

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 7, 1976

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITIONS: SEXUAL OFFENCES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES presented a petition signed by 119 electors of South Australia stating that the crime of incest and the crime of unlawful carnal knowledge of young girls are detrimental to society and praying that the Legislative Council would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received and read.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT presented a similar petition signed by 314 electors.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a similar petition signed by 415 electors.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON presented a similar petition signed by 226 electors.

The Hon. C. M. HILL presented a similar petition signed by 19 electors.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

WHYALLA SHIPYARD

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked recently regarding Whyalla shipyard?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The management of Whyalla Shipbuilding and Engineering Works has discussed with the Premier the very great need for the company to find orders for its work force outside the shipbuilding field. The company has tendered for various Government contracts, and these tenders will be considered on the same basis as those submitted by other companies. In considering what new areas of production the company might be encouraged to enter, full regard will be given to the possible consequence for existing producers, and every effort will be made to nominate product areas not presently being undertaken in South Australia.

RAT GUARDS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the mooring of ships and the provision of rat guards?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Regulations made under the Commonwealth Quarantine Act require the master of a ship to ensure that effective rat guards are fastened and kept fastened to every rope connecting the ship to the wharf, lighter, or other vessel, or alternatively to ensure that ropes are covered with freshly tarred canvas for a distance of at least three feet beginning from the side of the ship and extending towards the wharf, lighter, or other vessel. Quarantine staff make regular patrols of

wharves for this purpose and I have drawn the honourable member's remarks to the attention of both State and Commonwealth officials.

ALICE SPRINGS TO TARCOOLA RAILWAY

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Transport a reply to my question regarding the Alice Springs to Tarcoola railway?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Transport reports that planning provides for track on the Alice Springs to Tarcoola railway to be laid with 53-kilogram rail for 710 kilometres of its 830 km length and with available second-hand 40 kg rail for the remaining 120 km. A committee appointed by the Federal Minister for Transport is currently examining the construction standards and costs of the Alice Springs to Tarcoola railway. The committee will take into account existing and projected traffic, including possible demand for transport in bulk of minerals, locomotive and rollingstock requirements, axle loads, train speeds, and standards of permanent way construction necessary to ensure all weather operation, reliable service, and satisfactory maintenance costs.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Transport to my recent question about this railway?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague reports:

The press statement to which the honourable member refers was apparently based on the answer I gave in the House of Assembly to the member for Eyre. The full text of my reply can be found in *Hansard* on page 344. My reply to Mr. Gunn was based on the demand recently made for an urgent assessment to be made to ascertain the cost of retaining the present rail link for a further period of 10 years. The demand for this assessment flows from the announcement of the Federal Treasurer that the standards and costs of the Tarcoola to Alice Springs line were to be reviewed by a special committee, as also was the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standardisation project. Mr. Lynch's statement appears on page 2334 of *Federal Hansard*.

WILLIAMSTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have received from the Minister of Lands a memorandum indicating that he has a reply to the question I asked on August 19 regarding the Williamstown Primary School. Will he give that reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Transport reports that the Highways Department can find no record of its advice being sought with respect to the recent alterations to the Williamstown school and school oval gates. In 1974, the Public Buildings Department prepared a plan showing the relocation of a school oval gate to a position opposite the school gate now in use. This would have enabled children to walk straight across the road from gate to gate. However, the relocation of gates which has now taken place is not in accordance with the department's plan and has led to a tendency by some children to cross the road diagonally from the school gate to a school oval gate further along the road.

The present position is that vehicle and pedestrian numbers are small and visibility is good at the crossing point proposed by the department. There is no real justification for a school or pedestrian crossing at this location and "school" signs, which are in position, are considered to be the most appropriate form of protection. The Highways Department has in a letter to the council suggested action that may be taken by the school authorities and council to improve the movements of schoolchildren whilst crossing the road.

FODDER ACQUISITION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Agriculture any plans to acquire fodder for the same reasons that hay was acquired by the Government during the 1944 drought?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: No. The Government has no plans at present for acquiring fodder, although it has appointed a drought committee and has been constantly reviewing its policies in relation to the drought. The situation having deteriorated in South Australia, several alternative forms of assistance to producers have been discussed by the drought committee, which has given advice to the Minister of Lands and me. Undoubtedly, the honourable member's suggestion has been considered by the committee, although so far it has made no recommendations to the Minister of Lands or me regarding the acquisition of fodder.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Chief Secretary a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I have noted with interest that many honourable members have received notices from Ministers indicating that replies to questions are available. I have been waiting patiently for five weeks for a reply to a question I asked the Chief Secretary on August 4.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Which one was that?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The question concerned the administration and annual report of the Adelaide Festival Centre. At that time, part of the question I asked was as follows: was it possible that it was poor administration of the centre that accounted for the fact that it took 13 months for the annual report to become available to Parliament? Now, I also ask: similarly, is it poor administration that causes it to take five weeks to bring down a reply to my earlier question?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member asks such complex questions. Obviously, it is not the administration that is wrong: it is the complex matters that he raises. I will bring down a reply to the honourable member's question as soon as possible.

SUPERANNUATION

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister of Health, as a result of good administration, a reply to my recent question about superannuation?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The superannuation scheme available to South Australian Government employees is, generally speaking, amongst the most generous in Australia. The additional benefits the honourable member has suggested could be provided only at an additional cost to the Government, and I do not believe that expansion of the benefits is justified at this stage. In the circumstances outlined, if the person were the beneficiary of the public servant's estate and if there were no dependants, any excess of contributions over benefits paid to the public servant prior to his death would be payable to that person.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a further question of the Minister.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Minister may recall that this matter related to a public servant who was a bachelor. His sister had remained at home, caring for their aged parents, and on the death of the parents she remained at home and cared for the public servant himself. In this circumstances, when he is superannuated and later when he dies, his sister will receive no benefit from superannuation, except in limited circumstances. In reply, the Treasurer said:

The additional benefits the honourable member has suggested could be provided only at an additional cost to the Government and I do not believe that expansion of the benefits is justified at this stage.

Will the Minister of Health ask the Treasurer to estimate what would be the extra cost to the Government of these additional benefits?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: One can just about forecast what the Treasurer's reply would be, because in no way could one say what would be the position.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Well, why say so?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Obviously, it will cost more. The honourable member gave one specific example, so there must obviously be some additional expenditure. The Government does not know whether there is one case, or 100 or 1 000 cases. Let the honourable member be fair about this, and tell the Government how it can say what are the personal and family problems of all superannuants. In no way is that information given when one first contributes to a superannuation scheme. However, I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

TOURISM CONFERENCE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On July 29, in reply to my question regarding a proposed oversea trip to Hong Kong, the Minister said that there was a possibility of his travelling to Hong Kong during August to attend a conference of the Australian Federation of Travel Agents. He gave, as the reason for this pressure being brought to bear on him to make the trip to represent this State, that there was a possibility that the next conference after the Hong Kong conference could be held in Adelaide and that, as 1978 was the year for the next Festival of Arts, it would be most beneficial and in the interests of tourism and the State generally if this very important A.F.T.A. conference could next be held in Adelaide. Last month, the Minister was absent from the Chamber and, in reply to a courteous question as to his whereabouts, I was informed that he had, in fact, taken this official trip to Hong Kong. Now that the Minister has returned, I ask him whether he achieved his object during his recent trip—to obtain the next A.F.T.A. conference for South Australia.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I thank the honourable member for showing such a keen interest in my whereabouts.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Hon. Mr. Hill keeps his whereabouts secret.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Actually, the Hon. Mr. Hill should have listened more attentively to what I said prior to my attending the A.F.T.A. conference in Hong Kong, because I said that the next A.F.T.A. conference would be held in Hobart next year. I said that we were

ying for the conference to be held in Adelaide in 1978, and that it could coincide with the holding of the Festival of Arts. As I pointed out privately to the honourable member, other countries were also vying for the opportunity to host the 1978 conference. The Philippines was one such country, and I must confess that it did put on a good show in Hong Kong in an effort to stake its claim. Nevertheless, our contribution had much merit and I cannot say whether we will be granted the 1978 conference or not, because that decision will be made by the A.F.T.A. executive some time in November this year.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Where is it meeting?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Possibly in Sydney, as Mr. Dan Russell, the executive President, resides in Sydney. There are representatives on the executive from each State of the Commonwealth. However, I believe Adelaide has a good chance of holding the conference in 1978. As I earlier indicated, it will be up to the executive to decide exactly where it will be held.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Did any officers from the Minister's department accompany him on his recent trip and, if they did, who were those officers?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No. I joined a party of travel agents from South Australia, including the President of the South Australian chapter, Mr. Roy King.

WATER HYACINTH

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I know that questions on this matter have been directed previously to the Minister, but I have received from the Murray Valley Development League a circular which, among other things, states:

With reference to water hyacinth, you are asked, please, to assure yourself, and us, that the full plan of attack which has been recommended by Dr. David Mitchell and which is described on pages 4 and 5 of the *June Riverlander* gets under way by October 1.

Will the Minister comment on that statement? Do the States support the plan recommended by Dr. David Mitchell, and will the eradication plan commence on October 1?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The States have agreed on a plan developed by the New South Wales Agriculture Department. The plan involves a comprehensive programme to contain water hyacinth, and I believe that that is the most realistic approach to the problem at this stage. For its part in this comprehensive plan, South Australia will contribute \$50 000 (about one-quarter of the cost) and will be involved, amongst other things, in the clearing of a channel through the water hyacinth to try to get the water flowing more quickly, in monitoring rivers and water courses in the area to prevent spreading of the weed to further areas, and in a spraying programme. Other programmes have been undertaken in New South Wales that will further reduce the spread of water hyacinth, involving earthworks for the purposes of drainage and water diversion. At this stage, it is most important to control the spread of water hyacinth and contain it in the area in which it is now found. That programme is being undertaken according to the plan produced by the New South Wales Agriculture Department, and South Australia is paying its share of the cost of that programme.

AUSTRALIAN OPERA

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I direct my question to the Minister of Health, representing the Premier. In view of the announcement two days ago by the Australian Government that it is willing to provide an extra but conditional grant of \$250 000 to the Australian Opera in this financial year, can the Minister say whether the South Australian Government will consider giving a grant to the Australian Opera to help make up the extra \$250 000 required before it can benefit from the Australian Government's offer? It is true that the South Australian Government has given substantial grants to the Australian Opera in the past couple of years, but I understand that the Australian Opera is not expected to tour to Adelaide in this current financial year, so that any funding by our Government would be an act of generosity in the national interest.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall seek a report for the honourable member and bring down a reply.

CATTLE TAGS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked recently about cattle tags?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Field staff of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department report that both ratchet and stick-on tags are found on market and lairage floors. The commonest reason for tags falling off is incorrect application, especially attaching them too high up the tail. When so placed they tend to slide down and become loose owing to the decreasing diameter of the tail. Tags should always be affixed just above the brush with reasonable tension applied. In relation to the stick-on type, there was a period of about two months when tags with faulty glue were issued by the manufacturer. This was a very unfortunate occurrence, the more so because it happened just before tagging regulations were enforced in this State some 12 months ago. The makers informed my department that they would replace all of this batch without charge if owners wrote to them enclosing one of the tags, and wide publicity was given to the problem by departmental staff and the manufacturer. However, it is possible that some of these tags are still in circulation and make up a proportion of those being seen in yards.

Western Australia has used the stick-on tag exclusively for more than four years, and except for the above-mentioned incident is satisfied with their performance, achieving an 87 per cent trace-back of disease to properties of origin. Queensland and Victoria have also decided to use them exclusively in their newly operating schemes. Those South Australian cattle owners who use stick-on tags and who were not supplied with a faulty batch also seem satisfied with the product. In summary, there is no evidence to suggest that the stick-on tag is inferior to the ratchet type. With regard to the practice of applying other than correct tail tags to cattle, my department is aware of its occurrence and shares the honourable member's serious view of the matter. It is an offence under the regulations, and the department takes evidence for prosecution from any offender detected. The general public could assist in the matter by bringing to the attention of departmental officers anyone they find applying incorrect tags.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a further question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question refers mainly to the last part of the Minister's reply. For the benefit of honourable members, I will repeat it. It states:

With regard to the practice of applying other than correct tail tags to cattle, my department is aware of its occurrence and shares the honourable member's serious view of the matter.

The reply goes on to state that the general public and other people could assist in detecting people who engage in this practice. The problem is that certain people pick up tags from various places, certainly from transports, and put them on to cattle other than those belonging to the original owner. I understand that at present people who have cattle in which disease is detected through tail tags are told of the problem and are told that remedies are available through the department or their local veterinary surgeon. However, I understand that it is also intended that action should go further and that eventually some sort of compulsory treatment will become necessary; it may even lead to the quarantining of cattle. Until the cattle owners have complete confidence in the scheme, it will be a serious matter indeed to introduce any sort of compulsion or quarantining. It is obvious from the reply that has been given that there will be doubt in the minds of cattle owners about whether their tail tags have been on the proper cattle or on someone else's cattle. I ask the Minister whether, before introducing any other restrictions on the sale of cattle from properties on which disease has been found as part of the tail-tagging system, and before he provides for quarantine, he will seek a more reliable method of identifying cattle.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: In Australia at present the tail-tagging system seems to be most effective, having regard to cost and other criteria. I know that other systems are available and that they are being investigated overseas to try to solve the problems of identifying cattle further along during slaughter, and my department is closely watching these other forms of identification. It is essential that we make sure that the practice referred to of other tags being put on cattle incorrectly does not prejudice the owners in any way, and that the owners are not required to carry out the programme of disease eradication without justification.

MESSAGE PARLOURS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked recently about massage parlours?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: During the past six months four persons have been charged and convicted of offences under section 28 of the Police Offences Act. These offences have all taken place in massage parlours. The particulars of the offences are as follows: on February 20, 1976, at *Le Chat Noir* massage parlour, Pirie Street, Adelaide, one female charged with receiving money paid in a brothel, fined \$50; on February 20, 1976, one male charged with managing a brothel, fined \$50; and on March 30, 1976, at *St. Tropez* massage parlour, Morphett Street, Adelaide, two females charged with receiving money paid in a brothel, both fined \$35.

ETHNIC GROUPS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have been informed that the Premier, in the South-East recently on his tour, stated that he now had an Italian officer in his department whose duty it was to specialise in assisting Italians and the Italian community generally with their problems. If this is the case, first, would the Premier say who this officer is, what is his salary, and what are his exact responsibilities? Secondly, are other ethnic groups in South Australia provided with a comparable service within the Premier's Department?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

PRAWN FISHING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Fisheries a reply to my recent question about prawn licences?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Agriculture and Fisheries Department, as agent for the Commonwealth Government, issues fishing licences and fishing boat licences in accordance with the Commonwealth Fisheries Act, 1952-1974. The Department of Primary Industry has instructed that such licences be issued to *bona fide* fishermen, with the suggestion that the holders of South Australian fishing licences and crew members who are covered by such licences be regarded as *bona fide* fishermen. Several Commonwealth fishing licences and fishing boat licences which had previously been granted to persons who did not hold the relevant South Australian licences were not renewed following expiration on June 30, 1976. The persons concerned were advised that my department was seeking a direction from the Department of Primary Industry, Canberra, regarding the renewal of the licences and, following receipt of advice from that department, arrangements have been made for their renewal. The only other Commonwealth fishing and fishing boat licences not renewed upon receipt of the relevant applications were in a case where my department refused to reissue the person's South Australian fishing licence. This decision was made pursuant to section 34 (2) (a) of the South Australian Fisheries Act, 1971-75, on the ground that the applicant was not a fit and proper person to receive the rights granted by a licence, and was upheld by the competent person appointed to review the case. However, it has been decided that the South Australian licence and boat registration be renewed on January 1, 1977, subject to compliance with certain conditions by the fisherman concerned, and it would be the intention to renew the Commonwealth licence at the same time.

RAILWAY TICKETS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Some weeks ago, I asked the Minister of Lands a question about the cessation of the sale of railway tickets at Clapham railway station. Has he received a reply from the Minister of Transport?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The withdrawal of ticket-selling staff from the Clapham station was necessary in order to fill a vacancy at Emerson, a higher priority station. It is not proposed to provide ticket-selling staff at Clapham in the near future, and there is no evidence that passenger volume has been adversely affected because of the lack of such staff. However, the matter will be kept under review.

X-LOTTO

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to my recent question about the large advertisement for the sale of X-Lotto lottery tickets?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Lottery and Gaming Act was amended by the State Lotteries Act, 1966, which provides, amongst other things, for the promotion and control of lotteries conducted by the State Government. Section 13 (1) (a) of the State Lotteries Act provides that, subject to this Act and directions of the Minister not inconsistent with the Act, the Lotteries Commission of South Australia may—

promote and conduct lotteries within the State and do, or cause to be done, all such things as are necessary for, or incidental or ancillary to, the promotion or conduct of lotteries within the State . . .

The honourable member has referred to regulation 11 (6) (a), made pursuant to the Lottery and Gaming Act. This Act does not govern lotteries conducted in accordance with the State Lotteries Act. Accordingly, the Lotteries Commission of South Australia is not subject to the regulation, which, in any case, as subordinate legislation would be inapplicable in view of section 13 (1) (a) of the State Lotteries Act. The rather large size and format of the advertisement to which the honourable member referred was for the \$10 Adelaide Cup special lottery and not for X-Lotto. Advertisements for X-Lotto are generally 20 cm by two columns and occasionally 20 cm by three columns. They are confined to Tuesdays to announce the estimated Division I prize pool for that week's X-Lotto. At present, there are no proposals to increase the size of advertisements appearing in the daily papers. However, I do not believe it would be in the best interests of the commission to give a categorical assurance that the size of advertisements will not be reviewed in the future. Such an assurance could restrict the future administration of the commission and could be detrimental to its success.

TOURIST BUREAU

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I wish to direct two questions to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. First, has an appointment to the office of Director-General of the Tourist Bureau yet been made and, if it has been, who has been appointed? If an appointment has not been made, are there any particular reasons for the delay in making it? My second question deals with advice that a Mr. J. Parkes (who I understand is from Macao and, I believe, is in charge of the Tourist Department there) has been appointed Manager (Publicity Services), Premier's Department, as from December 1, 1976. I ask the Minister whether Mr. Parkes will have any control over the Tourist Bureau in this State or over the staff of the bureau and, if he will have, what that arrangement will be.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The reply to the first part of the question is "No"; an appointment has not been made as Director of Tourism in South Australia. The situation is in abeyance at present and we are considering it closely: I hope that an appointment will be made soon. In his second question, the honourable member refers to a gentleman named Joseph Parkes, who is now employed in Macao as the publicity officer for that region. His duties there are to publicise, on the international market, the potential of Macao. His services have been acquired by the Government, and he will take up, as the honourable member has mentioned, an appointment as publicity officer with the Premier's Department from December 1, this year. I had

the honour of announcing this appointment when I was in Hong Kong recently. When I was there, I met Mr. Parkes, and I assure the honourable member that he is an extremely capable officer.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I am not questioning that.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am letting the honourable member know in case he has any doubts. I assure the honourable member that what I have said is the case. He has an international reputation as a fine publicity officer and, if the honourable member wants more particulars than that, I am willing to supply them.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I only want an answer to my question.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: If the honourable member stops interjecting, I will get on with the reply. The fact remains that this officer, Mr. Joseph Parkes, will be employed as the publicity officer covering all ambits of publicity for the State Government, and naturally his talents will be used as widely as possible. There is no shadow of doubt that he will be used in some form of publicity regarding the Tourist Bureau, but it will not be his role to order people in the Tourist Bureau around; he will not be doing that. I assure the honourable member that Mr. Parkes will be publicity officer in the Premier's Department but that his field will cover all the State.

SOLICITORS' CHARGES

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General and Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Recently it has come to my notice that the only recourse that a person has if he believes that he has been overcharged by a solicitor is to have the matter taxed by the Supreme Court, which also regulates the scale of fees. For the average layman, this is a relatively complex affair. The account must be taxed by the Master of the Supreme Court. I have been told by the Master's office that, even if the appellant is unrepresented, he is still charged for use of the Master's chambers and for the solicitor's time for appearing to explain his charges. For example, to have an account for \$120 taxed may cost between \$50 and \$80, even without legal representation. Under the present situation it is frequently only within the knowledge of the solicitor to give an account of the time spent. If the appeal fails (and in the present situation it often must fail) the appellant must pay all costs. In other words, if the account is not reduced by 10 per cent or more, the appellant pays all costs. In view of the Government's excellent record in other areas of consumer protection, will the Minister ask the Attorney whether the present position is as I have explained it and, if it is, whether he is satisfied with the situation? If the Attorney is not satisfied, will he say whether he is contemplating action that would enable complaints regarding accounts of below, for example, \$500 to be processed more easily and more cheaply?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague.

APPRENTICES

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Minister of Health received from the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding apprentices?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague reports that he can confirm that a letter has been received from the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations that contains certain proposals regarding the manner in which financial support may in the future be arranged in the apprenticeship area. The letter was addressed to the Minister of Labour and Industry and marked "confidential". Although parts of the letter have apparently been leaked to the press, my colleague considers that it would not be appropriate for the Government to comment further on the letter's contents and any Government initiatives in relation to it until after the whole matter has been considered at a meeting of Federal and State Ministers of Labour which was held in Adelaide on September 3, 1976.

MEAT PIES

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked recently regarding meat pies?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: During the past 12 months no official samples of meat pies have been taken, as at present there is no legally acceptable method of procuring a sample. The Food and Drugs Act has been amended to enable regulations to be made prescribing a sampling procedure for meat pies. Preparation of such a regulation is being considered. Meanwhile, trial or exploratory samples have been taken in the past 12 months by four local boards; eight of the 10 samples taken did not contain the minimum amount of meat required by the regulation. These deficiencies have been reported to the manufacturers concerned.

It is recognised, as stated in the report in *Choice*, that the methods of determining the source of the various ingredients of meat pies need revision. The regulation for meat products is being reviewed by the Food Standards Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council, and consideration is to be given to the matters raised in the *Choice* report. Sausages were sampled by the Metropolitan County Board; of 33 samples, eight complied with the standard, 25 failed to conform and 12 prosecutions were made. The Food Standards Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council had initiated a review of the meat and meat products standards, which includes the standard for sausages.

BREAD

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Minister of Health received from the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs a reply to my recent question regarding bread?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague reports that the report in *Choice* magazine about bread raises the matters of increased extraction rate to give higher yields of fibre, vitamins and minerals, bleaching of flour, the range of additives permitted, and label declaration of these additives. These matters are controlled at present by the food and drugs regulations for labelling of foods and flours, meals and bread. These regulations are based on a uniform standard prepared by the Food Standards Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council.

The matters raised should be considered by that committee so that uniform action is taken by the States in dealing with amendments to bread regulations. This matter has been referred to that committee. Although there is

a choice of breads on the market, the most common bread purchased is white bread, and this seems to indicate a consumer preference that would have to be modified if breads of the type advocated by *Choice* were to be made compulsory because of changed colour, moisture and crumb characteristics.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary received from the Treasurer a reply to my recent question regarding succession duties?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague reports that 1701 transfers of property into joint names under the moratorium granted by the Statutes Amendment (Gift Duty and Stamp Duties) Act, 1975, were lodged at the State Taxation Office. No record has been maintained by that office of the number of transfers as tenants in common or as joint tenants. However, the assessors handling these documents state that a very small percentage only were transferred as tenants in common.

HIGHWAYS EXPENDITURE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On June 12, 1975, I asked the Minister whether he would obtain from the Minister of Transport the total expenditure by the Highways Department since May, 1970, on the acquisition of properties along the freeway and expressway routes as defined in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study report. The Minister later replied that \$13 137 733 had been expended in this way during the period June 1, 1970, to May 31, 1975. He also said that sales of properties in the same period amounted to \$369 811. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from his colleague the adjusted figures, for the same purposes, for the period from June 1, 1970, up until August 31, 1976?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

MUSSELS

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: When in Melbourne recently I discussed the matter of mussels, a fish product that is sold extensively in South Australia and Victoria. Before going to Melbourne, I was in the habit of purchasing mussels, which are tasty. However, I was told by certain people in Victoria that about 12 months ago there was much public concern and discussion in that State regarding the edibility of this product. If mussels were caught in the deep sea, they were usually all right, although if caught near pylons or piers at Williamstown, or other areas of Victoria, people could contract typhoid after eating them. Since then, I have not bought any mussels, although I would have liked to do so. Although I realise that the people to whom I spoke in Victoria are connoisseurs of food, there is some doubt whether what they have told me is correct. These mussels, most of which have been

imported from Victoria, are sold in nearly every fish and chip shop in Adelaide's metropolitan area. I do not want to state the brand name of the product I have purchased in the past, as the information that has been given to me may prove to be incorrect. I ask the Minister of Health to investigate the matter of mussels on sale in fish and chip shops in South Australia with a view to satisfying the public and me regarding their quality, whether they are edible, and whether people can contract any type of disease, not just typhoid, from eating them.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will ask my department to investigate the matter to see whether there is any danger to the public from eating mussels, and I will bring down a reply for the honourable member.

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about the State Government's attitude to subsidising the steel industry?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The South Australian Government presented a submission to the Industries Assistance Commission inquiry into the iron and steel industry at the Adelaide hearing on July 19, 1976. The submission indicated the importance of this and related industries to the State, highlighted the special significance of the inquiry to the future of Whyalla, and requested that these factors be considered by the commission in establishing tariff levels. The submission did not recommend specific rates of protection for the various products under review, but suggested that: specific rates be replaced by *ad valorem* duties; tariff rates for these products be made more uniform; subsidies be introduced for selected products (such as sheet steel); and any changes in rates be gradually introduced. These recommendations would result in slightly higher tariff protection for structural steel produced at Whyalla, with reduced tariffs but higher subsidies for sheet steel produced in other locations. These recommendations, if accepted, would assist the long-term prospects of South Australian industry. Copies of the South Australian submission are available from the Trade and Development Division, Premier's Department.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Question Time to be continued for a further five minutes.
Motion carried.

HER MAJESTY'S THEATRE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the possible acquisition of Her Majesty's Theatre by the Government to assist the State Opera of South Australia and the cultural life of Adelaide generally?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No definite action or consideration can be undertaken to acquiring Her Majesty's Theatre until the owners confirm their intention to sell, or indicate an expected price. Equally obviously, this Government is not prepared to give an open commitment to buy the theatre without knowing the cost. The honourable member does the cause of the State Opera and the South Australian public a grave disservice by inviting speculation which may encourage the present owners to demand a

higher purchase price than may be justified. Whether or not the Government purchases the theatre, it intends to ensure that it is retained for performing arts purposes.

LAND DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister for Planning.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question follows a question asked in this place by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall about a proposed retirement village at Summit Road, Crafrers. Subsequent to that question, the Minister for Planning stated in the House of Assembly that the State Planning Authority had rejected the application for this proposed development. That statement of August 11 sets out the grounds for rejection and indicates that apparently no action can be taken against a developer who starts development of land and is subsequently refused permission to proceed with it, even though he may have completely decimated the amenity of the area by removing the trees and destroying the natural environment. If permission is then refused for him to proceed, no action can be taken by the State Planning Authority, the Government, or the local council to force him to pay compensation for the damage done. Does the Government intend to remedy this ill?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the matter to my colleague and bring down a reply.

VOTING SYSTEM

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Chief Secretary inform the Council of the voting method used by the Parliamentary Labor Party to elect its officers?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The system used for officers is the card voting system.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: For the Parliamentary Party?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, I am sorry. I do not know the name.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The exhaustive ballot system?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes.

WATER RESOURCES ACT

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (on notice): On how many occasions in the last five years has the Minister acted to the contrary of a decision of the appeals tribunal appointed under the provisions of the Acts repealed by the Water Resources Act, 1976?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: One.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1976.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE REDEVELOPMENT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Parliament House redevelopment (Phase II).

STATE BANK REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1976, together with profit and loss account and balance sheets.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 19. Page 753.)

Clause 2—"Constitution of the board."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Since the introduction of this Bill to this Council several honourable members have spoken on it and have expressed their views, and I have been seeking information from parties interested in this matter. However, some of the information I sought did not come to me—it went to the wrong quarter. I have now changed my mind on this matter. I was not really happy with my original amendment, and over the weekend I had an opportunity to examine the matter. I refer to the Dentists Act Amendment Bill of 1960. That Bill was strongly supported by the leading Labor Party speakers, and several amendments were introduced and agreed to.

I refer to the essential difference between the Dentists Act, as it has operated since 1960, and the Medical Practitioners Bill now before us. Mr. Justice Bright originally drafted the Dentists Act Amendment Bill in 1960 to overcome an important point that has relevance to this Bill. As it is presently constituted, the Medical Board is both the prosecutor and judge of cases. That this sort of situation should not exist was recognised as far back as 1960. I am sorry that I did not pick up this point earlier. As a result of the amendment to the Dentists Act in 1960, to which I have referred, that board was divided into two sections—the administrative section and the statutory committee that acts in a *quasi* judicial fashion. I believe that this is the right approach to adopt in the case of the Medical Board.

I telephoned the Australian Medical Association when the Bill was first introduced in this place. The association examined the matter and wrote to Dr. Tonkin, so that I received the letter only yesterday. Therefore, I moved my amendments rather in the dark when the Committee last sat.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: In other words, the A.M.A. contacted you.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Does the Hon. Mr. Foster doubt my word about it?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I always have doubts about you—have no doubt about that!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I contacted the A.M.A. to ask its views on this matter.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It got in touch with you and went crook at you.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is not so.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the honourable member give way?

The CHAIRMAN: The give-way rule does not apply in the Committee stage.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The A.M.A. wrote to Dr. David Tonkin following the contact I had made and its letter of August 23, 1976, is as follows:

Re: Medical Practitioners Act.

I refer to my letter dated August 18, 1976, to you on this subject.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Why don't—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Shut up!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I will not shut up for you or anyone else.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He is not yelling at me like that—I don't care who he is. What is Squawky Dawky on about?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster is out of order in continually talking across the Chamber to another honourable member.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The letter continues:

At a meeting of branch council held on August 19, 1976, this subject was again discussed and after receiving legal advice from the branch solicitors it was decided:

The problem could best be solved by creating a new body to be called, say, "The Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal" which alone would adjudicate on complaints, after they had been investigated by the Medical Board. The Medical Board would retain its administrative functions, investigate complaints and lay charges before this Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal. This would be in line with amendments that were made to the Dentists Act in 1960 and which I am led to believe were drafted by Mr. Charles Bright, Q.C. as he then was. As a result of these amendments the Dental Board investigates complaints and the Statutory Committee (to which my proposed Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal would be equivalent) adjudicates on these complaints. I would hope that such amendments would be acceptable to both the Government and the Opposition. I am led to believe that both the Government and the Opposition have supported amendments contained in a Legal Practitioners Bill recently before the House setting up a Legal Practitioners Board and a Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal whose functions are similar to the functions proposed above for the Medical Board and the Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal.

I fully realise this is a slightly different concept to splitting the Medical Board in two as envisaged in my letter of August 18, 1976, but at that time we did not have the benefit of considered opinion by our legal advisors, although they were at that meeting, and subsequent to this meeting we have legally been advised that the above concept seems the most satisfactory way of achieving the desired result. Thank you once again for your co-operation.

Yours most sincerely,

Jim Harley, President

I am sending an identical letter to Mr. Banfield and also to Dr. Robert Steele.

Already in the Dentists Act the functions of the board are virtually divided between the administrative function and the *quasi* judicial function. That also appears to be the position regarding the legal practitioners legislation that was recently dealt with by this Council, although there are some modifications in that case.

While the Bill is before us we should take the necessary action to place the Medical Board in a similar position so that its functions are divided between administrative matters and those of a *quasi* judicial nature. Since receiving this letter at about 2 p.m. this afternoon, I have instructed the Parliamentary Counsel to draft an amendment along these lines. There is no doubt that my amendment should be acceptable to both the Government and the Opposition on this matter. Although I was not completely happy with the amendments I was to move, at that stage I did not quite understand the point, as I do now, that the division of the board into two separate functions seems to be eminently desirable.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): Is it anticipated that the board will be set up as envisaged by this Bill and then split into two? I should like some

more information from the Leader before I can answer his proposal. He did not elaborate on the composition of the board.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Leader was suggesting that progress be reported.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. I should like the Chief Secretary to consider this letter and the Hon. Mr. Sumner and the Hon. Mr. Burdett to look at my submission on it, because I believe there is an important point here that should concern us. It is a point that has been recognised in previous legislation and now, while the Bill is before us, it should be recognised in this Bill. For that reason, I ask the Chief Secretary to report progress while the amendments are being drafted, or to report progress on motion so that he and the Hon. Mr. Sumner can examine the matter and comment on my suggestions.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: After conferring with members of the board, I understand they want further time to consider the implications of the recent decision given in court and to look at its ramifications. For that reason, they want this Bill to go through now. The board itself will look at the matter with a view to making recommendations to the Government. When that has been done, I give an undertaking that in this Council I will introduce legislation for their recommendations to be implemented. However, in the meantime I am not prepared to accept the proposed amendments outlined by the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is a great pity because a point of principle is involved. We are a House of Review and we have a proposal which even the Minister would have to agree has much merit. Surely, this should be the time, when we are endeavouring to change the legislation, to improve the Bill to give the best possible results. We should have as our primary aim that, when we finally dispose of this matter, the new legislation will be the best possible that can be achieved by this Parliament. A proposal has now been made. It was not the fault of the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS that some delay occurred, because, as he explained, the correspondence from the Australian Medical Association unfortunately did not go directly to him as Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber. I think that is where it was intended to go. Whilst we have the legislation here for review and have the opportunity to amend it and make the final result the best legislation we can get, we should take steps to achieve that target. If the Minister is inclined to say that he wants to get to the final situation in two stages—by trying to get the present Bill through and then by looking at the matter of further improvement and alterations and bringing down another amending Bill—I do not think that is the most efficient way to approach the problem. It must need only a few days for perusal of the proposal mentioned for the first time in this Chamber today and, after a few days, this Council should be able to fashion amendments. Whether or not it accepts these amendments is entirely a matter for this Council when it has those amendments on file. Although we fully appreciate that the measure has been in this Chamber for some time, it would appear, because of the circumstances, that it is only reasonable to ask and to expect the Minister to allow a few more days consideration of it. I am sure that, if the Minister gave a little more thought to the situation, he could come up with a decision on what would be the best thing to do.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have read the judgment to which the Minister has referred, and in my view that judgment constitutes an argument for the proposition put

forward by the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS. I hope the Minister will accede to the Leader's request at least to report progress so that an amendment can be moved and considered.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: At this stage I am not inclined to move to report progress. The Hon. Mr. Hill, in his opening remarks, said we should give more consideration to this matter raised by the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS, but that is exactly what I suggested when I said I did not believe that now was the right and proper time to introduce it. I want people to look at the suggestion made by the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS, not only in this Chamber but also outside it. I have given an undertaking that I will introduce a Bill as soon as we get the recommendations, after consideration of the proposal of the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS. As I have said, the board needs time to look at it. It wants to make sure that the position is properly covered. For these reasons, because this is a new matter entirely, I do not feel inclined to report progress. We want this matter looked at properly. If honourable members opposite have not been able to look at it when the Bill has been on file since August 19, how much more time do they need? They have had since August 19 to look at it. It is a completely new matter and, because so many people are interested in it and it can be the subject of another Bill to be introduced later, I am not prepared to move that progress be reported.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask the Minister to consider this matter further. True, he said that this Bill has been on honourable members' files since August 19.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Earlier than that.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: But it is only this afternoon that the A.M.A.'s reply has been available. I have seen the reply from the A.M.A. in this Chamber only this afternoon because, as the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS properly said, it was directed, probably by mistake, to the Leader of the Opposition in another place.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: They are not talking to one another.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: We want to peruse a copy of that letter. As the reply of the A.M.A. has become available to honourable members only today, I ask the Minister further to consider his unwillingness to report progress at this stage.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask the Chief Secretary to report progress. I say that the amendments will be drafted and the Bill will be through this afternoon, so there is no delay as far as that is concerned. The Minister seeks to have the Bill passed and says that at some time in the future the Government will consider my suggestion. My suggestion was taken up by the dentists more than 16 years ago and it also has been taken up in legislation dealing with legal practitioners. We have had recently the judgment of the Chief Justice and, I think, the comments of Mr. Justice Jacobs on this point.

If the Minister reports progress and I get a chance to get the amendments on file and to move them, I hope that the Bill will go through with those amendments, and it can then be examined in the other place. The matter can be put before the Medical Board. If the Government, when dealing with the matter in the other place, considers that the amendments are hopeless, the matter will come back to us and we can re-examine it. Just to say that this Chamber should not do the correct thing with the legislation at this stage and that the Government will do the correct thing in the future seems to be a ridiculous procedure, when the Bill is before us.

I ask the Minister what it matters if this Bill is held in this Chamber or the other place for another week, anyway. I do not see any big problems in that situation. Surely the Medical Board and the Government's advisers can examine the position. They could have a reply tomorrow. It is almost impossible to get the Bill assented to before, probably, Thursday week anyway, and the Government refuses to consider a submission that I believe this Chamber should consider, seeing that the matter has been commented on by prominent lawyers back to 1960. The matter was commented on by Mr. Justice Bright when he was Queen's Counsel and it has been commented on recently in a Supreme Court judgment. This Chamber has an obligation to do the right thing with legislation before it, and I ask the Chief Secretary to report progress, even if he puts the matter on motion at this stage.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have already stated that this is another matter and that people outside want an opportunity to consider the ramifications. I have indicated that the matter can be the subject of another Bill. The board is not entirely satisfied with what is in the Dentists Act. It does not want a complete replica of that Act. I do not know the board's view in relation to the Legal Practitioners Act, but we want to consider these matters. If we want to do the right thing, we should be given time to examine them. As this is a new matter, it can be the subject of a new Bill that I would hope to introduce when the ramifications have been considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: I ask the Minister whether he classifies this Bill as a Bill that the Government wants passed as a matter of urgency.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The legislative programme is a matter of urgency to the Government. We want our legislation through, and all legislation that has been introduced should be considered in this way. This Bill has not had a quick passage through this place. It has been before the Chamber since August 19. No-one has shown any urgency as far as that matter is concerned, and I feel that the time has come when this Chamber should consider the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chamber is considering the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am so disappointed with the Minister's attitude that I retract the undertaking I gave when this Chamber was sitting about two weeks ago. I said then that I was prepared to support the Government's Bill, except that I opposed the inclusion of a legal practitioner. I retract what I conceded at that time. It is an unreasonable attitude for the Chief Secretary not to allow the Hon. Mr. DeGaris a little more time to prepare amendments in accordance with the proposal that he has put forward today. That proposal came into Parliament about two weeks ago but did not come into the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's hands until today.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This is another matter entirely.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: All that is asked in this latest request is that the matter be put on motion. I cannot recall a request of that kind being refused in the time that I have been here. Despite the attitudes that I have made clear, I again implore the Minister to reconsider his attitude.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I agree with the honourable member that it is usual for progress to be reported when we are considering a Bill, but members opposite are raising a new matter that is not in the Bill.

If the matter had something to do with the Bill, the Hon. Mr. Hill's argument might have some substance. The Bill has been before the Chamber since August 19, and for the reasons I have given I will not ask that progress be reported.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the Hon. Mr. DeGaris whether the amendment that he proposes to bring before the Committee is relevant to the subject matter in clause 2.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My amendment proposes to divide the board into two sections and, as clause 2 deals with the constitution of the board, I think that the division of the board into two sections is relevant to that clause.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The subject is not new matter. The subject matter of the Bill is the constitution of the board, and the subject matter of the amendment that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris proposes is also the constitution of the board. The amendment simply changes the way that the Bill alters the constitution of the board.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I say that the proposed amendment is not relevant to the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I cannot see how the Minister can say that an amendment affecting the composition of the board is not relevant to the Bill. Anyone can see that the measure is about the composition of the board and the number of members on the board. We are reaching the situation of wondering what will happen to the Bill, and I have doubts about voting for it if the Minister is to take this attitude. The amendment may not get sufficient support and the Bill may pass in its original form; that is a matter for this Chamber to decide. It is difficult when an honourable member says that he wants further time but is not talking in terms of next month or next year. I would be doubtful about supporting a Bill if an honourable member had indicated that he wanted to move amendments thereto. I do not think this is a proper way for the Government to act. If I wanted to move amendments, I would indeed be disappointed if the Committee did not give me sufficient time to enable me to do so. As I had not seen the Australian Medical Association's submission until an hour ago, I think some little time should be given to honourable members to enable them to digest the contents of that submission. No-one will think any the less of the Minister if he now changes his mind in this respect. I implore him to give honourable members an opportunity to examine whatever amendments may be moved.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That sort of talk will not get the honourable member anywhere. If this was a new proposition, I would agree with honourable members opposite. However, they have had this Bill before them for some time, I think since August 19—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No, since July 29.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That means that they had even more time than I thought. If they had not previously received a reply from the A.M.A., why did they not chase up their original inquiry? Is it my fault that honourable members opposite wanted to go walkabout during the adjournment?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You did, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course I did, and that is what it is all about. Before I went walkabout, I had received correspondence from the A.M.A. and was able to check up on any outstanding matters. It is not my fault if honourable members opposite were not willing to do that. I would need much more time to examine the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's proposal. Because it does not affect

the Bill, and because I have said that I would be willing later to introduce a further amending Bill, I am not willing at this stage to report progress.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I indicate my disgust at the Minister's attitude. He has received co-operation from Opposition members, particularly me, many times on many matters, and I am extremely disappointed by the attitude he has taken on this matter. Any future approach for co-operation may be treated in the same way that the Minister is now treating the Committee.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It seems that the Opposition, because of its own fault and because of a lack of communication between its two Leaders, has not done what it should have done. Despite this, it expects the Government to accede to its every request and, immediately this does not happen, honourable members opposite adopt an attitude of absolute truculence.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Rubbish!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Honourable members opposite scream at Government members and tell them to shut up, yet the Hon. Mr. Dawkins had his head immersed in that local rag, the *News*. The Hon. Mr. Cameron made a direct threat regarding co-operation. The Opposition's attitude is quite wrong. They have overlooked the fact that the Minister said no less than three times (indeed, he almost gave an assurance to the Opposition on this matter) that if, after this Bill was passed, a matter arose concerning honourable members opposite another Bill would be introduced to provide what they wanted.

It is not the Government that is putting honourable members opposite in a spot: they are trying, by every way possible, to put the Minister in a spot. They are not able even to pass a piece of paper across the Chamber to the Minister telling him what the amendments will be. This Bill has been before honourable members since July 29, much longer than was stated. This is not the time for honourable members opposite to say they have been wronged: the boot is on the other foot. It is wrong for the Leader to berate the Minister and Government members, issuing threats that, unless the Government waits for them to move amendments, they will refuse to pass the Bill. That is nothing less than scurrilous.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I reiterate that neither flattery nor blackmail will get the Hon. Mr. Cameron anywhere. The Opposition has received from the Government every co-operation in this matter. I said that the Bill came before the Council on August 19, after which the Hon. Mr. Foster said that it was introduced on July 29, three weeks earlier. If honourable members opposite are going to talk about co-operation they should realise that there must be co-operation from both sides. This Bill having been before the Council for nearly six weeks, the Opposition has had enough time to examine it. I reiterate that, if the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's proposal had something to do with the Bill, I would be pleased to report progress. However, it has nothing to do with the Bill at all.

There have been discussions regarding the Dentists Act. Because of dissatisfaction among certain people, I believe that this matter should be considered after everyone has had plenty of opportunity to canvass the position thoroughly. For that reason, I do not want progress to be reported.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Minister that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is asking him only to report progress until a later time this afternoon. If the Minister is not willing to do that, he may find that the Opposition will carry on the debate until the amendments are ready. In other words, we may have a filibuster.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Let us sit here until midnight if they want that.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: It appears that unwarranted emotion has been generated. Certainly, there has been a lack of communication. Is it so vital that this Bill should go through today or tomorrow? I think an assurance could be given that the Bill would go through the Council this week, and I cannot understand why it should be forced through now. Surely it is our duty to study carefully all legislation. I therefore cannot understand why the Minister is being so difficult.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It seems to me—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You are assisting the filibuster.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Opposition Whip is holding the Chairman's attention, and I am waiting for him to buzz off.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member addressing the Chair?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I was waiting for you, Mr. Chairman, to be disengaged. Much time was taken up by the Leader of the Opposition in berating this Chamber in support of amendments which he subsequently withdrew. The Opposition hoodwinked the Government by being insincere in proposing its earlier amendments. Honourable members have a further list of amendments from the Hon. Mr. Hill. Now, the Opposition wants more time to introduce amendments which it has not fully considered.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Leader of the Government said that this Bill came into the Council on July 29; that is correct, but it must be remembered that the Minister allowed debate on the Bill to be adjourned because the Australian Medical Association was not familiar with the legislation; further, the association had difficulty in meeting because of problems in connection with its Chairman. So, there was a forced delay at that stage. The Government agreed that the Bill should not be debated for a time, and today it has refused to give time for amendments to be tabled. The Government is saying that it will not report progress, although it does not know what the amendments provide for.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They have been outlined by the Leader. They indicated completely new matter.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: They indicate a fairer system to help the medical authorities of the State. I recognise that the Government has the right to say that it does not want progress to be reported. It was not until 2.15 p.m. that I, as Opposition Whip, went to the Chief Secretary and asked him whether he was familiar with the letter from the A.M.A. He indicated that he was not willing to move amendments associated with that letter. Therefore, the Opposition believes that it must take its present course for the betterment of the medical profession.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I gave no indication before the adjournment that I intended moving any amendment.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: No. The Minister had not received the letter from the A.M.A. before the adjournment.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield. It is an entirely different matter. I will indicate to the A.M.A. that we will consider its proposition; it is as simple as that.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The A.M.A. has asked that it be written into this Bill. We were criticised about the action taken, yet it was not until 2 p.m. today that I found out from the Leader of the Government that it was the responsibility of the Opposition

to try and help in this matter. The Government has not indicated clearly that the A.M.A.'s amendments are not acceptable. Argument has been advanced about leave not being granted in relation to the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I have already indicated that the subject matter of the A.M.A.'s letter and the matters to which the honourable member is referring will be considered by the Government at a later date.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Opposition does not want to filibuster, but it must be able to see what the amendments are when they get here.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The views of the A.M.A. were made known to the Minister about 14 days ago. How much time does the Government want in which to consider the A.M.A.'s submission?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As I have already indicated, there are more people interested in this Bill than the A.M.A. Other people should have time to consider the matter and, when they have given their reasoned opinion, I will consider bringing forward another Bill.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Minister has said that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's suggested amendments bring forward new matter, but I suggest that that is not the case. True, every amendment does something new, otherwise it would not be moved. The Bill alters the constitution of the board provided in the principal Act, and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's amendment seeks to make a change in a different way. However, it is not something new: essentially, it is the same matter.

Honourable members opposite have referred to the matter of fault and have suggested that it was the Opposition's fault that this delay has occurred, that there was a break-down in communication and that it was not their fault at all. I agree that it was not their fault and that there may have been some fault with us but, as this is not a matter of extreme urgency and as it will not make much difference whether this Bill is passed today, tomorrow or some time in the future, the question of fault is not relevant. The job of this Chamber is to review and consider legislation. It is our job to properly consider legislation and possible amendments in order to produce the best possible legislation. We should have the opportunity of considering fully amendments that would possibly make the Bill better than it would otherwise be.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

Line 11—Leave out "seven" and insert "six".

Is the Minister's stubborn attitude today a reflection of his hope that the Opposition will defeat this Bill? Does the Minister want to chalk up a score to include with other evidence collected by him and the Government for further use? Opposition members will not fall for that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You said it—not I!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That further reinforces my view. My later amendment removes the inclusion of a legal practitioner as a member of the board. I have moved this related amendment as a test case. Honourable members may query whether an even number of members on the board could cause difficulties regarding voting on the board. Such difficulties will not arise, because section 11 (3) provides that a person presiding over such a board shall have a casting vote as well as a deliberative vote.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I oppose the amendment. I indicated in debate that the board is most anxious to have a legal practitioner appointed to give assistance to it. The board believes that such an appointment would be a great help in its deliberations. It was the board's suggestion that a legal practitioner be included on it. I

refer to the assistance that has been given to this Committee by a leading legal man and the benefits that have accrued. Similar benefits would accrue from a legal practitioner's being a member of the board.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, C. M. Hill (teller), D. H. Laidlaw, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield (teller), F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 10 Ayes and 10 Noes. To enable this matter to be further considered in another place, I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

Lines 15 and 16—Leave out all words in these lines.

This amendment is consequential on the previous amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Qualification for membership of the board."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Consequential on the amendments already made, I oppose this clause.

Clause negatived.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Quorum."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Consequential on the amendments already made, I oppose this clause.

Clause negatived.

Remaining clauses (7 to 10) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TERTIARY ALLOWANCES

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. Anne Levy:

(1) That this Council notes with concern—

(a) that the Budget of the Commonwealth Government makes no increase in the value of the tertiary education assistance scholarship;

(b) that no adjustment will now be made until the 1977 calendar year despite the fact that the consumer price index has increased by over 20 per cent since the last adjustment 20 months ago;

(c) that the students and community generally have voiced their concern over the level of payments particularly their relationship with unemployment benefits; and

fails to understand why the indicated inquiry into this matter has been delayed until after the Budget.

(2) That this Council deplores this apparent callous disregard for student welfare and requests the Government to make urgent representations to the Federal Government for an early review of the position,

to which the Hon. R. C. DeGaris had moved the following amendments:

Delete from line 1 the words "with concern".

Delete from line 1 of paragraph 1 (c) after the word "students" the words "and community generally" and all words after "benefits" in line 2.

Delete from line 1 of paragraph (2) the words "deplores this apparent callous disregard for student welfare and"; after the word "requests" delete the words "the Government to make urgent representations to"; and after the words "the Federal Government" delete the words "for an early review of the position" and insert in lieu thereof the words "for a review at an early date".

(Continued from August 19. Page 760.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I support the motion so ably moved by the Hon. Anne Levy, and oppose the amendments moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, which indicate what the Opposition thinks about the motion. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has moved to delete the words "with concern". Obviously, he is not at all concerned about the students; he is not interested at all.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is not rubbish. If the Leader and honourable members opposite had any concern, they would be prepared to leave those words in, but they have no concern; they want to take them out.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You didn't have any concern when your Party didn't do anything about it.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member knows what was the state of the education system before the Dunstan Government was elected, yet today our system is the equal of any other system in Australia. He knows what a mess the Liberals made of the education system from 1968 until 1970. Honourable members opposite should think back to where they were in those days. They are not showing any concern. The concern they should show is that this Council notes with concern the lack of action taken by the Commonwealth Government, but that does not mean a thing to members opposite; they have no interest in the Tertiary Education Assistance Scholarship scheme. They are not concerned that no adjustment will be made until the 1977 calendar year although the consumer price index has increased by over 20 per cent since the last adjustment some 20 months ago. There is no concern by members opposite and they are prepared to get up and say so, because this is what their Leader has done by amending the motion. The motion states:

That this Council notes . . . (c) that the students and community generally have voiced their concern over the level of payments particularly their relationship with unemployment benefits.

Honourable members opposite have not noted or do not want to note that the community generally has also voiced its concern. It is of no interest to members opposite. All they want to say is that only the students have voiced their concern, when they know very well that this matter is of grave concern to the community generally; but again, members opposite are not interested in what the community thinks or does as long as they can cut back on the TEAS scheme and support this Federal Government, which, of course, as I have said previously, is not going over too well with the community generally. Members opposite are not prepared even to accept that proposition at present, and they want to exclude the community.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: They are all ashamed of Fraser; even the Hon. Mr. Dawkins is ashamed of him.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: What rubbish! I am ashamed of you.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I am glad you do not like me; I would be upset if you liked me.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The motion states:

That this Council deplores this apparent callous disregard for student welfare and requests the Government to make urgent representations to the Federal Government for an early review of the position.

Members opposite do not deplore this disregard for students' welfare: the Hon. Mr. DeGaris wants to leave out "deplores" in relation to this callous disregard for student welfare. Why do he and other members opposite want to do that? They are quite pleased about the present position because they are not the slightest bit interested in TEAS. They have no regard whatever for the students in this area.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We do not use them for political capital.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We are not using them for political capital either, but we at least want the students to have some capital in their pocket, and that is more than members opposite want. We want the students to get a proper education, but that is not what members opposite want.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Cameron will support the attitude of his Leader, which previously he has soundly denounced. He is now only out to earn his spurs to get preselection, and for that reason he has been going back on things that he said in the past 18 months. It is clear to me the Opposition shows no concern for the students or for the fact that the community generally has voiced concern. Members opposite are not interested in that concern, but let them say so. Let them carry their amendment and show to the people outside their lack of interest in the students.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: What an incredible speech! There was absolutely nothing in it. It is disappointing that the person who in this place is in charge of the Government can make such a small, empty, and meaningless contribution to a serious subject. I am sorry that the Minister has now left the Chamber. The Government has engaged in nothing more than a cheap political stunt, based on pure hypocrisy by a bunch of hypocrites opposite who have no desire to assist students and have not had such a desire in the past. I would not mind if these crocodile tears had been shed earlier. On this matter, I do not want to single out the Hon. Miss Levy too much, because I know she has been appointed the hatchet person for this motion. It is the Government that has put up this staged performance on behalf of students, but let us look at history. In October, 1974, a committee was appointed to review the tertiary education assistance scheme. It was under the chairmanship of Dr. H. S. Williams, Director of the Western Australian Institute of Technology. The review was considered necessary largely because of the short time available for planning before the introduction of the scheme in 1974. The committee's report was tabled in Parliament in May, 1975, and, essentially, the report endorsed the aims and operation of the scheme, with some minor recommendations.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Who appointed that committee?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The former Labor Government in Canberra appointed it.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What did the Government before that one do?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will come to that. The minor recommendations to which I refer are as follows:

- (a) Increases in the maximum living allowance for students (\$1 200 for students living at home, \$2 200 for students living away from home).
- (b) Twice yearly adjustments to the allowance, based on a student allowance index which might be devised by the Department of Education using information supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- (c) Minor amendments to the requirements governing the application of the means test.
- (d) Other minor recommendations.

Since the adoption of the report's recommendations would have added \$20 000 000 to cover the increases in allowances and \$4 000 000 for the other recommendations, the Government postponed consideration of the report. That happened in May, 1975, under a Federal Labor Government. However, what happened when that Government

introduced its Budget in 1975? It had before it those recommendations. It had everything it needed to increase tertiary education allowances, but it refused to increase them in that Budget, even though the allowances were based on June, 1974, cost of living figures. Students in this city demonstrated, and I will refer to some newspaper reports about this. The first report to which I refer is dated September 17, 1975, which was after the Federal Labor Government's Budget had been introduced. It states that a move by students would be part of a protest campaign against the Federal Government for not increasing the tertiary allowance. The report went on to say how low the allowances were, compared to other things.

Another report, dated October 10, 1975, states that the South Australian Executive Officer of the Australian Union of Students told a rally that the Federal Government had gone back on its tertiary education promises. He said that that Government had promised to remove financial barriers to education but that the failure to increase the living allowance was restricting access to tertiary institutions. After that happened, were Government members of this Council crying crocodile tears on behalf of the students? Did the Hon. Miss Levy, who was in the Council then, move a motion similar to the one before us, which is purely a matter of politics and which uses the term "callous disregard"? Does that honourable member agree that the previous Labor Government had had callous disregard for students and, if she did, why did she not do something about the matter? This is a cheap political stunt purely for the moment.

I have no doubt that the present Federal Government will increase allowances if and when the inquiry into tertiary education has been completed. I would not mind if Government members in this Council were genuine. However, they are not genuine, because they did not do anything about the matter at the proper time, which was when the allowances first fell behind the cost of living figures. The Hon. Mr. Foster has stated that the students require these amounts to keep themselves.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I have not spoken yet.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The honourable member said it in an interjection to me.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I did not. You are dreaming.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am not. I looked at the cost of living figures to find out why students and others in this community were in a disastrous situation because their allowances, wages, or whatever they received did not follow the cost of living increase. In the past, it probably was possible to get away without an increase for one or two years, because then we had a reasonable inflation rate. But let us see what happened to the cost of living index figures after Labor took office in this country, because they are interesting. In 1970-71, the figure was 7.8 per cent; in 1971-72 and 1972-73 it was 7.4 per cent; in 1973-74 it was 16.8 per cent; and in 1974-75 it was 24.5 per cent. It is shameful that that occurred, yet not a damn thing was done about student allowances, and there was no protest from Government members in this Council, because they did not like to embarrass their Federal colleagues. However, like the true bunch of hypocrites they are, Government members are now trying to do something to hurt the Federal Liberal Government. Had there still been a Labor Government in office, they would have remained silent.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Well, you are a hypocrite. You are on record in the history books as a hypocrite.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It was the Whitlam Labor Government that, in August, 1975, cut four Education Commission budgets by \$105 000 000 for the 1975-76 calendar year compared to the previous year's allocation, and abandoned triennial funding. But what about this year? The Fraser Government is currently reviewing student allowances with a view to announcing, early in October, the new rates for 1977. It was under a Federal Labor Government that soaring inflation eroded student allowances, and record unemployment denied many students the chance of obtaining part-time employment to supplement their allowances. High unemployment started not under a Liberal Government but under a Labor Government. At least the Liberal Government has tried to do something about inflation, which has caused unemployment.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: They aren't doing anything about unemployment.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Federal Liberal Government must first reduce inflation, because that is the key factor involved. When the Federal Labor Government brought down its last Budget, it cut Government spending, because it recognised that Government spending was one of the causes of inflation. I do not support the original motion, as every word contained therein shows what it is—a cheap political stunt. I call on the Government to take a sincere approach when it introduces matters in the Council; then, it might get some support. However, if it takes this cheapskate sort of approach, the Government will not receive support.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I support the motion. Before the Hon. Mr. Cameron leaves the Chamber, may I recall a meeting that we both attended at the Salisbury College of Advanced Education during the last election campaign? In the presence of Mr. Dean Brown, a member of another place, the Hon. Mr. Cameron, who now scurries from the Chamber, said, "Although it is true that the Whitlam Government has cut to some small degree the allowances applying to students, let me tell you that that is nothing to what Fraser will do if he should become the Prime Minister of this country."

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Who said that?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Martin Cameron said that to a bunch of students at the college of knowledge at Salisbury. He knew damn well that I would remember it: that is why he has rushed out of the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must moderate his language.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You need never refer to me as "honourable"; it is a prefix that should not apply anywhere. Let me deal with the gentleman who accuses me of being hypocritical. Given that what he said was true, he was equally guilty, because he did not raise his voice in support of the students who were demonstrating. I knew that late in 1974 students were lined up in the laneway adjacent to the then Commonwealth Department of Labour building in Currie Street. Those students considered that they had a right to receive unemployment benefits because they were not getting what they considered to be fair student allowances. Now that the Hon. Mr. Cameron is back in the Chamber and is earnestly speaking to the President, let me repeat my statement that he stood on the same platform with me at the Salisbury College of Advanced Education and warned students not

to elect a Federal Liberal Government because it would kick hell out of their allowances in every way, shape and form. Let me now hold aloft—

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is not in order for the honourable member to hold anything aloft in this Chamber.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Isn't it, Mr. President? I am holding myself aloft, despite what Standing Orders might say. I refer now to a document dealing with the Liberal Party's plans for a brighter future. The slogan "Turn on the light" referred to therein was first used during the term of office of a former English Prime Minister during the coal strike in Great Britain. Let us see who has been hypocritical. Regarding education, Mr. Fraser, in his Party's policy speech, states:

The tertiary education assistance scheme will be retained. That is what the lying Malcolm Fraser said. He continued:

Triennial funding on the recommendation of the Education Commission will be restored as the economy improves.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That's right.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: According to Mr. Lynch, the economy has improved. However, in the next breath Mr. Fraser said that inflation had to come down before anything could be done. Therefore, the students and workers are to be starved, and the professions can rip-off Medibank, but inflation must come down before the Federal Liberal Government starts regarding people as human beings. In this infamous document, Mr. Fraser continued:

Free tertiary education will be preserved. A basic grant for children in all schools will be provided. There will be extra financial help for children subjected to educational disadvantages.

On and on it goes! It is wrong for anyone in this Chamber to say that the former Whitlam Labor Government delivered a heavy blow to any section of this country's education system, whether it relates to the private schools or otherwise. A demonstration by school teachers on behalf of students at all levels of education was held in the Norwood Town Hall when Mr. Fairbairn was Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science. However, that demonstration was not acted on by the Federal Liberal Party at that time. Indeed, it ignored the demonstration, and it was the Labor Government that made good the sum of about \$1 400 000 000 for education, a sum to which the demonstrators were referring. It is partly true to say that, after the various education commissions had been operating for about two years, there was a slight reduction in the Hayden Budget for certain areas of education. No Government member denies that. So, the Hon. Mr. Cameron's charge of hypocrisy does not find root, because we realise that that happened.

We recognise that there were demonstrations, but we also recognise the necessity to carry the motion. People were put into the education stream by the previous Federal Labor Government, and it is absolutely vital that the policies enunciated by that Government be continued, so that people who took advantage of the changed system are not forced out of the system because of lack of funds. True, there was a percentage of unemployment during the period of the Labor Government but there was high unemployment under the McMahon Government, and there is at present high unemployment under the Fraser Government. So, the argument advanced by the Opposition is not valid.

Students will be seriously disadvantaged by financial cut-backs in a number of areas. It is no good our being over-political in this Chamber. Some honourable members try to score cheap points. I confess that I have done that myself, but I am being fair dinkum now: I am

saying that there was unemployment under the Federal Labor Government and that there was undoubtedly a cut-back under the Hayden Budget for 1975-76. The difference between the 1975 Budget period and the 1976 Budget period is that unemployment has become worse.

It is no good amending this motion and making it a form of political acquiescence. Honourable members on this side of the Council, in being constructive, hope that they will fire the spark of reason in the minds of Opposition members. We have been accused of having shortcomings, and we accept that we have shortcomings. I have here a document issued by the Liberal Party, and I could reveal it to score a cheap political trick, but I not not want to do that. If the honourable members opposite have sons or daughters at the university, those students can continue there, because our Parliamentary salaries enable us to give our children a helping hand. Of course, most people in the community are not on such salary ranges.

The number of students in universities today who come from non-privileged areas is greater than it was some years ago; this is why honourable members opposite should reconsider their attitude. If a student is living with his parents, who receive less than average earnings (and 60 per cent of the people are on less than average earnings), that student will not be able to continue at the university next year. The Federal Government's policy is that, if the student cannot find a job, he cannot apply for unemployment benefits until next February. If his father, who may be the only breadwinner in the family, becomes sick between now and December 17, the whole family will be living on the dole. So, the matter is very serious. I do not question at this stage whether the Federal Government is right or wrong in connection with not paying unemployment benefits.

I agree that conditions have improved since 1972. Indeed, they might have improved if Mr. McMahon had won the 1972 election; there would have been some form of improvement. After having young people in the tertiary education stream for two years, we will waste that if we deprive them of the right to remain in that stream. In addition to the wasted two years, I point out that no-one can measure the human damage done as a result of cutting short tertiary education after two years. There will be no great loss of face if Liberal members support this motion; the question of loss of face is in the minds only of people who think that there ought not to be any criticism of a political Party that is in power and is of their political persuasion. I have admitted what happened in the period of the Labor Government. It would be wrong, and in the interest of petty Party politics, to amend this simple, straightforward motion, which deplores the fact that the education allowance is being cut. We have not moved a motion of condemnation.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Read it.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: We have not moved a motion in condemnation of the amounts that the present Federal Government provides for free enterprise and for assistance in many other fields. All we ask for is sufficient support from Opposition members to have this motion carried unamended. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I, too, support the motion. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Foster on the honest, forthright way in which he has discussed the matter. His contribution this afternoon has been brief and to the point. On the other hand, the Hon. Mr. Cameron has accused honourable members on this side of playing politics, yet he has made remarks that have been completely

irrelevant to September, 1976. To quote Shakespeare, it is appropriate to describe his remarks as being full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. The Hon. Mr. Cameron has no credibility at all, especially in the light of his recent history.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I suggest in the light of his entire history.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: True, and I thank my colleague for his assistance. It must be remembered that this matter has not arisen in nine days or nine weeks; the Fraser Government has been in office for nine months. I point out that TEAS was introduced by the Whitlam Government, and I should like, as was my colleague the Hon. Norm Foster, to be perfectly honest about this situation. True, perhaps the 1975 Hayden Budget was disappointing in this respect. One reason for this was that to some extent the Treasurer had become a captive of the conservative gnomes of the Treasury and Reserve Bank, but certainly not to the extent that Fraser and Lynch have become captives.

Two weeks ago when this matter was dealt with in this Council the Opposition attempted to make a joke of the whole Parliamentary process. Despite his years of experience, the Leader of the Opposition, with his former so-called reputation to be feared, was unable to prepare amendments acceptable under Standing Orders and made a mockery of the situation.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Has the Leader lost his numbers?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yes, there has certainly been a change.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: He is a paper tiger.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The Leader carried out his exercise with much persiflage and banter a fortnight ago. He sounded like a travelling quack from the past. Certainly, he was in dire trouble and did not know how to proceed. Despite his 14 or 15 years experience, the Leader did not know how to move the appropriate amendment. We then saw the Hon. Mr. Hill rise and unashamedly begin to filibuster. The honourable member read from the 1976 Federal Budget, but he might as well have read from the *Sporting Globe*, because that is how relevant his speech was. Honourable members will understand the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's approach to this matter if they refer to the position a few short weeks ago when I was trying to discuss in this Chamber the Medibank situation. By way of interjection, the Leader equated health insurance with the price of meat. That said something.

The Hon. Anne Levy: He was after his pound of flesh!

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I was about to say exactly that. The Leader was seeking his pound of flesh. He and his colleagues are attempting to defend the indefensible. Honourable members on this side of the Council are not playing politics: for my part, I am up here to talk about real poverty, about malnutrition, about many recorded cases in tertiary students of sub-clinical scurvy. Imagine the effect on the mental health of these students. Of course, the Opposition does not see anything in real human terms: it sees everything in statistics and moving pawns about on a chess board.

Opposition members talk about the great fight against inflation, and their whole philosophy is in line with the Fraser Government's philosophy of recreating a two-class society: the few wealthy privileged people, whether they live in Australia or abroad, and the remainder of the people

who have to carry the burden if we are to overcome inflation, those least able to afford to carry this burden. Members opposite have no regard for human problems, they have no regard for human beings, and they are in no way humanitarian.

Strangely and ironically, the present Government is spending about \$700 000 000 annually on unemployment benefits. By Christmas time it is estimated that this figure on an annual basis will be about \$1 000 000 000. In those circumstances, it seems strange that the Federal Government has deferred consideration of an increase in tertiary allowances until next year. These increased allowances are needed now. What good does it do to tell someone, "We cannot assist you now, but we are looking into it; you may be starving to death but it is not our fault; the previous Government did nothing, but it had plenty of time to act, and so it is all right for us to take our time"? The position is deteriorating day by day.

I appeal to honourable members opposite to consider this matter from a humanitarian aspect. Supposedly, this Council is a Chamber in which honourable members opposite think and vote as they like. Certainly, we have been handed this line for a long time. Honourable members opposite are true Independents! Therefore, when this motion is taken to a vote, let honourable members opposite show us their true colours. Traditionally, tertiary student allowances have always been supplemented by employment during the long vacation and by part-time employment during the remainder of the year, but this concept no longer applies, because it is virtually impossible for students to find employment over the long vacation or part-time employment during the term. Therefore, the allowances provided now in a vast number of cases are the only means of support available to students, and we must not overlook the fact that this whole scheme is severely means tested.

To obtain the maximum benefit, small, niggardly and totally inadequate as it may be, a student has to come from a very low-income family. Naturally, these students cannot expect any parental assistance whatever. It is important that this factor be remembered. The \$31 a week allowance is not a supplement; it is not something which is there and on to which other sums are added, such as vacation employment, part-time term employment and the like. The \$31 a week is the only money these students have to live on for 12 months a year. With continuing inflation, \$31 a week is a ridiculous allowance.

As I have said, this position reflects a complete denial of any humanitarian instinct. Also, I am surprised that no reference has been made in this debate to the secondary students assistance allowance. For a secondary student, the allowance is only \$450 a year, and this allowance is even more severely means tested than the allowance paid to tertiary students. The maximum sum available as an allowance to secondary students in the last two years of their education is \$450. It is available only if the means-tested income of the student's parents does not exceed \$4 300 a year. I am referring to students who are about 17 or 18 years of age. There is little difference between those students and tertiary students, yet the secondary allowance remains at \$450 a year. Obviously, a student's parents must both be invalid pensioners, because no-one earns only \$4 300 these days. I am not an economist, and my knowledge of economics is almost as abysmal as that of the Hon. Mr. Hill—

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You're selling yourself short.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: —but I cannot understand how increasing student allowances by \$10 or \$15 a week to lift students a little above the poverty line, enabling

them to eat three times a day, to buy a pair of jeans and a T-shirt occasionally, is going to contribute in any way to inflation. It is a tragedy to see the sort of phrases the Liberal Party trots out.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: "Fraser" is the word.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Some of the phrases are "It would be inappropriate at this time" or "The whole matter should be reviewed". As the Hon. Mr. Dunford has pointed out many times, some students are walking about starving, and we should be concerned about that and not be playing politics in this Council; but, of course, with the Liberal Party student-bashing is a fairly popular sort of thing.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Here we go.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Here we go indeed: it is a popular sport. Sometimes, as with the Fraser Government, members opposite elect to do it subtly, but they like to see students starve to death. As the member for Alexandra in another place said about trade unions—"Let them starve for a while; let them go hungry." What a great humanitarian!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He is only repeating what had been said in the Party room.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: But their colleague in Queensland, Bjelke-Petersen, is not nearly so subtle: he believes in a direct approach. When there was a peaceful student demonstration, and there was clear evidence on film that a female student had been beaten up by an overzealous policeman and the Commissioner of Police himself said, "Yes; there should certainly be an investigation into this", what happened? Bjelke Joe sacked his Minister. One could call it lateral promotion, but he was sacked nevertheless.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: What has this to do with the matter under review, which is on the Notice Paper?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I put it to honourable members that starving students to death by not giving them a decent allowance is equivalent to beating them to death. Whether you do it subtly or not, you people opposite do not care, because you like to categorise them as long-haired no-good no-hopers, and you think that goes down very well with the Alf Garnetts in the electorate. You appeal to ignorance and to the worst elements. Let us be reasonable about this.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It is not unfair to ask this of the Fraser Government, and I ask all honourable members to join in supporting the motion as moved. Certainly, I condemn the Fraser Government for its inaction in this matter.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: And the Whitlam Government?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I reject the amendment because it emasculates the whole motion.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In summing up the debate on this motion, I thank my colleagues, the Hon. Mr. Cornwall and the Hon. Mr. Foster, for their remarks supporting the motion. In reply to some of the comments made on the other side of the Chamber in the course of the debate, I apologise to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. If he wishes to hear my voice more frequently and has not had an opportunity to do so (I was not aware that he enjoyed the sound of my voice so much), I will endeavour to satisfy him in this regard. The best comment I can make on what the Hon. Mr. Cameron had to say is that I shall be grateful when our noise pollution legislation

has been passed and we can have an audio-meter in this Chamber to monitor the sounds that our ears have to suffer.

Turning to the substance of the motion and the amendment, I should like to consider in detail the amendment that has been moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. I can only suggest that he moved it with the intention of playing Party politics. I see no other reason for the substance of his amendments. First, he wishes to delete the words "with concern" and this Council to note something and not express its concern. I assure honourable members opposite that I am concerned about the situation of the students. I have been for quite a while and I have stated it many times in various places. I am concerned and hope, in view of the facts and figures that have been presented to the Council during this debate, that honourable members opposite, too, are concerned. To delete the words "with concern" would suggest a callousness that I would not expect of honourable members of this Chamber.

The second part of the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris suggests that only students have voiced their concern on this matter and that the community has not. This I categorically refute. Concern was expressed on the steps of this building by the Leader of the Opposition in another place and by the Minister of Education in this Government. Concern has been expressed by numerous academics over quite a lengthy period.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: And parents.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Concern has been expressed by parents, and by the Vice-Chancellor of Adelaide University on July 5, when he wrote to the Minister for Education in the Federal Government on this very matter. There have been many representations to the Government from a very large section of the community. To suggest that only students voice concern about this matter is completely to deny the facts of the situation.

The next part of the amendment by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is to delete the words "deplores this apparent callous disregard for student welfare and". I do not know what words mean if the present situation is not a callous disregard for student welfare. We have had the fact that the TEAS allowance is now only 75 per cent of the unemployment benefit. Students working full-time at a university are being paid less than people doing no work at all; they are expected to live on \$31 and not only live on it but also provide books and other necessaries for their studies out of this miserly allowance.

True, as the Hon. Mr. Cornwall said, there are students on these allowances who are going hungry and not getting three meals a day. I do not see how it can be regarded as other than callous to let this situation occur in our community. So, to suggest that we do not want these words in the motion means that we are condoning the activities and those actions that have let this situation arise. I, for one, cannot condone those activities, and I ask all honourable members not to support an amendment suggesting that we do condone them.

Another part of the amendment would strike out "the Government to make urgent representations to", so that the motion would then read that the Council request the Federal Government to do something. I cannot see why this has been included in the amendment. We know that our own South Australian Government is likely to take note of any motion carried by this Council. If we do not make this amendment, our own Government will be requested to make representations to the Federal Government on behalf of the students, and I am sure that it will do so.

I know that the Minister of Education has made submissions to this effect in the past, and I am sure that he will do so again. However, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris wants us to strike out the words that refer to our Government. Does he really think that the Federal Government will take more notice of a motion sent to it by this Chamber than it will take of representations made to it by a State Government? I thought we had a state of new federalism whereby State Governments undertook many responsibilities and State and Federal Governments co-operated in running the affairs of this country. Yet the Hon. Mr. DeGaris seems to suggest that the Federal Government will not take any notice of our State Government, so he does not want to involve it in the motion.

I can only suggest that the Leader is speaking from his experience when he was a Minister of the Crown in this State and there was a Liberal Government in Canberra at the time. Doubtless, the then Liberal Government in this State made representations to the then Liberal Government in Canberra and they were completely disregarded. This must be the experience that he has had, when he suggests that Government to Government representations should not be encouraged.

In short, the amendment considerably weakens the motion. It makes the motion have less effect to suggest that this Council is not concerned with the position that the students are in. I ask honourable members to consider, when they vote on the matter, the facts behind the motion, and these have been stated many times. In South Australia about 2 500 students are existing entirely on the tertiary education assistance allowance. They are living on 75 per cent of the unemployment benefit and in two months time they will be living on only 70 per cent of the unemployment benefit if the allowance is not increased.

The position is serious, and many South Australians are suffering hardship. I have been accused of playing Party politics or of trying to make political capital, merely because I have concern for the sufferings of 2 500 South Australians. They are my constituents and they are represented by at least half of the number of members of this Chamber. These people are trying to exist on a meagre allowance, and we ask that a review be made soon. We consider that a review should have been made well in the past.

Members opposite have spoken of other reviews made. Why does yet another review have to be made? The present Federal Government has been in office for nine months but it has made no review of its own and is only now starting to make one. What can this review be? In the recent Budget introduced by the Federal Treasurer, the allocation of money for student assistance has not been increased for 1976-77 above the amount allocated in 1975-76: the same amount has been allocated. It has not even been indexed for inflation. If the allowances for some students are increased, they must be decreased for others. I see no other way in which a review can work, given the budgetary constraints that have been applied.

We believe that the review should have been carried out before the Budget was brought down, so that allocations could be made in the Budget in terms of the results of the review, rather than that a committee should be appointed to make its review within budgetary constraints that have no flexibility. In the interests of equal opportunity for all students, I ask members opposite to vote for the motion and to oppose the amendment.

The Council divided on the amendment:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy (teller), and C. J. Sumner.

The PRESIDENT: There are 10 Ayes and 10 Noes. In my view, the purpose of the amendments moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is to remove emotive words and, if carried, will leave the substance of the motion substantially unaffected. I therefore give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The PRESIDENT: I inform the Council that, consequent on the passing of that resolution, I will convey the same to the Right Honourable Prime Minister.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.34 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 8, at 2.15 p.m.