Mr. SLATER: —does not have the courage to tell us who commissioned the survey. I suspect that the Liberal Party commissioned the survey and got the results it expected to get, simply to give the Leader an opportunity again to denigrate the State in this House.

Mr. Groom: They interviewed Liberals, too.

Mr. SLATER: The senior business executives who were interviewed would not be supporters of the Government. The result that was achieved would be biased in order to denigrate the State, particularly the State Labor Government. Last evening the Leader referred to an eight-point plan promoted by the Liberal Party to restore business confidence in South Australia.

Mr. Venning: The first thing to do is to get rid of this Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the member for Rocky River has had a fair chance to interject already.

Mr. SLATER: The eight points that the Leader recited to the House seemed fairly vague and indefinite to me. One of the points he raised was—

Mr. Gunn: You haven't told us anything yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre has had his opportunity, too.

Mr. SLATER: The member for Eyre's opinion does not go down too well with me, and it does not worry me a bit. One of the points made was the immediate revision of restrictive and oppressive provisions in licensing and consumer protection. Are we to understand that, if the Liberal Party, by some mischance, is returned to Government in South Australia, it would dismantle consumer protection legislation, and do away with builders licensing and other licensing situations to the detriment to the community in South Australia? I think that is the point that was made, and I accept that that is what the Liberal Party would do if, as I say, by some mischance, it was elected to the Treasury benches in this State. I should be fair about this, because the economy in South Australia is suffering some difficulty, but several factors are associated with this—

Mr. Groom: Called "Fraserism".

Mr. SLATER: "Fraserism" is probably the term, but the factors include seasonal conditions, the Federal Government's closure of the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla, the Federal Government's withdrawal of funds in relation to the construction industry, and the general down-turn in consumer spending throughout Australia. This down-turn in consumer spending has had a disastrous effect on South Australia in regard to motor vehicles, consumer durables, white goods, and so on.

Mr. Mathwin: You can blame Whitlam for all that, can't you?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is doing his fair share of interjecting, too.

Mr. SLATER: If we could follow the thinking of the member for Glenelg, and, if he wanted to go back in history, it is almost three years since the Fraser Government came to power. We are still blaming the present difficulties throughout Australia on the Whitlam Government. Perhaps the honourable member might like to go back to the time of Ben Chifley and John Curtin and blame them, or even further back and blame Jim Scullin or Andrew Fisher. There is no logic in that sort of argument, because the Fraser Government has had three years to restore economic stability in Australia, and it just has not happened.

Mr. Mathwin: In two years Whitlam fixed it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to take any action, but members of the Opposition have interjected many times during the course of this debate. I can hardly hear the honourable member for Gilles.

Mr. SLATER: The Leader said that industry in this State had received no assistance from the Government. That in not correct.

Mr. Tonkin: Order!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. It is awkward to keep an eye on members and an eye on the clock. The honourable member for Coles.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I speak about the problem of road safety for schoolchildren. It is a matter that concerns every member and I cannot imagine that it will elicit such lively interjections as the two previous speeches have unless, of course, members support what I have to say. I am pleased that the Minister of Transport is on the front bench, because I thank him for his courtesy in receiving a

deputation this afternoon from my district. The problem of road safety for schoolchildren should always be before the community, because it increases with each passing year, as the added density of traffic and alterations to the road system put schoolchildren at risk.

I would like to make four points in connection with this problem. First, I stress that the problem is serious. About 1 000 children can simultaneously spill out of a school at dismissal time at about 3.30 p.m. in the space of a few minutes. They can go on to roads carrying fast flowing, dense traffic. The situation is often complicated by parents who are picking up their children. In my own district more than 12 000 children hit the streets within five minutes at about 3.30 p.m. They then move on to roads that are potentially very dangerous. Obviously, the location of schools cannot always be selected to take into account potential traffic dangers. Some schools are on busy roads, some on dangerous corners, and some on island sites flanked on all sides by roads around which traffic flows sometimes at high speeds and sometimes with careless drivers at the wheel.

My second point is that schools are not equipped to deal with this problem. I have four high school councils in my district currently grappling with the problem. Some of these schools have been troubled by this problem for years. There are many more primary schools in my district than there are high schools in my district, and these primary schools have been trying to cope with the problem, but so far with limited success. They certainly need the help of road traffic engineers, State Government authorities and local government authorities, and they need to have their problem recognised.

My third point is that action to assist the schools is the Government's responsibility. Perhaps legislative changes are needed to give the appropriate authorities the flexibility that they need to cope with the problem. All kinds of method can be considered if we are willing to acknowledge that the safety of children comes first and foremost. It is certainly important that children should be trained in road safety. In the first instance, that is the responsibility of their parents, and in the second instance a heavy responsibility falls on the schools.

The State Government, local government, and other authorities shoulder some of the responsibility, and in South Australia the Road Safety Council has carried out that responsibility very well. However, I wonder whether we have examined all means by which we can assist children to be safe on the roads. At some primary schools there are safety fences immediately outside the school grounds. Perhaps these fences need to be extended, and perhaps more such fences need to be built outside high schools. Perhaps we should examine the method of contouring footpaths near schools and to narrow the roadway to create a visual barrier for traffic.

Perhaps we should examine providing plantations which could give the appearance of a pedestrian mall, which would slow down traffic. This suggestion would be appropriate only for side streets, not for main roads. We should perhaps be examining the question of one-way streets, where appropriate, to control traffic near schools. We should perhaps have more flexibility in choosing the method of road closure and in using it experimentally to see what its effect is on traffic in surrounding streets, and to see whether it is a useful method of creating safe conditions for children leaving schools.

Perhaps we should be examining the question of staggered dismissal times, so that not all children hit the street at the same moment; this situation is partly the cause of the problem. Perhaps we should be examining the idea of traffic monitors who monitor crossings, and perhaps we should be examining the situation near school gates and nearby locations where the pedestrians are schoolchildren.

We could be looking at a system of boom gates similar to those at railway and tram crossings. These gates could block off dangerous roads for short periods of up to half an hour. If, in fact, the problem is as serious as many schools believe it is, this may be one method that needs examination and consequent legislative action to enable it to be implemented.

I would like to place on record a request made to the Minister by a deputation from my district that saw him this afternoon. Representatives of my high school councils desire the establishment of a working party consisting of representatives of teachers, school and parent organisations, local government, police, the Road Traffic Board, and any other relevant bodies, to examine all factors affecting road safety in the vicinity of schools and to seek the view of schools throughout the State on this matter. The function of that working party should be to establish whether existing road safety provisions are satisfactory; whether existing legislation is adequate to enable local and State authorities to take the necessary steps to ensure the continued safety of children; and what additional action, if any, should be taken by the State Government or any other authority to ensure the continued safety of children and the free movement of traffic near schools.

Of course, we all acknowledge the need to preserve the rights of residents to have free access to their homes, as well as the rights of motorists to be protected in the interests of free traffic flow, but I think that the schools have been left to fend for themselves with this problem for too long. I think it has now reached serious proportions, and the Government should take action. When I use the phrase "continued safety of children" I am referring to the altered circumstances which can, within months, transform a previously safe road or street into a potential death trap.

In my own district, once the Darley Road bridge was installed, the traffic which had previously taken other routes started to move like a fast-flowing river along Newton Road, St. Bernards Road and Penfold Road. Residents who had previously used those roads as main thoroughfares are, in order to find a quieter route, now being forced into back streets in Rostrevor and Magill, to the consequent distress of residents living there. It seems to me that the problem needs to be tackled on a broad front and to be looked at with a fresh eye by people who are trained to solve the considerable problems associated with road traffic.

I think that in the past the authorities have to some extent failed to recognise the problem. I know that school councils in my district feel extremely frustrated, having approached all the responsible bodies without receiving what is in their view a satisfactory reply in terms of action that will be taken to assist them. I believe that, as a result of the Minister's sympathetic hearing this afternoon, we can look forward to such action, and I hope that it will be taken speedily and that, if a working party is established, it will be given a time limit in which to report to the Minister. Also, so that as a result of that report action will be taken that will guarantee the safety of children not just in my district but throughout South Australia.

Motion carried.

At 8.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 24 August at 2 p.m.