

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 29, 1976

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

PETITIONS: SEXUAL OFFENCES

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN presented a petition signed by 56 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Mr. EVANS presented a similar petition signed by 28 electors of South Australia.

Mr. COUMBE presented a similar petition signed by 45 electors of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: DENTAL TECHNICIANS

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE presented a petition signed by 114 electors of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to introduce legislation to bring dental technicians in South Australia into the same position as those in Victoria and Tasmania in regard to registration enabling them to deal directly with the public.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

UNION BAN

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say why the Government has not adopted a positive attitude to the black ban placed by the Trades and Labor Council on the Bus and Tram Division of the State Transport Authority, and why he has not informed the T.L.C. that the ban is totally against the established policy on national strikes held by the Australian Council of Trade Unions, of which the T.L.C. is a branch? The recent national strike was approved at a meeting of the Federal Unions Congress, not a meeting of the A.C.T.U., and the Federal Unions Congress cannot make decisions for the A.C.T.U. Since 1947, five attempts have been made by left wing unions to organise national strikes through A.C.T.U. congresses, and on each occasion the attempt has been rejected. The T.L.C.'s action in placing a black ban because tramway employees elected to work is, therefore, in direct conflict with the accepted policy on national strikes of the A.C.T.U., of which the T.L.C. is the State branch. The T.L.C.'s action, I am informed, is also directly in conflict with the terms of the motion passed at the Federal Unions Congress, the pertinent part of which states:

... in these circumstances, we recommend that affiliated unions should call upon members to cease work for 24 hours from midnight, Sunday, July 11.

First, these terms permit a union to accept or reject the recommendation and this is not binding under A.C.T.U. policy. Secondly, those unions which accept the recommendation are not precluded from calling on their own members for a voluntary decision. Thus the Trades and Labor Council, in calling for a black ban on the Bus

and Tram Division, simply because the tramway employees decided, democratically, to continue to work, is totally in breach of A.C.T.U. policy on national stoppages. The tramways employees—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable Leader's attention to the fact that he is now debating the question.

Dr. TONKIN: I have one last matter that I think is pertinent. The tramways employees were exercising and this is in fact, Mr. Speaker, their democratic right under A.C.T.U. rules when they elected to work, and the Government has a duty to see that neither they nor the general public are penalised.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me take up the last remark of the Leader that the Government has a duty to see that neither the workers involved nor the public are penalised: in fact, neither are. We have taken action: we have seen to it that neither are penalised.

Dr. Tonkin: Tell us all about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is apparently unaware that sufficient fuel and services were supplied to the division to see that neither the workers of the trust nor the public were in fact adversely affected.

Mr. Millhouse: Were you careful to see that the Trades and Labor Council knew that before the ban was imposed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what the T.L.C. knew concerning that matter. All I can say is that the Government took the necessary action, and—

Dr. Tonkin: Do you support the T.L.C.'s action?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me turn now to the Leader's remarks on that score. He now advises the Government that it should advise the T.L.C. in South Australia that there are certain rules of the A.C.T.U. which he asseverates and which he says we should tell the T.L.C. to comply with. Frankly, that is not the duty of the Government in South Australia. If the Leader wants to give advice to the T.L.C. on the subject of its affiliations with the A.C.T.U. he is perfectly at liberty to do so. It is not my duty to do so.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you support the T.L.C.?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not the question either. Obviously the Leader wants me to get into some public argument with the T.L.C. I can say that, had we in fact been in a position where some harm was being done to the public or to other unionists, we would have been in an argument with the T.L.C.

Mr. Millhouse: And you will be next time?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In fact, in these circumstances that situation does not arise. If the honourable member wants to get into an argument with the T.L.C. he is perfectly at liberty to do so.

Mr. Nankivell: You're not game.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, I am the only Premier of this State who has stood up to a number of unions outside this House. When the unions have been acting against the interests of this State, I have stood up to them just as much as I have stood up to employers. When it is needed I will do it, but on this occasion the Leader knows perfectly well that there has been no interference with public services, or with the employment of employees. What the Leader wants to do is to get some row stirred up. It is not necessary for us to stir up a row on this occasion. If the Leader wants to have a row with the T.L.C., he is perfectly at liberty to do so. I am not going to interfere with his rights on that matter; I think that is proper. If the Leader wants to tell the T.L.C. that it had no power under its rules to pass the motions which it passed in

relation to the Medibank stoppage, he is perfectly at liberty to do that. I do not know what notice it will take of him, but he is perfectly at liberty to do that.

JOB HUNTERS' CLUBS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what will be the future of the job hunters' clubs set up by the Community Welfare Department? I understand that these clubs have been doing quite a good job to help the young unemployed people in various ways. However, I ask my question in view of the recent announcement that a youth employment advisory unit is being set up to tackle the problem of unemployment amongst the young people in South Australia. Will there still be a need for the clubs or will they be disbanded?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Unfortunately, in the economic climate presently prevailing, I think it is clear to everyone that there will be a continuing need for the job hunters' clubs. The best way to answer the general question about the future of the clubs is to outline the present position and then, perhaps, I can suggest what might occur. The present position is that there are about 18 people operating 13 job hunters' clubs at 13 locations. The numbers involved in these job hunters' clubs range from, in some cases, about 30 up to, in one sad case, 154 young people. I think every member would understand what a statement like that really means—in one area alone 154 young people are not able to obtain employment. The total number of young people involved in the clubs has been 1 140. Some success has been attained, with a proportion of those people gaining employment during the year. About 300, or just under 30 per cent, of those who have been in contact with a club have gained employment. This, in itself, indicates the general success of the clubs, because it would be reasonable to assume that some of those people, at least, were helped in obtaining employment by the activities of the clubs.

I am sure members would understand that the clubs are not primarily job-finding locations, but are operating to try to improve and maintain the confidence and skills of young people and assist them, as individuals, to improve their job-hunting efforts. Probably one of the most important activities of the clubs is that they try to maintain the motivation of the young people, many of whom undergo many job refusals, and they are genuinely trying to gain employment. They are not, as has been suggested in a camouflage attempt by the Federal Government, dole bludgers; I categorically refute that statement, which has been made in the past. I believe a great many of the young people throughout Australia who are not employed want employment and are trying to obtain it. What I have said so far outlines the present situation. It would seem that there will be a continuing need in future, as almost 10 000 young people under 21 years of age are now unemployed in South Australia.

Mr. Gunn: Thanks to the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member who just interjected about the Whitlam Government made that point at the time the Whitlam Government was in power, but it is getting a bit thin now, because there is now another management in Canberra that has not done anything to increase employment opportunities; everyone would admit that is so. Every activity that Government has carried out has reduced the number of jobs available. It may be argued that in the long term it will increase the number.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjecting.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Every member in this House owes a duty to the people of this country to be honest in this matter.

Mr. Gunn: You're not.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am certainly being honest. I can outline that duty for those Opposition members who seem not to know what it is. That duty in this case is that some measures have been taken that have not increased job opportunity. That has occurred in the last several months, and it may be reasonable to consider that there will be an improvement in the long term. However, to make out, as some Opposition members are trying to do, that there is not a bad situation now is entirely wrong and unfair to those young people. Clearly, we will need further activity by the job hunters. Proposals have gone to the Premier and the Cabinet suggesting an expansion of job-hunter activity. They will have to be considered by Cabinet, and I expect that the Premier and Cabinet will give every consideration to the details of the proposals.

Perhaps other measures, as suggested by the honourable member who asked the question, can be considered with respect to the youth work movement. The Premier announced earlier that the State Government, at least, had recognised that it is a time of crisis in this matter, and we are taking energetic steps to try to do something about it. However, we are only in the early days of the overall planning approach, some of which is my responsibility, and some of which is the Premier's, and the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Minister of Education may also be involved. There would seem to be a need for increased activity in the job-hunters club soon.

BREAD

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what consultation, if any, he had with employer and employee organisations in the bread industry over Saturday baking and its effect on bread prices before he announced Cabinet approval of Saturday baking? It was announced in yesterday's press that Cabinet, at a meeting on Monday, had decided to introduce Saturday morning baking in South Australia, but within hours of that announcement the Minister had to make a humiliating back-down under pressure from industry groups. It seems that the Minister had not done his homework and that Cabinet was either ill-advised or naive in accepting the proposal on Monday. I think the Minister admitted yesterday that he had made a mistake. Because of this slap in the face for the Government, what investigations did the Minister make when he presented his case to Cabinet?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am delighted to reply to the question, because, as usual, the Deputy Leader is way off beam. Not only were all sections of the industry consulted but they were also placed on a bread inquiry committee. The union and employer representatives all had the chance to make submissions to the committee, which brought down its report and which, as far as I am concerned, did not satisfy me and I am still not satisfied with it. Some of the unions involved complained yesterday that they were not pleased with the report either, and I asked them why they had not made a minority report. They had every chance to make a minority report, and one does not have to sign such a report willy-nilly. I think that that is what anyone who did not agree with the report ought to have done, but no-one did it. Let me assess what has happened since. I can well imagine that there will be a series of questions asked of me today (and I hope there will be),

but this is one time when Opposition members cannot blame the unions, as they normally do.

Mr. Mathwin: They'll blame the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: They may blame me if they like. I have never said that I had made a mistake: that has not been in the press, or on radio or television. I said that if I had made a mistake I would be willing to reconsider the situation. Let us talk about backdowns at the same time, because we could consider all the Opposition's questions at the same time. The Government is not backing down; it is being flexible, as it always is.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If laughter is the Opposition's best defence, it is not much of a defence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Let me finish—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the Deputy Leader would keep quiet and stop showing his ignorance, as he always does, I could finish. The strongest pressure in this instance has not come from the trade union movement, as members opposite would dearly love to believe, because it is on that basis that they make their attack: they cannot do so this time because at half-past three this afternoon the Premier and I are meeting industry representatives who are also objecting—

Mr. Millhouse: You have to bring the Premier in to help you, do you?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, I do not need any help. I can manage my own affairs: in fact, I have managed them fairly well for 12 months, and my record can stand anyone's examination. There have been fewer industrial disputes over the past 12 months than in any of the past 10 years.

Mr. Millhouse: Why have the representatives asked to see the Premier?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not know.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order. I must remind the House that one question has been asked and one question must be answered, not a series of questions.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wish to reiterate that members opposite always condemn the Government for being under the control of trade unions. Opposition members always accuse the Government of backing down but, this time, the Opposition has been caught cold, because the people that it represents are also objecting to the situation. The Government is considering the situation and, by this time next week, the Government will be able to make up the Opposition's mind whether or not the Government has backed down.

Later:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I had better address my question to the Premier. If it had not been for the answer given by the Minister of Labour and Industry—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —a little while ago, I would have addressed it to him. Can the Premier say what is today the policy of the Government on the extension of hours for the baking of bread? We heard from the Minister in his own defence, and in reply to the member for Kavel, that the bread manufacturers and the unions have asked to see the Premier at 3.30 p.m., although he assured the House that he had been capably handling the matter

during the past 12 months. All joking aside, and all prevarication aside, it is obvious that something went wrong yesterday. I had the experience of seeing the impressive preparations for one of the Minister's press conferences in one of the interviewing rooms during the afternoon. I take in that that was the one in which he withdrew what had been announced in the morning as the policy of the Government. It is obvious that the Government has been deterred by the opposition that apparently its decision to extend baking hours brought forth on its announcement, and I want to know (and this is, of course, the purport of my question) what the policy of the Government is as it goes to meet the employer and employee representatives in about an hour's time. To fortify the Premier, I may say that I personally and my Party are in favour of unrestricted hours for the baking and selling of bread. I do not speak for anyone else. The Liberals can speak for themselves, but that is my view. I say that simply to assure the Premier that on this and other matters I am not, as he suggested yesterday, sitting on a barb-wire fence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am glad the honourable member has got off the fence on this occasion.

Mr. Millhouse: Now you make sure you're not on the fence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will tell the honourable member the position. A lengthy investigation by the Bread Industry Inquiry Committee was conducted into the problems of the bread industry, in order to see whether we could get better service to the public at lower prices. The problem in the bread industry is a multiple one. First, we have in the metropolitan area several bakeries: one very large bakery partly automated and other bakeries of medium size that are not so automated and whose profit level is, frankly, rather low. Within the metropolitan area a five-day baking week operates. The baking week is based on bread baking hours that are unusual, but the structure of payment within the industry is based on those unusual baking hours. In the outer metropolitan area some bakeries are allowed to bake at other times on a special dispensation, provided that they supply bread only from shops attached to their bakeries. Outside that area several small bakeries, some of them owned by the metropolitan bakeries, have freedom of baking hours. In order to try to obtain some sort of consensus of the development in the industry, we established the Bread Industry Inquiry Committee to consider all aspects of the problem of providing fresh bread as often as possible and at the lowest possible price. The committee, however, favoured a total restriction on weekend baking hours throughout the State.

Mr. Millhouse: You rejected that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government did not accept it. We then considered some means of providing fresh bread by some marginal change in the structure, and that proposal was before Cabinet on Monday. The Minister then spoke to the industry and to the unions, and released the nature of the proposal that was being suggested. The industry and the unions have outlined several problems that arise out of that proposal. Indeed, their allegations (and there seems to be some substance in them) are that the proposal would not improve the situation but would compound it, in that the price to the public would go up and there would be an extension of metropolitan control over country bakeries and, in consequence, a reduction in the service of fresh bread to the community.

Mr. Millhouse: Surely, all those factors were known before Cabinet's decision last Monday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some of them were certainly considered.

Mr. Millhouse: They all should have been.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have had a lengthy investigation. I can only say to the honourable member that despite his great courage on behalf of that 2 per cent of people in the State whom he seems to be speaking for at the moment—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are giving him credit for more than he got.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thought I was being generous. I always try to be that, even with the honourable member. He has made a courageous statement on their behalf, but he does not have to take responsibility within the State. If we had taken a hard and fast attitude about this matter, I have little doubt that the honourable member would have asked us why we were taking a hard and fast attitude. The reply would be that we have a responsibility as a Government, and if matters are put to us from time to time that cause us to have second thoughts, we will have second thoughts.

Mr. Millhouse: What are the second thoughts now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The second thoughts are that we ought to talk further to the bread manufacturers and the unions about the consequences of the proposal. If they can convince us that we ought not to go ahead with it, we will not.

SEATON WEST PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Education say what is the programme for the construction of a new school at Seaton West? For some time it has been intended to build a new primary school at Seaton West, an area adjoining West Lakes, but no announcement has been made regarding the likely construction date for that school. Perhaps the delay has been caused by development not progressing in the area as rapidly as was first thought. However, because of the likely demands on adjoining primary schools until a primary school is constructed in the area, I would appreciate the Minister's telling me what is the department's thinking on this matter.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member. The department tries to keep fairly close watch on enrolments in certain districts. Future enrolments at Seaton West are somewhat uncertain, as unlike most western and north-western suburbs there is still scope for development in that area. I will try to obtain the full picture for the honourable member, including the projected enrolments for the area over the next few years.

KANGAROO ISLAND SUICIDES

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare outline what action he intends to take concerning the series of tragic suicides among youths who had lived at Kingscote, Kangaroo Island, in recent months? Following representations from responsible and authoritative officers on the island, discussions have been held this week between me, the Attorney-General, and the Minister of Community Welfare. The subject is indeed a delicate and sensitive one, and I do not intend to ventilate the tragic details in this place, but I, with others in that community, am anxious

to learn of any assistance, guidance, or co-operation that can come from the Government in this most unpleasant and disastrous climate surrounding our community where these incidents have occurred and where rumour has it that further such incidents may occur.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have had some discussions within the department concerning this matter. I appreciate the way in which the honourable member has framed his question, and I do not intend to enlarge on the aspects he skirted, because the feelings of people are involved and should be respected. The situation is most worrying and, as Minister of Community Welfare, I am disturbed about what is happening. I have taken some action, and Mr. Graham Forbes, the Youth Services Officer in the Community Welfare Department, has gone to Kangaroo Island today in order to provide back-up assistance for the community welfare worker on the island.

Mr. Chapman: She is indeed a very good one.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: She is Miss Sleeman, and she has already been taken to the hearts of the people in the Kingscote community, which speaks volumes for her ability when she has been in the job only about six months.

Mr. Chapman: She is a young officer, very well received indeed.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: This officer will be glad of the assistance of Mr. Forbes, who is very experienced in youth activities. I do not want to make any diagnosis about the situation, especially from this distance. As I am not there, I cannot judge, but it seems, at least from an initial examination, that an improvement in attention to youth on the island is needed. I understand, for example, that the facilities for young people to meet in the area are limited. The honourable member would be more familiar with some of these circumstances than I am, although we have discussed this matter. Perhaps locating another officer in the area for a considerable time would be of assistance. This is the sort of thing I intend to do. I have suggested that, if it will help, professional psychiatric assistance will be made available on a consultant basis, if necessary with the Government assisting with the expense. Initially, I hope that these responses will be of assistance with what is truthfully, as the honourable member pointed out, a tragic situation that has developed on the island over the past few months.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. WELLS: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my recent request for generous fare concessions for St. John Ambulance Brigade officers travelling in uniform on duty?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The request of the honourable member was fully investigated by my officers, and subsequently I placed before Cabinet last Monday a recommendation that his suggestion should be adopted, namely, that St. John Ambulance officers, whilst travelling in uniform on duty, should be permitted to travel free on public transport. Cabinet unanimously adopted that recommendation.

PETERBOROUGH COUNCILLOR

Mr. MAX BROWN: Has the Minister of Local Government seen an article in today's *Advertiser* about a woman councillor (Councillor Goudie) recently elected to the District Council of Peterborough, and will he explain his position in relation to the final decision he is expected to make? The article raises the question of the legality of

the woman being allowed to sit on the council. The last paragraph of the article states:

However, I was sworn in as a councillor and I feel that it would be improper for me to comment further since the final decision will be made by the Minister of Local Government (Mr. Virgo).

I should like the Minister to comment, if possible.

Mr. Millhouse: It will probably be subject to revision six hours later.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This will not be subject to revision at all unless this Parliament wants to revise it, because the problem that Councillor Goudie faces is one that was determined by this Parliament. In its wisdom, or otherwise, this Parliament decided that any person whose husband or wife was in the employ of the council was ineligible to be elected as a councillor. In this instance Councillor Goudie's nomination was apparently incorrectly accepted by the Returning Officer. I believe only 70 people voted in the election with 34 votes being cast for Councillor Goudie. It was an extremely small election, but nevertheless she was declared elected. Regrettably, her nomination should not have been accepted in the first place. I can do nothing about the situation. I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, in your former capacity as Mayor of the Corporation of the City of Port Pirie would know that the provisions of the Local Government Act must be complied with. I have no authority to over-ride the Act, and the only course that can be taken is for Councillor Goudie either to tender her resignation or, alternatively, find herself in breach of the Local Government Act.

ADELAIDE HILLS

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered the appointment of a Parliamentary committee of inquiry to investigate land use in the Adelaide Hills, with such an inquiry including a cost-benefit analysis? If the Government has not considered I am sure the Premier is aware of the complexities of the rural-urban land use conflict in the Adelaide Hills, and appreciates the need to ensure an evaluation of the situation in that area and the importance of drawing on as many resource areas as possible to submit evidence in order to allow or to bring about a definite answer, conclusion, or recommendation to the problem. I would not be adverse to the idea of such an inquiry covering the whole State, if it were deemed necessary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Studies have been made of the land-use situation in the Adelaide Hills. The Government is investigating this position further, and I expect an announcement to be made soon.

Mr. Wotton: Is that the Ian Lewis report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the honourable member is referring to future or past reports on the subject.

Mr. Wotton: Past, in this instance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member, as member for the district, will know that many reports on the subject have been made. A further announcement will be made relating to inquiries into the situation to some extent relating to land use in the Adelaide Hills. In the meantime I have had discussions with organisations representing landholders in the Adelaide Hills in relation to land tax, and I have told them, as I have said publicly, that measures will be introduced to alter provisions of the Land Tax Act, some of which will be designed specifically to cope with the situation that occurs in the Adelaide Hills.

SPORTING FUNDS

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister for the Environment ask the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport for a report showing the amount of funds received from the Federal Labor Government compared to present grants from the Federal Liberal Government, and details of what cuts were made for transporting sporting participants to national championships and oversea competition? Recently, criticism has been voiced by politicians, sporting bodies and participants about money now received compared to funds received from the Labor Government. It seems to me that there is a difference of opinion on this subject among the Prime Minister, the Minister in charge of sporting affairs and one of his colleagues on sport funding. This matter has important repercussions for the future of our sportsmen.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will be delighted to get a report from my colleague on this matter. I notice considerable disagreement among members of the Federal Government on this issue—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And in the State Opposition, I would expect.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I would imagine. I believe that it is important there should be Federal aid towards the promotion of sport in general. I think the cuts in grants made for recreational purposes throughout the community have been very serious and against the national interest. I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

RIVERLAND ALLOTMENTS

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, say when the Government will provide an adequate supply of housing and industrial allotments in the Riverland towns under the control of the Lands Department? In recent years many business undertakings and family units have been lost to the Riverland district because of a lack of housing and industrial allotments. This is borne out by a number of representations that have been made to me, in particular in relation to the Berri district. One letter I received recently indicates that the person writing it applied some 15 months ago for an industrial site on which to establish a business. From his letter, it seems that he is no nearer receiving an allotment than he was then. We have lost many valuable business undertakings in that part of the State. The point is made in the letter that, if this continues, the area will continue to decline in relation to future development. If the Lands Department is not able to undertake the subdivision and development of land for industry and housing allotments, I believe it is probably high time that the Government handed this over to either private development or the South Australian Land Commission, because it seems that nowhere else in South Australia is there such a bottleneck or hold-up as has existed in the areas under the control of the Lands Department. I would appreciate the Minister's taking this up with the Minister of Lands, as it is a problem that has existed for many years, and the sooner this matter can be resolved the better it will be for the district and all concerned.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will certainly take up the matter with the Minister of Lands to ascertain first exactly what is the situation. I am rather surprised to hear the comments of the honourable member, because during my term as Minister of Lands I know that we had great difficulty, in fact, in the township of Berri in disposing of allotments we had created. That does not necessarily mean the situation is the same today, but I am surprised to hear

the statement made by the honourable member. I will certainly have it checked out for him, get a full report from my colleague, and bring it down as soon as possible.

BUSH WALKING AND LEADERSHIP TRAINING

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education provide me with a report concerning the extent of the activities to date of the Bush Walking and Mountain Climbing Leadership Training Board in Adelaide? The Minister will be aware that courses conducted by the board are now in their third year of operation and, as announced recently, are undergoing extensive procedural changes. Up until May of this year, the board had great support from the National Fitness Council, and it was set up as an independent body of interested and concerned persons in the areas of bush walking and mountain craft leadership. Members of the board represent the Police Force, the South Australian Mountain Federation Outward Bound, the National Fitness Council and the Education Department. I understand the majority of course clientele is from the Education Department.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I shall be very pleased to obtain that information for the honourable member. I take the opportunity of saying that the form of recreational activity to which the honourable member refers is one that I believe should be very fully supported. Earlier this week the press rang me with a question that was, in effect, "What are the schools doing about ensuring that in future we have more gold medal winners." The simple reply to that (one that would be supported, I think, by every member of this House) is that it is not the responsibility of the school system to turn out gold medal winners. I fully support the Minister of Community Welfare in deploring the extent to which restrictions have been placed on money made available from Canberra for sport and recreation. But, even with a greater effort on the part of the whole community in providing recreational facilities, I again reject the concept that our schools are here to create outstanding performers in particular events. I believe that sport and recreation within the schools has to be seen as part of the general educational effort, fitting people to be able to take a meaningful place in the general sport and recreational scene once they become adults and, indeed, right through their childhood and adolescent years. This means understanding much of the philosophy underlying sport. It means understanding the sort of life that has to be lived to ensure that one has a healthy body and a healthy approach to sport. It does not, I think, mean the sort of tyrannical control over the child's life that leads to the type of highly specialised training that in turn, perhaps, means outstanding excellence. Maybe society wants that: it can get it in ways other than purely through the schools.

PORT LINCOLN ABATTOIR

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Works, as Minister in charge of the State Supply Department, say whether arrangements have been finalised to enable the abattoir at Port Lincoln to participate in the programme of rendering drought affected stock and, if so, what details have been agreed on? On Wednesday morning an announcement appeared in the press that Samcor had agreed on certain provisions to process drought affected stock. I understand the price was 40c a head for sheep of

18 kilograms or more that were bare shorn. Also in that press statement was a comment to the effect that negotiations were being undertaken with the Port Lincoln works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The details the honourable member has given to the House are correct in the sense that Mr. Tom Phillips, the Director of the State Supply Department, has conferred already with the Samcor board and proposes to visit Port Lincoln tomorrow to meet with the management of the abattoir there. The aim of that meeting will be to set up a scheme similar to the one that Samcor had initiated in Adelaide. I am hopeful that the Director will be able to report to me and to the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, if not tomorrow then certainly on Monday, but an announcement should be made tomorrow on the outcome of that meeting.

Mr. Nankivell: They were to process 400 a day.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The meeting has not yet been held. The member for Mallee informs me that they will process 400 today. If that is so, my Director is behind the eight ball, because he has not informed me of any of the details. However, I will check that. What I am telling the honourable member for Flinders is the situation at the moment: no decision has been made. A report will be made to me by the Director before any decision is made, and that cannot and will not happen until tomorrow, or maybe Monday. The matter will be dealt with as soon as possible.

NEWSBOY COLLECTORS

Mr. OLSON: Will the Attorney-General investigate the possibility of introducing safeguards to protect newsboy collectors? It has been brought to my attention that youths employed by some newsagents are responsible for making up shortages of cash that may occur in the course of door-to-door collecting. Newsboys are employed over an area comprising rounds of 12 streets and are sometimes required to make several visits when householders are absent. Commission is paid at the rate of \$5 for every \$200 collected. The system used by some newsagents is that sums are marked on a card when paid at a shop by customers before the street collection is made, and this practice seems to be open to abuse. As these cards are handed to the lads, the sums paid are often debited against the lads as deficit. Many lads therefore collect over the full area without commission entitlements. Will the Minister investigate an insurance requirement by newsagents to protect the lads engaged fully?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall be pleased to investigate this matter for the honourable member. It seems to me that he has basically raised two matters that require investigating; first, the matter of young lads who are collecting in this fashion being deprived of the commission, because people have not paid their money, or something of that kind. It seems to me that that practice ought to be investigated. However, I do not imagine that that practice is widespread, because it seems to me that, as the honourable member has described it, it would be a matter of deceiving the lads concerned, and I think that most newsagents concerned in this matter are not involving themselves in this kind of practice. However, I will have the matter investigated.

Regarding an insurance scheme, I was not quite able to understand the direction of the honourable member's question, but it seems to me that he is concerned about the safety of young persons going to homes and collecting

money in this fashion. I will have that matter investigated also. It may well be somewhat undesirable to have young boys visiting private homes in this fashion, because I imagine that much of the collection is possibly done during the late afternoon or in the early evening, and that seems to be somewhat undesirable. I will have that matter investigated to ascertain what is the position and whether the Government can take any steps to remedy the situation.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

Dr. EASTICK: My question, which I direct to the Minister of Works, is supplementary to the Ministerial statement he made last Tuesday regarding Bolivar water, part of which states:

. . . that annual underground water allocations will be maintained at their present levels for at least the next five years.

Can the Minister say whether any consideration has been given to the alleged anomalous situation in which some licensees were placed when quantity allocations were first announced? There are still definitely held beliefs in the area encompassing the northern Adelaide Plains underground water area that certain anomalies exist and that the people who failed to give correct information were advantaged, but that some people temporarily out of production as a result of illness or travel or because of a glut in the market they normally supplied failed to benefit in the allocation of water. If this is to continue over the five-year period the Minister has mentioned their livelihood will be jeopardised for a long time. This matter extends a little further, because in the present drought conditions the question is raised whether, for instance, with onions, which may require eight waterings instead of the normal three waterings, any consideration will be given by the Government to the problems associated with this year's drought, and more so if it should extend beyond this year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have the last part of the honourable member's question examined by the department to see whether anything can be done in this regard. Regarding the first part of the question, my information is that the circumstances the honourable member has outlined in the case of certain growers in the area do not exist for the reason that the allocations currently being used by the various growers were based on the years 1971 and 1972, which was after the period to which the honourable member referred; I took it that he was referring to the period prior to restrictions being introduced. On at least two occasions people had been given the opportunity to place submissions before the committee examining the situation. I think that some hundreds of appeals were lodged with and heard by the underground waters appeal tribunal, and I think that about 200 of them were upheld. That situation should not exist, but I am willing to examine the question and to see whether there is any room for further action. The proclamation of the new Water Resources Act, on July 1, 1976, will afford the opportunity to any grower who is under allocation or who is working on allocation water to appeal against that allocation again. So, the opportunity exists for anyone who believes that he is being wrongly treated to appeal against that situation, and we would be pleased to see people avail themselves of the opportunity.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what progress has been made in establishing the Casual Employment (Long Service Leave) Board? Earlier this year Parliament approved legislation to come into

operation in April, 1977, to enable building employees to qualify for long service leave, and a board was to be constituted. To the best of my knowledge, appointments to the board have not been made, and I respectfully request some information on the matter.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member, who was a very able member of the committee, told me yesterday that he was wondering what was happening in this regard, so I have obtained the necessary information for him. Since the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act for employees in the building industry was assented to in March this year, rapid progress has been made within the Labour and Industry Department to put it into operation. A full-time Secretary has been appointed to carry out administrative functions. Before the end of June, a preliminary letter was forwarded to over 13 000 licensed builders in South Australia explaining the essential parts of the Act. It also gave advance information of probable future financial commitments by employers to enable them to frame budget commitments for next year. It will also enable a register of employers to be created.

The letters generated a considerable number of telephone inquiries, and response in general has been good. However, I appeal to those builders who have not responded to the letters to do so by the middle of August to enable the creation of a mailing list for more detailed information by the end of the year. I am in the process of appointing the Chairman of the proposed board, and employer and employee nominations for the other board members are being processed. I expect to be in a position to name the board members in the very near future.

I have been faced with tremendous difficulties in appointing a Chairman. The first person I chose (and the member for Light will recall this, because I told him that I was willing to tell him in confidence who that member was, but I was not willing to disclose details then because the matter had not been finalised) was a Commonwealth Bank employee. He is a very well respected person. We tried as hard as we could, but the bank would not release him to take the position. I do not know whether the present Commonwealth Government felt that it should not help the State Government to solve its problems. He is a capable and well-respected person in the community who would have filled the position very well. That has delayed the appointment of the Chairman. I wanted to spread the other members of the committee around the Chairman. The second person I am considering is also a Commonwealth employee and we are also having difficulties regarding him, but that situation has almost been resolved. After four months of investigation, he is being released from the Commonwealth Government. I believe that the Liberal Commonwealth Government should be more liberal in helping the State Government solve some of our problems.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: For the question say "Aye", against "No". I hear no dissentient voice and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the motion for suspension is agreed to.

Motion carried.

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

That, pursuant to section 17 of the Land Settlement Act, 1944-1974, the members of this House appointed to the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement under the Land Settlement Act, 1944-1974, have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of next week.

This is done to enable the committee to get on with the urgent investigation into the problem that exists on Kangaroo Island. Parliament has been assisted in this matter by an offer from the Leader of the Opposition to give pairs to the Government to enable the committee to sit. That action is much appreciated. Although the committee intends to conclude the inspection on Wednesday, I included Thursday in the motion just in case the committee is held up. It is covered for the three sitting days.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. It is a responsible motion, and I believe everyone in this Parliament believes that the welfare and well-being of the Kangaroo Island settlers comes before anything else.

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MONARTO CHAIRMAN

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. GUNN: Yesterday, in reply to a question I asked, the Premier accused me of attacking the personal competence of Mr. Ray Taylor. That was not the intention of my question, and the Premier knew it. He took that line to attempt to cover up his Government's lack of foresight in agreeing—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a personal explanation.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 28. Page 279.)

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): In continuing my remarks, I hope that the Premier will further consider the question I asked today regarding the setting up of a committee to inquire into the conflict that exists in the Adelaide Hills. I do not believe adequate opportunity has been given to the community to involve itself in discussion on this matter. Because of the seriousness of the situation, I believe that such a committee should be set up. Yesterday I referred to various statements made about the Adelaide Hills by His Excellency the Governor and, indeed, the possible solutions he has put forward. I also referred to the work that Ian Lewis of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department had put into preparing a discussion paper entitled "Rural urban land use—conflict in the Adelaide Hills". Whilst I repeat, as I did last evening, that I do not agree with everything in that paper, it indicates many of the problems associated with the matter and some of the possible solutions and recommendations.

I acknowledge the assistance given to me by the committee that I have formed to look into this subject. The committee consisted of gentlemen with diverse interests in the preservation of the Adelaide Hills. Interests on that committee represented the grazing industry through to the highly intensified fruit and vegetable industry in the Adelaide Hills. It consisted of fourth generation land users from well-established properties throughout the Hills to a stud horse breeder who had only recently moved into the district. The committee also had representation from local government and has received expert assistance from Dr. Gordon Edwards, of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute of the Adelaide University, Mr. Bill Seager (a field officer of the Stockowners Association), Mr. Don Grivell (President of the South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association and Past President of the Australian Vegetable Growers Federation) and members of the South Australian Advisory Board on Agriculture.

I acknowledge publicly the support these gentlemen have given to the committee that I set up, and I look forward to their continued assistance. I also appreciate the assistance given to the committee by officers of the State Planning Office, and I look forward to further assistance from the office. I cannot bring forward a solution to the problems associated with land use in the Adelaide Hills, but the committee appreciates, as I do, the vast complexities associated with the preservation of the Adelaide Hills.

Last evening I asked some questions that we all need to ask ourselves about the Adelaide Hills, questions such as: Do we actually need to preserve the Hills for agricultural purposes? Is it practical to continue agriculture in the Hills in a viable manner? Do we want the Hills for rural production, for their aesthetic value or for open space? Do we require the Hills purely as a buffer zone between metropolitan Adelaide and the proposed city of Monarto (an idea the Government may have in relation to the Hills)? If the Hills are to remain rural, how can primary producers in the area continue or, in many cases, start again to carry on a viable rural industry?

If there is a need to protect the Hills, how willing is the Government to support or protect rural industry there? I believe the best way that open space can be retained in the Adelaide Hills would be for the Government to protect rural industries there. I am sure that we are all aware that people involved in agricultural pursuits in the Hills desperately need taxation and rating concession incentives. A final question is whether the Government is willing to admit that all the problems do not result from hobby farms (as has so often been suggested by the Government) but rather that many of the problems relate to the situation that the genuine primary producer in the Adelaide Hills cannot continue or is unwilling to continue without some incentives.

I suppose a further question that could be asked is whether we believe that restrictions in the Adelaide Hills should be made on a blanket scale or whether individual situations should be judged on their merits. I tend to agree with the latter point. Through its policies and through the State Planning Authority, the Government has said that agriculture, horticulture and bushland areas should be preserved. Why should the Adelaide Hills be preserved? Is it for the land or for the people, or both? Many times I have stressed in this House the importance of the preservation of the Adelaide Hills, and I have given many reasons for my statements. Should the Hills be held as they are at present because of the significant agricultural importance and because they are feeding and helping to provide food for the Adelaide metropolitan area, or because we want to

preserve the open space or to create a buffer zone? It is extremely difficult at present to make the production of fruit and vegetables and, in many cases, dairy products, viable in the Adelaide Hills. Some of the reasons include the increasing costs, particularly the increasing cost of labour, the taxation situation in which people find themselves, and the need, because of increasing labour costs, to become more involved with mechanisation. In the past, much of the agriculture that has been undertaken in the Hills (and much that will be carried on in future) has been by family farming units.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We have to keep those.

Mr. WOTTON: My word! The people on the family units have remained because of their hard work, their guts, and their determination. They will carry on because, in many cases, it has been, and will continue to be, a family tradition.

Mr. Evans: What will they live on?

Mr. WOTTON: That is something we will have to find out from the Government. We all realise the many advantages of owning properties in the Adelaide Hills. There is the advantage of the rainfall, the soil, and of course the closeness to the Adelaide markets, and producers are able to sell their own produce. Much blame has been placed on hobby farmers, but I believe the Government should be held responsible, because of high rates and taxes, for much of the subdivision that is going on in the Adelaide Hills. The hobby farmers are buying because people want to get out, or find it necessary to get out—

Mr. Allison: Or are forced out.

Mr. WOTTON: Yes. They are fed up with working long hours in all weather conditions, without incentives or returns. I turn now to a statement in the *Grower*, a newspaper published by the Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association. The report, by Mr. Don Grivell, the President of the South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association, under the heading, "Stronger Incentives Needed", states:

The land use report for the Adelaide Hills (*Advertiser*, 30/5/76) completely overlooks the principal reason for the decline in agricultural and horticultural activity.

It suggests treating a symptom and not the root cause of the problem, which is the very low economic viability of the area with present farmgate prices of produce and a high cost structure.

The greatest loss to the vegetable industry in particular is families that have acquired several generations of skills and are leaving the industry because of low returns.

The cost of rates and land tax is a problem, but not insurmountable if realistic levels of exemption or concession are maintained.

No scheme of land zoning or lease-back of State-owned land is going to keep these families in the industry. As an example, South Australian celery, Brussels sprouts and onions command a premium price in the Sydney markets in competition with produce from all of Australia.

This is due entirely to the skills in husbandry these growers have acquired over many years. The industry is now capital-intensive, and if growers once leave the industry the low return on capital would discourage any return.

It is evident throughout Australia that the only way a grower can expand his operation to cope with prevailing economic conditions and stay in the industry is by making a capital gain on a small area of land and use this to re-establish in a larger operation.

The horticultural branch of the South Australian Department of Agriculture is severely restricted in funds to provide adequate research stations and specialised extension services to the industry as are available in the other States. These services help growers to remain in the industry.

The present vegetable markets are antiquated, with large volumes of produce being handled in the streets, which

are main city thoroughfares. At least half of the produce is not being sold through the markets, with low prices to the growers but unfortunately high ones to the consumer.

Land zoning controls, as suggested in the report, would only compound the problems. There is no way growers can be told "There is a piece of State-owned land, grow vegetables."

If the incentives are strong enough, sufficient produce will be produced.

Much of the fragmentation of the Hills has been brought about by purchasers and by wholesale cutting up of land in the area, caused by lack of viability. Primary production in the area in many cases is just not viable. We could ask why. Some time ago, a tractor firm advertised that one man and a Fergie could do almost anything. Today, I suggest that one man and a Fergie, or one man and a tractor, must do everything; he has no alternative. At present, there is no way that people on the land in the Adelaide Hills can employ others.

I refer now to the growing of vegetables close to the metropolitan area in the sections of the Adelaide Hills. Records of the growing of potatoes have been kept since 1960, and in that time it has become noticeable that yields have been decreasing significantly. The terrain is not suitable, the costs are too high, but, more particularly, it is becoming more and more necessary for much expensive machinery to be brought in in place of general labour. High-cost machinery for potato growing on small areas is not economic. An example was brought to my notice recently, when I was told by a person that about four years ago he had purchased a potato harvester for \$8 000. Recently, he had found it necessary to replace the chains on the harvester, and was amazed to find that they would cost \$7 800. When he inquired, he was told that the potato harvester, which four years ago had cost \$8 000 would be valued today at \$14 000, and it is quite feasible that he would have to pay \$7 800 for a new set of chains. With this equipment, and with the need to use such equipment on an economic basis, it is uneconomic to grow potatoes on small areas. It is now necessary for them to be grown on areas of 40 or 80 hectares rather than on two or 16 ha.

For many years most of the bunch vegetables sold in Adelaide were grown in the Adelaide Hills, but for various reasons most of them are now grown in the sandy country near Blanchetown and Cambrai. The river holdings are twice as large as many properties in the whole of the Piccadilly Valley, where most of the vegetables were grown in the past. Cabbages and cauliflowers, which used to be grown to a large extent in the Adelaide Hills, are now being grown on a large scale in the South-East, particularly near Padthaway. One has only to look at the Wattie Pict enterprise in that area to see the scale on which vegetables are grown there. Some industries, including the growing of cherries and Brussels sprouts, need special conditions found in the Hills, and it is becoming impossible to sustain production of these specialised industries during the last few years. Unless the Government is able to assist these industries to make them viable, the metropolitan area of Adelaide will have to import such commodities from other States and further afield. If the Government is not prepared to support the industry, it will have to take the consequences, and the people in the city of Adelaide will suffer.

One of the joys of living in Adelaide in the past was the relatively cheap fresh fruit and vegetables that were available, but that will not be the case for much longer. A similar situation arose in the apple industry 10 years ago, when it had to face the situation by increasing the size of orchards and find more capital. Many of the

properties in the Hills at the present time are extremely over-capitalised. They have to spend vast sums of money on cold stores, spraying equipment and irrigation systems, etc.

Vegetable production in the past had to rely on the success of the family farm. What has made the family farm viable in the past, and what will continue to make it viable? Such farms have survived in the "get big or get out" situation because the persons involved were prepared to take less than a basic wage for long periods of the year in the hope that they would be better off in the long run. In addition, they are prepared to work odd hours and, at a certain time of the year, extremely long hours—all for a bare living in many cases. The one thing that could be said was that their equity in the farm was improving, and the value of the farm was escalating with inflation. At least, they were able to say that until recently. A good year with improved prices every now and again made it all worth while. For many producers inflation has increased astronomically the cost of production, but the prices received for the products have hardly advanced at all, and in some cases they have been reduced during the last three years. It can be argued that inflation has increased the values of the properties, and that is so in most cases, but it has also increased capital taxes markedly. As these taxes are paid on a steeply escalating scale, the increases in value are a liability to the yearly financial running of the farm. Increases in value are of benefit only when the property is sold. Most family farms are carried on with the idea of passing them on from one generation to the next, so these higher values only make such transfer more difficult. In many cases, increases in values would only be equivalent to a superannuation fund payment to the owner for his retirement from the property. There is much talk about how the family farm should be preserved, but should it be preserved by people working for less than a reasonable wage without the possibility of capital gain or some other incentive? Without capital gain or some other incentive, family farms will not be preserved for much longer. In the Adelaide Hills and other places where values are based on potential use, land values are being forced higher and many family farms are being lost forever.

It is noticeable that many people who have lived in the Hills for many years are much more tolerant of changes being made there than are the newcomers. How does one reduce the cost of staying in the Adelaide Hills? If it is Government policy to protect the Hills, as it has stated many times that it is, the Government will have to find a way to reduce the cost of staying there for the primary producers. As pressures close in on them, many farmers are leaving the area. Some have already left, and many are finding it necessary to sell off part of their property to pay their taxes. Perhaps this could be referred to as evolution, but because people are being forced to do that subdivision is increasing, and the whole thing becomes a vicious cycle. Viability of production cannot continue in the Hills under the present tax system. It has been said that land tax is being used to push the land into its best use; I think the Minister of Mines and Energy has made that statement. This is not happening in the Hills; in fact, the opposite is occurring. If land tax is used to push land into its most productive and economic use, it is reasonable to ask for its abolition, because the Government has a State Planning Authority that can do this, and it is doing it faster and more directly than

can be achieved by waiting for the pressures of taxation to take effect.

We also know that in many cases the high tax has pushed land into unproductive and uneconomic use. If land tax is used to stop the large land holdings getting larger, it has missed out to a large degree, because it has hit many small farms adjacent to the city, vineyards and market gardens. If it is used as a wealth tax, it has failed again, because it does not take into account the equity the landowner has in the land, and it is hitting the widow who has had the enjoyment of the estate and the entailed estate. While many can dodge it by altering the ownership of the land to avoid an aggregation, it is the poor once again who cannot afford the cost of transferring titles, etc., who are being hit the hardest with this tax. If it is used purely to raise general revenue to cover the cost of services, it is only fair that all landholders, and not just a victimised few, should pay a proportion of this tax. It is grossly unfair that a landholder should be singled out to be taxed because his neighbour sold out to a hobby farmer, or decided to plant a vineyard in that vicinity. I should now like to comment on a few points that were made by a frustrated friend of the farmers, from Florey, in his address in this House yesterday.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you casting alliterate aspersions?

Mr. WOTTON: Not at this time, but I am going to try. Most of his comments were particularly in relation to a meeting that was held at Mount Barker to discuss the concern that people had in regard to land tax in the area. I consider that that was an extremely important meeting. The member for Florey seems to have brushed it off as a bit of fun, but I can assure members that the people who were there were genuinely concerned then, and still are genuinely concerned, about the land tax situation at the present time. The member for Florey said:

I have addressed a few meetings of wharfies and trade unions. Perhaps the people at the Mount Barker meeting were rude, but I do not think it was a particularly violent meeting. At any rate, not much satisfaction was gained from it.

Perhaps it was because the member for Florey, who attended that meeting to represent the Minister, did not even mention land tax of any description that the meeting was not as satisfactory as it could have been if the Minister had been there himself. The member for Florey continued:

What amused me most was that these people said, "We will tell you what we will do. We will put our tractors and ploughs on the freeway, and no vehicles will be able to travel between Adelaide and Melbourne." I said, "At least you show some guts." However, they did not carry out their threat. Afterwards, I said to them, "You had better be sure that your tractors are registered before you take them on to the road. Otherwise, you may get into trouble." I have not heard that the freeway was blocked. They are very nice people, but they went cold. They did nothing, except talk.

I can assure this House that in no way have those people gone cold. They have, through deputations, been told that the Government is prepared to look into the situation, and it is hoped that it will look into the situation, because if it is not prepared to do so soon quite a lot of action will be taken. They will do more than just block the freeway to make their point, because people in the area feel very strongly about this matter. At this stage I should like to quote from the editorial in this week's *Mt. Barker Courier*. It deals not only with the land tax situation but also with the whole matter of the preservation of the environment of the Adelaide Hills. It refers to a press release that was made in that paper in relation to an answer

given by the Minister of Works in reply to a deputation on land tax that was taken to the Premier by the people of Hahndorf. The press release was as follows:

In a letter to the Hahndorf Association, the Deputy Premier, Mr. Des Corcoran, states that the Government proposes to review the rates of land tax and the concessions granted under the Act, to offset some of the effects of the increased taxable values.

The editorial states:

The Deputy Premier, Mr. Des Corcoran, dropped what must have been the quietest bombshell ever, when he wrote an innocuous looking letter to the president of the Hahndorf Association, Mr. John Storey. After a couple of preliminary, acknowledgement paragraphs, the Deputy suddenly unloaded his big guns. He blithely admitted what hundreds of farmers and land owners have been trying to say for months, that is, that the recent revaluations of land coupled with the "equalisation factor" will lead to some large increases in the taxable value of land for land tax purposes, and therefore, large land tax accounts.

It is pleasing to know, at any rate, that the message has finally penetrated and that the various public meetings, letters of protest and official objections have not been in vain! However, the real bombshell comes in the sentence: "The Government will not be looking for any significant increase in the total land tax revenue next financial year." (The letter was sent in June—the end of the 1975-76 financial year.) In that year, the total income from land tax was \$19 900 000—nearly \$20 000 000. In order to offset the obvious effects of increased taxable values of land, the Government apparently intends to review the rates of land tax and the concessions granted.

How, and to what extent, this review is undertaken, could be of the utmost importance, not only to individuals who have been expecting exorbitant accounts, but also to the future of all primary industry in this State and particularly in the Hills. At the moment, apart from a nominal exemption of \$40 000 for primary producing land, land tax is levied at the same rate for everyone and land is valued simply at the maximum potential market value. Because of the tremendous increase in recent years in the demand for land in the Hills by city people wanting a "rural retreat" comprising a few acres, the market value of Hills agricultural land has sky-rocketed, reaching towards the price paid for housing allotments. With a good rainfall and underground water the Hills is an assured agricultural area. Situated close to the large city market, in the driest State of the world's driest continent, it would be a tragedy if this unique area were taken over by unproductive development, such as hobby farms, horse studs, kennels or rural retreats.

The Hills supply the city with water, food, scenic beauty and natural bushland. No other State possesses such a remarkable area so close to its capital city. Every effort must be made to ensure that the encroachment of suburbia and other forms of unsuitable development into the Hills is halted. Because of increasing costs—including State taxes—and diminishing returns, the primary producer is finding it less and less worthwhile to stay on the land. If the Hills are to be preserved in what is left of their natural state, it is absolutely essential that a positive incentive be provided to encourage the farmers to stay on the land and the owner of natural bushland to keep it that way. With its proposed review of land tax rates and concessions, the State Government has a golden opportunity to ensure that the priceless heritage of the Mount Lofty Range is preserved forever. I think that editorial, particularly the last paragraph, sums up the situation in the Adelaide Hills, and I hope the Government will take particular notice of that paragraph. One of the gentlemen on the committee to which I referred earlier, a field officer from the Stockowners Association, has made a contribution to what he believes could be the answer regarding the valuation of land in the Hills. In a paper he has presented recently, he stated:

If, as the Act states, the only sale values of land that can be used for valuation purposes are those for land "that is the same or of a similar character", we should add, "and the land was not purchased with the intention of altering that character". Then the escalation of values would stop to a large degree and the pressure to subdivide would be reduced. It would be far better for the Government to participate in the capital gain at the time of sale,

when the seller has money in hand from that sale, than tax the supposed capital gain every year by valuing on potential or best possible use, which incidentally may never be achieved.

If a property owner knew that the Government would take a certain percentage at the time of sale, surely this would have the desired effect of discouraging sales, and certainly should discourage the speculator. The money that would have been used each year for land tax would then be available to keep the property viable. If these high values and consequent high taxes are to continue, then the individual's equity in his property needs to be taken into account when the tax is levied, or his only alternative is to sell part or all of his property. This equity should relate to the land only and not his other assets, if any.

One of the other matters that has been discussed by my committee is the controlled use of the land, by zoning in particular. Dr. Gordon Edwards, of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, has come forward with many suggestions on this aspect and has also delivered several papers on this matter. The suggestions he made for zoning have been well received and well put together, and I will quote several paragraphs from one of the papers he has produced, under the heading "Zoning as a means of regulating the competition for land for conflicting uses", as follows:

As any city expands in population there occurs on the fringes competition between use of land for traditional rural pursuits and its use for residential purposes. Land is more valuable on the open market for the latter use than the former. Any person wishing to continue using land for agricultural purposes in the face of this competition must expect continually rising land values from which arise rising council rates, land tax and transfer and succession duties, and the consequent temptation to sell. The history of Adelaide's expansion shows that the use of land for agricultural and horticultural purposes does not survive this competition.

The competing and conflicting demand for land for residential purposes is now affecting the traditional agricultural and horticultural use of land in such areas as the Barossa Valley, Adelaide Hills and southern vales. If this is considered undesirable, and only if it is considered undesirable, there needs to be some control over the use to which land may be put. More than ever before, public opinion considers it an undesirable process, and planning procedures are available to control it. Zoning is the basic planning procedure available. It is already in use and found acceptable in the inner metropolitan area to control competition between other conflicting uses of land, for example, high density versus low density housing or housing versus industrial use.

Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your point of view, the sequence of events which culminate in zoning regulations operating in an area is a long-drawn-out process. The first stage is the preparation by the State Planning Authority of a development plan for an area. This is something of a misnomer: it is more a statement of policy than a plan. It spells out in general terms what type of development will occur in an area, what particular features will be given attention. Such development plans are now authorised for that part of the Mt. Lofty Ranges included in the metropolitan area and the outer metropolitan area. These plans state the general policy that agricultural, horticultural and bushland areas will be preserved. They don't say how or where!

The next stage is the preparation of zoning regulations. This job is done by the councils in accordance with the general guidelines of the development plan. It involves preparation of a detailed plan of the council area, outlining individual areas or zones, for example residential, country township, rural, etc. In conjunction with such a plan is a two-way table relating land use to zone, with three possible categories for any land use and zone combination—permitted, prohibited or subject to consent. Day-to-day administration of zoning regulations is carried out at local government level and is thus most amenable to influence by the people most affected by the controls.

The preparation of zoning regulations and land use tables for the Mt. Lofty Ranges is presently in the hands of councils. My concern is that inadequate provision will be made for the rural areas. It is noteworthy that the introduction of zoning regulations does not

regulate present use—only future use—an existing use may continue even though it may be a prohibited use under the regulations. Furthermore there is provision for the alteration of zones should they prove to be unsatisfactory. From personal experience in the city of Payneham, I can say that development in that city was transformed from chaotic to sensible and predictable by the introduction of zoning regulations.

Dr. Edwards is a member of the Payneham council. There are many points for and against zoning regulations. One of the things that particularly concern me, as it has in areas such as the Flinders Range, the Murray River and Kangaroo Island, is that the Government may consider it necessary to take away the control of these areas from local government. I believe it is essential in this area that local authorities be given the task of controlling the area and having as much say as possible. Much has been said about the effect of hobby farmers on the Adelaide Hills. I believe that much that has been said has not been fair to this group of people who have moved into the area recently. Many of these hobby farmers are maligned. Most care well for their properties, in many cases by extensive tree planting and beautification of the surroundings.

I know of one case where a person who came into the district recently planted about 1 000 trees. Unfortunately, as in so many other cases, a small minority of people has made it difficult for the majority. This small minority are those who live in the city, who have holdings in the Hills, who do not look after their properties, and who are ignorant of the best way to go about looking after their 30-hectare spreads. However, other people are genuinely interested in improving the small holdings they have in the Hills. Much of the criticism against many of these people, particularly by the Government, has been unnecessary and quite unfounded. I know of many instances where people who have moved into the area on small properties have taken over land which, because of the lack of incentive in the past, has been allowed to become run down. Many people have come in with a surge of enthusiasm. They have been able to build up these properties and contribute much to the community in doing so. Apart from building up the properties, they are willing to contribute to the success of the community in more ways than one.

I believe it most important that the bushland in the Adelaide Hills be retained. I do not believe there is any need to do away with any more bushland in that area for agriculture. As regards fruit and vegetable growing, if production were increased by one-third it would completely unbalance the situation in Adelaide's metropolitan markets at present. As I said in opening, unfortunately I am unable to provide any solution to the problems in the Hills, particularly for their preservation. Because of the advice that has been given me by the committee to which I have referred, suggestions may come forward, and I hope that the Government will take notice of them and look more closely into the problems with regard to our Hills. I support the motion.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): First, I join with other members in congratulating His Excellency the Governor on the work he has done since his appointment to high office in South Australia, and I wish him well for the future. Secondly, I note with regret the passing of deceased members, particularly Mr. Jim Ferguson (former member for Goyder). I knew Jim Ferguson and his family, and I always felt that the perfect accolade that could be placed on Jim Ferguson's shoulders was that of being a true gentleman in everything he did. I share the regrets of other members and pass on my condolences to his family.

I note with pleasure that it is intended to introduce a Bill to amend the Community Welfare Act, in particular to provide for the prevention or alleviation of the serious maltreatment of children. Most practising lawyers, and most practising medicos, are aware of the many cases in which children, for one reason or another, are seriously maltreated. Experts at the Adelaide Children's Hospital have published several illuminating papers on what they refer to as the "battered child syndrome". I have had the sad experience of being in court and seeing photographs of some of the horrible injuries that have been inflicted on children by people who hold themselves out as parents. Of course, they have no right to claim that title.

Great problems of professional confidentiality are raised, because it would seem that, in the case of the battered child, one can fairly safely say that there are certain classes of parent and certain classes of child from whom the victims will emanate. Given the proper and requisite degree of knowledge by the medico, he will, in many cases, be able to say in relatively minor cases of injury, "This may well happen again." I appreciate the conflict in which he could find himself. On the one hand he could be pulled by the force of confidentiality for his patient and secrecy to others and, on the other hand, the public interest. Those factors are conflicting factors that the Bill must overcome.

Certainly, something must be done, because these cases are becoming more and more frequent. I also note that it is intended to amend the criminal law, both the Police Offences Act and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. I draw special attention to two problems that have not been widely canvassed. Recent publicity has been given to the concern about the use of outmoded verbiage in the law courts and to moves suggested by the Chief Justice to remove such verbiage. I wholly support that suggestion.

More substantially, however, I should like to repeat my plea that the documentation of the law, and some of its tedium, be withdrawn, and that some of the endless paper work and endless paper war that goes on at great expense to litigants (strangely enough, in the name of expediting cases) should be removed. It is strange to note that, in the past 10 years, the rules of the Supreme Court have increased about five fold, yet the expedition of cases is not much better now than it was at the start. Most legal practitioners in general practice are the first to admit that they are positively bewildered, if not frustrated, by the never ending welter of rules, subrules, subparagraphs, practice directions, and all the other paraphernalia that literally keeps pouring out from that place at Victoria Square. Although judges, the Government, and the committee concerned are considering the verbiage problem, they might also look at the question of the paper war, which is not helping anyone, except people in the paper industry.

Recently, to my horror, I was involved in a case in which a person who suffered mental disabilities was able to go to a retail store and, incredibly, without a question of any kind, purchase on credit a rifle, two magazines, two boxes of ammunition, and a silencer, and remove them from the premises. He then proceeded to a place far away from the city and killed three people. That is an extraordinary state of affairs and should not be allowed to occur. I am advised by responsible people, both inside the Police Force and among legal practitioners, that far too often the cases of mass murders that have occurred in South Australia have resulted from incidents like that.

It is far too simple to obtain weapons and ammunition. I appreciate other factors are involved and that there are people who, for legitimate reasons, farmers and sportsmen,

need weapons. I would have thought, at the very least, there should be a cooling-off period of a couple of days. I am told that, if that were the case, it is likely that many of these homicides could be prevented. I especially note the proposed measures to reform various aspects of industrial law, and first on the list is workmen's compensation. I have been amazed at some of the publicity that has occurred in relation to the existing Workmen's Compensation Act.

I accept some of the criticism because, under the provisions of the existing Act, it is conceivable in some cases for a workman on compensation to receive more money than a person doing the same work the injured man was doing before his accident. That is a defect in the Act, but it is a cyclical matter and, depending on movements in wages and the like, the reverse situation could occur. I accept that criticism, but do not accept the wild and sweeping statements that have been made by some people who are supposedly experts. I draw particular attention to the incredible statement of a person who apparently claims to be a leading spinal specialist and who, if I understand him correctly in the letter he wrote to the *Advertiser*, stated that 75 per cent of all people suffering from back injuries are malingerers. That is the height of absurdity. A practitioner on whose judgment I would rely far more (he comes from Melbourne, where he has performed thousands of operations on the spine and has written papers and is a world authority on the cervical spine) gave me his estimate of 5 per cent, at the most. Included in that 5 per cent there would be people he said, who, whilst their existing injuries could not be linked directly to back injuries, had their disabilities linked to compensation neuroses and to delays in court proceedings.

Again, it is delays in court proceedings that add to the plight of the victim. The existing Act provides for a form of conciliation and arbitration in dealing with matters of workmen's compensation. Either, because of its sheer novelty, or because of other duties, no-one has tried to implement the procedure of conciliation and arbitration in these matters. Some workmen's compensation cases are still trundling slowly (although in better circumstances with better rewards and more reasonable compensation) through the Industrial Court, at an unrewarding pace. This is an area in which the sooner the injured workmen can be returned to work the better, and the sooner the action can be settled the better, and new techniques must be tried. I plead for something to be done in this direction.

I note with great interest the statement of the Minister of Labour and Industry to his colleagues throughout the Commonwealth on the need to provide jobs for the disabled. This is a move I strongly support. Another matter under the industrial heading relates to preference to unionists, and I shall refer to that. However, the first matter to which I refer in some detail is the question of civil actions against unions. This deplorable state of affairs has once again raised its ugly head. In Britain, since 1906, after the passing by the Campbell-Bannerman Liberal Government of the Trade Disputes Act, there has been no capacity on the part of employers to use civil actions against unions. The same situation has obtained for many years in Queensland, and it is deplorable that this State is the pacesetter for these actions.

What do such actions achieve? They are against the trend of history, they are not productive, except of bitterness, and I suggest that those who use them only defeat their own objective. Employers who use them want to have, so they claim, an orderly system of wage fixing and

industrial regulation. I say that by using them they are playing into the hands of the extremist elements which would break down that system. There is every justification for the successful introduction of legislation to prevent civil actions against trade unions. As recently as 1964, after more than 50 years experience of the British Trade Disputes Act, Gerald Gardiner, in his work on law reform, at page 206, had a reasonable amount to say about the British experience. He summarised it quite neatly when he said:

When the Trade Disputes Act, 1906, was passed to give unions a reasonable degree of freedom to strike without interference from the common law, it was difficult to determine what precisely the common law was on this topic. But the common law continued to develop and now gives a fairly satisfactory degree of protection so far as the aims of strikes are concerned. So long as the predominant aim of the strikers is to improve their own conditions, to act in their own interests, there can be no action for conspiracy at common law unless the strikers resort to some unlawful method, for example, riots or malicious damage—

and with that I fully agree—

But in 1906 it seemed as if the very aim of a strike was unlawful, and that is why the Trade Disputes Act provided that no action for conspiracy would lie against any persons acting in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute unless the acts committed would be actionable if done by one person. The effect of this is that a combination to strike in which no tort or crimes (i.e. no "actionable" acts) are committed does not amount to conspiracy so long as the aim of the strike is connected with a trade dispute. The fact that it harms the employer or is in restraint of trade does not matter.

Yet another restriction which severely hampered strikers, namely, the tort of inducing a breach of contract, was removed by the 1906 Act. Section 1 has the effect that no action will lie against any person acting in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute on the ground only that he has induced the breach of a contract of employment. This is important, for clearly, every time a person persuades an employee to strike without first giving the employer the necessary notice to terminate the contract, a breach of the contract of employment is, technically, induced. All this protection given to the strikers is dependent upon the acts being done in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute.

They are the key words: if what is being done is being done in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, then surely that is a matter that should be dealt with by the recognised industrial machinery unless, of course, the argument is that the recognised industrial machinery cannot work. If that is the argument, it is a deplorable situation, and a deplorable argument. I note with even greater regret that in South Australia, having started this tendency of issuing tort writs, originally the employers at least attempted forms of conciliation and arbitration. Now that has gone, too, and the latest writs issued in the Supreme Court have been issued without any attempt at conciliation and arbitration in the Industrial Court or the Industrial Commission. The situation is becoming worse and worse.

The author of the book on law reform from which I have quoted suggested to the British people and the British Parliament that the protections extended by the Trade Disputes Act should be extended, and those protections are further extended by the Queensland Act. There is no reason to believe that the level of strike activity or disruption is any the worse in Queensland because of that legislation. I hope that, in the course of this Parliament, there will be a sensible resolution of this problem. I point out only one matter, technical in origin, but with severe repercussions. Because in South Australia we are still relying on the early English cases that were overridden by the Trade Disputes Act, we have an even more ludicrous situation. In 1900, the House of Lords, in the famous

Mogul Steamship Company case, held in that era of free trade that it was perfectly all right, where a group of six traders held a monopoly on the tea trade throughout Britain, for five of the six to get together and smash the sixth out of business.

But, following that the same House of Lords, after a rather dubious delay and after writing what I consider a rather dubious judgment, had to deal with a dispute between the railways union and the Taff Vale Railway, and held precisely the opposite, and so there are two standards: one standard of free trade for the employer groups, and one standard of prohibition for the trade unions and, what is more, a liability of attack on trade union funds. That is the state of the law in South Australia today, and no wonder trade unionists are upset by it. The other parts of His Excellency's Speech foreshadow amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

I turn now to observations made by members opposite on trends in industrial matters that they consider disturbing. It is sometimes said that there is a growing tendency towards industrial anarchy in Australia, and implicit in that statement is the thought that this is something new, or at least something growing that has grown disproportionately in recent times. This is simply not so. Whether or not there is a growing tendency to industrial anarchy is a matter of fact, and the facts show that, throughout this century and the latter part of the 19th century, at various times and to varying degrees industrial issues have been to the fore; in fact, it may be seriously argued (and is, by many reputable historians) that industrial unrest in Britain between the end of the 19th century and the First World War was so bad that, had it not been for the war, there might well have been a revolution, a situation not encountered in Britain since 1640.

In pointing to what are conceived to be bad aspects of industrial life, reference is made to strikes, bans, limitations, and stoppages, together with matters such as compulsory unionism, preference to unionists, industrial demarcation disputes between unions, and a whole list of other matters that would take far too long to catalogue. All these things are matters of fact. There may or may not be elements of anarchy in industrial movements: there may or may not be unreasonable and unnecessary strikes; and there may or may not be proper member control of official activities, and so on. Both the general allegations and the specific complaints about certain unions or activities do not refer to the major problem itself, but merely indicate the symptoms of the underlying disease. The problem that has been posed for at least the last century is how to reconcile, in a democratic country, the demands of the worker, employers, and the public interest. This is a difficult topic to canvass.

It is much easier, much more racy, to make a series of broad generalisations that sound good even if they are not based on fact or reputable opinion. It is far less appealing to discuss the underlying problem than to refer to the symptoms. Of course, I do not discount all of the things that have been said. To the degree that strikes, bans, and limitations are not reasonable, then of course I condemn them. It is true to say that we have the privilege of living in one of the ever-dwindling number of basically democratic and free countries in the world. The whole impetus of the free trade union movement has been to secure by Parliamentary means a fair share of the nation's profit for employees. That attitude is to be contrasted with those parts of the trade union movement dominated by communists or anarchists or other

elements who believe there can be no proper provision for the worker inside society as we know it. These people are intent not on a rational solution of the problem, but to manipulate the problem to achieve their goal, which is the destruction of the free mixed enterprise economy governed by Parliaments responsible to the people and accepted by the people of this country. The influence of those elements varies from time to time according to rises and falls in economic activity, to wars, and other crises, to the personalities of those involved, and so on.

In dealing with this problem I, along with the Australian Labor Party, totally repudiate those elements and their basic philosophy. It should not be the case that some of those elements should be in a position to gain control, but very often the reason for their gaining control is a lack of understanding of the problem I am discussing. That is to say, a lack of understanding on the part of the community generally and a lack of understanding by conservative Parties whose repudiation of amending legislation in many cases gives these elements their strength.

If the problem has been correctly stated by me as being the balancing of a fair share for the worker and for the employer, taking into account the public interest, how has that problem been resolved within our society, if at all, and what needs to be done to resolve that part of it still left? My first proposition is that it certainly has not been completely resolved. That I would have thought is so obvious it needs no argument. My second proposition is that it can be solved, and that proposition does need argument. When I say that it can be solved I assert that the Australian Labor Party and the free trade union movement can solve it as free men in a free society.

There can be little doubt that the problem has been partly solved by the implementation of industrial conciliation and arbitration through legislation over the past 80 years in the States and the Commonwealth. There can be no question that, speaking in broad terms, even in the past 30 years let alone the past 60 years, the broad mass of employees have on the whole received a fairer share of society's net profit. However, at all times, those who adopt my stand have to bear in mind that the problem is a changing one and that to judge progress in this regard is difficult. I am pleased to see that the reintroduction of wage indexation is one major factor helping this process, because I support the idea of wage indexation.

The real financial position of the employee is determined by factors in addition to the arbitration system, by factors such as taxation and its incidence, movements in prices, levels of employment, levels of inflation, and welfare payments, to mention a few. Other factors would include the provision of low cost housing, but for the great mass of workers it is the pay packet that represents a fair mark of his financial position from time to time. It is tremendously difficult to determine whether or not a fair balance has been reached at any time, but I boldly assert that that position can be reached. It will not be reached to the precise dollar or cent, and is not capable of precise definition, but one can generally and broadly reach a conclusion. The conclusion that I have reached is that given the great efforts of trade unions generally that position, while it changes from time to time, is capable of achievement in Australia.

Every time conservative spokesmen attack those propositions put by responsible union leaders and attack the work they do, they unwittingly play into the hands of the Marxist and anarchist elements we and they deplore. The share of the national product that should be appropriated

to the worker is a major problem, and it is often assumed that, because it is the major problem, most industrial dislocation can be referred to it. Such is far from being the case. At present within the major problem the issue that has produced tremendous disputation is the relationship between payments for various classes of work, often baldly expressed as wage relativities. It is obvious that every class of worker (including the professional, administrative and clerical employee, tradesman, semi-skilled and unskilled workers) of both the Government and private sectors of necessity places on his or her particular class of work his or her own value. Philosophically that is an unanswerable proposition.

As George Bernard Shaw said long ago (and I paraphrase him), "What is the worth of the candlestick maker, the butcher, the baker, or the parson", assuming for present purposes that to some extent the work of all of them is needed to maintain an efficient society. The plain fact is that we cannot, except in an arbitrary fashion, make a jump from examining what they do to putting a price value on it. The worth of the employee's work and the wage he would consider reasonable is usually deduced from community standards generally, but more especially by having regard to the relationship between his training, skill, responsibility, work burden, disabilities, and so on, and that of other working people. This raises the greatest degree of problem in the existing system: namely, wage relativity.

Under this heading one need only refer to the position of the metal tradesman to understand the problem. In this State it cannot be denied that, because of the large motor vehicle plants and other plants and because of the many persons (relatively more than in other States) employed under the Metal Trades Award, this problem has been continually highlighted. The unions involved in the Metal Trades Award, the workers who are paid under it, and the tradesmen, are perfectly correct in what they have been saying, and some of the attitudes of people in the community and of some employers have been most unfair when considering this matter. Until the late 1960's the fitter classification in the Metal Trades Award was the wage and the determining factor upwards and downwards for just about every other occupation. If we accept, in broad terms, that there are four major classifications of worker, as I have suggested, then we can even more effectively pinpoint the problem. Ten years ago, without a shadow of a doubt, there was an alarming gap between the unskilled worker at the bottom and the tradesman, and between the tradesman and the professional at the top.

At that time it could have been argued that the tradesman was in a relatively good position compared to the semi-skilled and unskilled worker. Again, that was an easy argument to put, because at that time the wages of the semi-skilled and unskilled worker were deplorably low and hardly livable. Today, however, we find that non-tradesmen in many cases are obtaining higher wages than tradesmen receive, and that is grossly unfair. In the building industry, in some cases labourers are receiving more than building tradesmen. That position can be seen in clerical and retail occupations, and it can be seen in other occupations.

Mr. Mathwin: And in the factories, too.

Mr. McRAE: I do not for a moment suggest that the gains that have been achieved by labourers, clerical workers, shop assistants and so on are not well deserved gains: 10 or 15 years ago the person who sold coats, milkshakes, or whatever it was, at David Jones or Myers was deplorably underpaid. There could be no doubt about that. That worker was in a wretched situation, and it is eminently

proper and much to the credit of his union that that worker has now got a rate of pay that provides him with something like a reasonable living. But it is wrong, in the process of all that, that the tradesman should have suffered. It is easy to see that, in the past three or four years, the big movements that have come about in Australia have been to elevate the rates of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers at one end of the scale. That is evidenced by labourers' rates in the private sector and Government workers' manual rates in the Government sector throughout the Commonwealth, not differentiating between State and State.

That is one example of that, and at the other end of the spectrum there can be no doubt that, again in a well-earned fashion, Government workers in the professions and administrative capacities of the Public Service have also received a large lift. That, too, was only appropriate, because 10 or 15 years ago I think the ridiculous situation was that the Crown Solicitor, with all his responsibilities, work burden and skills, was receiving less than \$12 000 a year, while a relatively inexperienced legal practitioner, with half the workload, in private practice was receiving perhaps \$20 000 a year.

Dr. Tonkin: What about the Parliamentary Counsel?

Mr. McRAE: The Parliamentary Counsel and many others can be cited, so in my belief it is a very good thing. I am not attacking the elevation, either at the lower end of the scale or at the mid-range of the scale, but I do say that, while this has all gone on, the tradesman has been sold a pup, as he cannot win either way. When his rate was the determining factor (and it was the determining factor), he could move only once whereas everybody else gained from what he did and then leapfrogged on top of him.

Now that that has changed, in another sense, because of the bargaining power, the sheer brute force power of certain other groups in the community, the tradesman has again been left in the lurch. It is small wonder that the tradesmen employed in plants throughout Australia are becoming more and more upset with the whole system. That is bad, because, as a person who believes (as I have already put) in settling these problems by free men in a free society, I think that unless we solve the problem of relativity we play into the hands of extremists, Marxists, anarchist elements (call it what you like) who want to find any excuse to break the whole system. I say that the problem of relativity can and must be solved. I say it will not be solved by brute force; it will be solved only by a rational approach to the whole problem.

It has got to be solved within the system, and, if to some extent the system has to be changed, let it be changed. It has to be solved within the concepts of the system and, if those concepts have to be updated, let them be updated. There are, as I have mentioned, forces at play which would strongly advocate the overthrow of the arbitration system which, whilst it has many faults and while it led in some ways to the deplorable situation to which I refer, nevertheless, to my mind, has always played such a tremendous role in Australian industrial relations. There are certain forces at work that would want to see it destroyed, and I do not think that that should be allowed to occur.

There are those people who argue that by collective bargaining justice can be obtained. Three years ago I said in this House (and was subsequently criticised) that those who advocated collective bargaining were wrong. I repeat that, and I think the results of the past three years have proved it, because collective bargaining, whilst it has achieved a great deal for some, has, to a very large extent, destroyed the very relativity we have been talking about. Mr. J. Isaac, of Victoria, a well regarded and

I think unbiased expert in this area of industrial relations, in the *Journal of Industrial Relations* recently had this to say:

If we are to have stable full employment (few would question this objective) and fairly stable prices (there is much uncertainty about the importance of this objective), then we will need to examine closely the kind of collective bargaining which is compatible with these objectives and which also provides a fairly acceptable level of industrial peace. What is becoming clear from the experience of many countries is that overall consistency of pay and other income movements to the requirements of full employment and price stability cannot be relied upon to emerge from free sectional collective bargaining. We do not seem to be operating in the competitive world of classical economics where the equalising forces of the market function freely through movements of resources, including labour resources; and where prices, including labour prices, are flexible in both directions. In our world of collective (as against individual) bargaining, the equalising forces do not appear to result from the movement of labour resources but are mainly the result of administered wages and prices which generally move in one direction—upwards, the pace being set by the larger pay settlements.

When speaking of collective bargaining, I am referring to the system of collective bargaining that would replace the arbitration system, not to the arrangements of amicable settlement between employer and employee; that, of course, is within the system and much to be applauded.

Mr. Mathwin: That is called a sweetheart agreement.

Mr. McRAE: No, that is not called a sweetheart agreement at all. It may be, in certain circumstances, a sweetheart agreement, and it may lead to the imbalance I have referred to but if conducted properly I do not believe it is to be condemned. I condemn the replacement of the arbitration system, in the public good, by the system of collective bargaining as I have just defined it.

Mr. Mathwin: Bob Hawke thinks it is a good idea, doesn't he?

Mr. McRAE: Bob Hawke agrees exactly with what I have put. Time and again, Bob Hawke has advocated what I have advocated, that is, bargaining across the table between unions and employers, and so has every judge in and historian of the system, if one can reach a proper agreement. Bob Hawke does not advocate the destruction of the system and its replacement by some anarchic chaos determined by Marxist forces. We would be back where we started.

Mr. Mathwin: There is more industrial peace in America because of it.

Mr. McRAE: I totally repudiate that. I believe that success or failure on the question of relativity will largely determine the orderly system of wage fixation. I say that it can be solved by reason and moderation, and I hope that it will be solved. In addition to the question of the pay packet, which is, after all, the key factor, there are several other matters to which employers, particularly large employers, should pay regard, but very often they do not.

I suggest that many of the disputes that arise in industry could be avoided or at least to some extent obviated if employers would have regard to some of the basic suggestions put forward recently by experts in the field. In the *Journal of Industrial Relations* recently, in an article on employee relations, the editor (he has been talking about wages, but now he gets on to the question of the proper relationship of the employee as part of industry, not just as a cog in the machine) says:

Is it not possible to have a policy which is taken seriously, which clearly spells out the premises of human dignity and which is turned into an action plan and

implemented? It seems devastating to suffer the tortuous path of strikes, action groups and disruptive confrontation to produce a situation where human rights are considered. In situations where only economic expediency dictates, it is certain that human dignity will take a back seat. If the foregoing are pointers to the problem, at least in part the following is intended to highlight some aspects of policy which a company might reasonably consider, amend in the light of particular circumstances and adopt as a working policy. The company employs people. Privileges and distinction by status detract from this basic premise.

Everyone employed by the company is a person and has the right to be treated as a person, not as a red-coated, blue-coated or white-coated person, thus indicating his status inside the company. The article continues:

2. The circumstances in which people work must be consistent with good health, both psychological and physical.

That is well known to anyone who has had anything to do with mass-scale production in industrial plants. The article continues:

3. The dignity of people is paramount at work. They must be treated as individuals, kept informed of both company matters and things affecting them personally, and treated equitably.

4. Groups or individuals should have some control over their work situation. Subservience to authority for its own sake is degrading.

5. Significant groups within companies should meet on a regular basis; unions, management and groups of employees to consider the things which improve human dignity at work.

6. The wider social responsibility of companies should be integrated into agencies whose services provide professional expertise. Such agencies may be of the government or welfare agencies.

7. Companies should offer opportunities to all employees for personal fulfilment and development at work.

8. Companies should be alert to the community problems of its major groups, especially migrants, and actively support agencies in social improvement and encourage Government attention to be paid to such problems.

I believe that, if more companies paid regard to those human factors, the rate of industrial disputation could be reduced markedly. Certainly pay is an important factor, but the dignity of the job and the satisfaction one can obtain from the employment are tremendously important factors as well. The *Journal of Industrial Relations* recently dealt with this matter after a study by the Western Australian Institute of Technology and asked a number of employees what factors they thought were important in their work situation. I suppose it is only logical to expect this, but at the top (and unanimously agreed to) the first statement was a feeling of achievement from the successful completion of a task; the next was management's treatment of employees; company policies and the like; recognition for good performance; supervision—good relationship with immediate superior; opportunities for advancement; interest and challenge in work itself; and opportunities for developing friendships. Then, the total amount of earnings was mentioned—curiously, a long way down the list. The points were not put in any order of value at that stage, but this was done later. The list continues by mentioning working conditions, physical surroundings, and responsibility (where applicable). In terms of ranking order, the result was as follows:

1. Interest and challenge in work itself.
2. Security of employment.
3. Feeling of achievement.
4. Wages or salaries.

It is interesting to note that even in the machine age, or perhaps because of it, the be all and end all is not just the amount in the pay packet but those other personal factors, which, to him or her, are so important. There are other reasons why industrial disputation continues and

remains a blight on the country. One reason for this is demarcation disputes. Although the member for Glenelg is not seated in his correct place, I agree with the comment he made about Mr. Hawke, of the A.C.T.U., that it was absurd that a country like Australia, with such a small population, should have so many unions, because the greater the number of unions the more likely it is that demarcation disputes will result.

The surveys to which I have referred hitherto were scientific surveys, whereas that to which I will now refer was not scientifically carried out, but resulted from a seminar of industrial lawyers in Victoria recently. The estimate (based on an unofficial survey) was that at all court hearings, both State and Federal, involving trade unions over the past five years (including national wage cases, work value cases, and specific matters of all kinds), 50 per cent of all those matters were concerned with demarcation disputes between unions or, alternatively, dispute within unions.

Mr. Wardle: How many man-hours were lost?

Mr. McRAE: More man-hours were lost because of inter-union disputes and intra-union disputes than because of union-employer disputes. The contrast that one gives is West Germany. Whilst I do not agree with all the philosophies of that country or of the trade union movement there, nonetheless, with a population of more than 40 000 000 people, there are fewer than 20 unions.

Mr. Evans: It is nearer 60 unions.

Mr. McRAE: I accept that. The total is no greater than that, and there is a potentiality to cut down the number of disputations by a marked degree.

Mr. Mathwin: West Germany uses collective bargaining, doesn't it?

Mr. McRAE: To some degree, yes, but with a sophisticated degree of arbitration that can be called on. West Germany is different from Australia also because, in broad industry bands, the situation does not arise, as it does in Australia. Because one is dealing with a broad industry band, one union secretary is responsible for tradesmen, semi-skilled and unskilled workers, too, whereas, in Australia, different unions are responsible for tradesmen, semi-skilled workers and unskilled workers. That is the trap in trying to compare our situation with the situation overseas. Beyond a shadow of doubt, it can be said that the large number of unions we have in Australia is viewed badly as far as the community is concerned because it causes unnecessary stoppages and because enormous cost is involved for the unions. The ratio of members' funds being spent in that area compared to that spent for the advancement of conditions is totally out of perspective.

I end my remarks by reasserting my belief that, within the context of the free social order, one can overcome these problems, given moderation, reason and persistence. Great problems must be overcome, but I believe they can be overcome. Anyone involved in this area should always be careful to maintain that philosophy and to do nothing that would play into the hands of the Marxist and anarchist elements who would seize on any excuse to break down the whole system. They are only too proud to say, "This cannot be dealt with in a reasonable way, so let us get people out on to the streets." That is so wrong. I repudiate that attitude, and so does my Party. I look forward in this session to at least some forward steps being taken. It is with pleasure that I support the motion.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I join previous speakers in complimenting His Excellency on his opening Speech. On the eve of his retirement, I wish him and Lady Oliphant a long, healthy and happy retirement. I extend to the families of deceased members my condolences, especially the family of the late Jim Ferguson, who was a member of our Party. When I was elected to this House in May, 1970, I was allocated a room with the new Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Tonkin), the member for Glenelg and Jim Ferguson. Jim Ferguson was responsible for showing us around Parliament House and telling us what we could and could not do in Parliament. I owe much to him for his guidance and understanding in those early years. He is sadly missed by us all.

The tenor and standard of debate of Government members has probably been the poorest we have witnessed and had to endure for some years. We on this side have witnessed the continuous belting of the Liberal Party, the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister. That is only to be expected when one considers the present Government and the difficulties it is facing at the moment. The Premier has made statements that the Opposition is better organised than it has been in the past. That is why we have come to expect that Government members will do all they can to belt the Liberal Party in an attempt to demoralise its members and supporters. Government members will not succeed, because what their attack has done is reorganise and unify the Liberal Party in such a way that it is ready to take Government whenever the opportunity arises.

Let me assure Government members and their cohorts that the attacks on the Leader are completely unfounded. Trying to label him as a knocker will not succeed. Labor is desperate. We saw it happen in the Federal sphere when McMahon was Prime Minister and again when Snedden was Leader of the Opposition. The Labor Party then engaged its forces to destroy the credibility of an individual. Try as hard as it might, it will not succeed in this State. The Leader has proved he is the type of man who can lead the Opposition by his leadership. He has a team that is working extremely well and efficiently, a team that will be more than a match for the present Government.

The Government is worried because it knows that the Liberal Party has a united team. The Labor Party is experiencing difficulty, which was obvious during a debate recently when some of its members were in complete conflict with the rest of the Party. I have no doubt that at least two members got a severe dressing down after the debate. For one of the Ministers, it would be the second or third time he has received a dressing down in his short sojourn in office, but he will not be there much longer anyway. The Government is also worried that Fraser is leading Australia on the road to recovery—that he is proving to be the iron man of Australian politics, a sound leader, and a leader for whom the Australian people were crying out in the past 12 months. If anyone does a better job than this Government, it is out to destroy that person's credibility. Gough is on his last trip, and there will be a leadership change in Canberra. Government members know that, so they must take attention away from the issue by attempting to blame the Fraser Administration.

A matter that concerns me greatly relates to the discussion recently in the press relating to the Olympics, amateur sport and so on. Last evening a boxing show called "The Old Lion Boxing Show" was held at the Old Lion Hotel and was operated in conjunction with the discotheque.

This matter raises the point that tent boxing, as it is known, was banned some months ago in Victoria following the unfortunate death of a boxer from injuries he sustained in the ring. This type of boxing, on a so-called professional basis, is not suitable for hotels or anywhere else. I believe the Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Sport was made aware of the events of last evening, but I do not know what he has done about it. I ask the Government to institute an inquiry into this promotion and to ascertain what happened. I believe that two amateur boxers were to have given an exhibition bout. One had had only one previous fight and the other had had two, but there was a difference of about 13 kilograms in their weights. That is a completely unfair competition and because they were amateurs the fight was not held.

Dr. Eastick: It is a very dangerous situation.

Mr. BECKER: I quite agree. The promotion of such fights should be in the hands of competent people. I am not knocking professional boxing, and boxers should be able to compete in their sport, but rules and conditions should be applied to professional boxing in this State. The previous Minister of Labour and Industry was greatly concerned about this matter, and I want to know what the Government will do. If it has not done anything, I hope it will undertake a thorough investigation.

Dr. Eastick: I wonder whether they are expected to have a medical examination beforehand.

Mr. BECKER: I do not know. In professional boxing that is not necessary; there is no rule in relation to medical checks. In amateur boxing it is necessary to have an examination before the fight. A medical practitioner is present and the boxers are examined after the fight. The rules in amateur boxing are strict, but that is not so in professional boxing. I contacted the manager of the hotel, who was most dissatisfied with the whole performance. It had been rumoured that there would be audience participation, and someone from the audience stepped into the ring and finished two rounds with someone else, because a person was considered unfit. It must have been a nice old Rafferty's rules show. The manager of the hotel said that there was to have been another fixture next week, but it had been cancelled. Even though this performance is not to continue at the Old Lion Hotel in future, I ask the Government to consider the matter in order to ensure that there is no repetition anywhere before a solid set of standards is set down to deal with professional boxing. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted: debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): The member for Hanson touched obliquely in his concluding remarks on a matter to which I wish to refer concerning some aspects of the Licensing Act. The District of Torrens seems to be a popular venue for people who want to be entertained at discotheques, although similar entertainment is available elsewhere in the metropolitan area and also in country centres. Discotheques have existed for some years, although not in hotels. With the extension of the Licensing Act and the permit system, we find that certain large hotels, to boost their income, are promoting discotheques. The effect

on local residents is disastrous and unnerving. Several hotel discotheques in my district do a fair trade, as they have a permit for at least two or three evenings a week.

Mr. Mathwin: Are they noisy?

Mr. COUMBE: That would be the understatement of the day. Not only does the noise cause concern, but also the happenings at the conclusion of the performance. I have been to discotheques and I think people who go there must eventually suffer damage to their auditory organs. I have been driven out, because I could not hear what was being said to me and could not say anything to anyone else. Much of the noise emanates from vehicles parked in the streets or near houses, and the language is pretty ripe. This is a source of nuisance to residents in nearby houses, and many times much disturbance is caused. I know of one person who wanted to drive into the parking space provided in his home unit, but he found another car in the space and managed to find a park somewhere else. The same thing happened the next evening, and this time he parked his car behind the car in his parking space, so that the other car could not get out. The next morning he found that his car had been pushed away and all the windows had been smashed, to enable his car to be moved.

Mr. Mathwin: What time do they leave these places?

Mr. COUMBE: Often midnight or later, and local residents are trying then to get some peace and quiet. A function held occasionally is all right, but when it happens three evenings a week and also on Saturday evening, nearby residents have cause for complaint. I can give the names of people who have been forced to move elsewhere. Under the Licensing Act a permit must be obtained for some of these functions. The Police Department has an unenviable job when complaints are received, and officers have to try to maintain order after the functions have ended, but that does not solve the problem. The root cause seems to be the rather easy method by which permits are granted.

We should look not afterwards but before this nuisance is caused. I commend the Police Department on the work it is doing, but I believe the Government should consider the matter. Perhaps the permit issuing authority should have more discretion and a power of veto, if necessary, concerning an establishment consistently causing a nuisance. If the number of permits granted were reduced, I believe people would have much less trouble. It is quite useless for the organisation to appeal to patrons to be quiet. They will not do that: in many cases they are not in a fit state to be quiet. I am not a wowser, but I ask for a little common sense in the administration of this aspect of our laws. I know at least two local councillors in my district who are extremely concerned at this matter. It is a pity that that seems to be the trend in many of the larger metropolitan hotels and I regret the passing of many of the smaller family or owner-operated pubs. I am thinking here of the English-type pub in which one can take his family along for a meal, a few drinks, and a bit of fun, as opposed to the large commercialised undertakings. The first "Bring your own" licence is operating in a restaurant in North Adelaide. Such licences were suggested by me a few years ago, but were turned down flat by the Attorney-General's predecessor. It will be interesting to see how the system works out.

I was delighted to see in the press this week that the Adelaide City Council has agreed to allow the Melbourne Street "Portobello Road" market to operate again. It is reputed to be one of the best of its type in the world, but of course it could not compare to the market in London. At least we are getting a little cosmopolitan in North Adelaide.

In the administration of the Licensing Act I should like a greater scrutiny of applications to be made before permits go to the court, so that more information will be available about the type of functions for which the permits are required. It would then be easier for a resident to complain to the court and lodge an objection.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): From March 29 this year a major study of public transport needs in the north-east area of Adelaide was commenced by the Transport Department. The study, known as the North-East Area Public Transport Review, will take about 18 months to complete. The study is expected to lead to a decision to invest, or not to invest, in major public transport improvements to serve the north-east area. If investment is found to be necessary, the study will evaluate alternative public transport routes and facilities, and recommend a specific solution for the area.

During the study information will be sought from, and frequently made available to, interested citizens through a major programme of public involvement. Briefly stated, NEAPTR is an important study of public transport needs, and the available options for satisfying those needs, in the north-eastern suburbs. As such, it is not only significant in relation to future public transport investment decisions, but also to the Metropolitan Development Plan review being undertaken.

I support the objectives of this study but, in doing so, I point out to the Minister of Transport that at the same time the immediate needs of the transport requirements of the Tea Tree Gully area must be met. I now refer specifically to some bus services, and wish to elaborate on past history. First, I refer to the Carinya Heights bus service, which was one of the former privately-owned services now operated by the Bus and Tram Division of the State Transport Authority. I was told on March 10, 1975, that it was intended that the Carinya Heights bus service (505) would eventually be extended from Billabong Road via Conyngham Avenue, Silvermore Terrace, Murrell Road and Kelly Road to Grenfell Road, ultimately serving the Wynn Vale area. It was also proposed that the Modbury Heights service, service 544, would eventually operate from the city and be extended from Milne Road northwards along Ladywood Road. At that time (and I am quoting from correspondence of March 10, 1975) roads for both these route extensions were not available. In addition, no spare buses for route extensions were available. In reply to a suggestion that the Redwood Park bus service be extended, the Minister of Transport informed me, on May 12, 1975, that the Bus Service Planning Group had agreed that this area was poorly served and proposed that the bus route be extended via Riverside Drive, Cronulla Drive, Kincumber Drive, Terrigal Road, Springwood Avenue and Grenfell Road to Agonis Street, Surrey Downs.

This proposal was subject to approval by the Tea Tree Gully council and to the provision of adequate roads. The Fairview Park area is another that is in need of an existing service to be extended to it. I was informed on February 20, 1975, that additional buses were required for such a service and, again, that the roads were in issue. It was suggested that the ideal route for a bus service to the area would be from Haines Road via Grenfell Road, Portmarnock Street, Selanger Avenue, Hoylake Crescent and Canoustie Avenue to Wannsee Road, returning via Wannsee Road, Selanger Avenue, Portmarnock Street and Grenfell Road. Fortunately, the school bus service to be operated over roadways in the Fairview Park area

was approved, but now the new primary school at Fairview Park has been opened. Representations were also made to me for public transport along Smart Road, Modbury, and the Minister of Transport, in reply to a question from me in this House, said that due consideration would be given to the matter in the review of all bus routes and services in the metropolitan area.

Representations were also made for bus services to be provided along the Lower North-East Road between Amber Road and Valley Road. In response to my representations, the Minister informed me that the service proposed by the Bus Service Planning Group included a service along the entire length of that road. As at April 12, 1976, the Minister informed me that he had referred the matter to the State Transport Authority for its consideration in the light of the implementation of improved services to the area. It was pointed out that it must be remembered that the improved services could not be provided until the new buses were available. In response to correspondence, I was informed again on April 15, 1975, that the trust was aware of the increased patronage that occurred on some bus trips operating on the St. Agnes to Adelaide via Perseverance Road and Hancock Road service: for example, during the morning peak loading period between 7.30 a.m. and 8.30 a.m. Again, it was not practicable to operate additional trips on this service until new buses on order became available.

I will now sum up the position; the extension of these bus services and the improvement of existing bus services is dependent on the provision of new buses and also, in some cases, the availability of roads. I know that the Minister of Transport is sympathetic towards the needs of the Tea Tree Gully District in respect to transport, but I again remind him that the immediate needs of this area must be met now and that it is obvious that town planning in the future must take into consideration the provision of adequate roads for such heavy vehicles as buses.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Earlier this afternoon the member for Playford referred to the ease with which firearms can be purchased from any gun store or other store in South Australia, and mentioned the unsatisfactory situation and the risk to which some members of the community could be exposed because of the lack of restriction in this direction. I support the comments made by the honourable member. He suggested a cooling-off period of, perhaps, two or three days when purchasing a firearm. I suggest either that there could be a cooling-off period, or, as an alternative, that the person wishing to purchase a firearm should show identification of membership of a recognised sporting body that is engaged in sport involving the use of firearms, or of a suitable organisation that is recognised as being involved in this field.

While the present situation relating to the purchase of firearms is quite unsatisfactory, there is another situation that I believe is just as unsatisfactory, and that is in relation to the present powers under the National Parks and Wild Life Act. At the moment, under that Act, wild life officers have the power to confiscate a firearm from a person whom that officer believes has possibly breached the law. This confiscated firearm is sent to Adelaide and is held in the National Parks and Wild Life Department. I am led to believe that many of the guns held by the department are tending to deteriorate seriously, and that there is considerable rust in many of them.

That power, which is contained within the National Parks and Wild Life Act, to me is quite excessive. If a penalty is to be imposed on a person for a breach of the law, the court should be the only body that can impose such

penalty. If a person has breached the law, he is summoned under that Act and he must appear before the court. The court will determine the magnitude of the offence and will fine the person accordingly. For example, a person may have destroyed a protected bird. The offence might require the court to impose a fine of \$50 or \$100 for that offence, but on top of this the offender also has his firearm confiscated.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Didn't you vote for that in the Act?

Mr. ARNOLD: In the main, I am pointing out a deficiency that I believe should be corrected.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: But you voted for it.

Mr. ARNOLD: I am pointing out, at this stage, that it is unjust and should be corrected.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: But you voted for it.

Mr. Russack: Some things work out differently in practice.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did he vote for it, or didn't he?

Mr. Allison: Confucius, he say, "Man who never change mind never change anything."

Mr. ARNOLD: The National Parks and Wild Life Act is a new Act and, undoubtedly, there are many provisions that will need amendment. This is an area that I believe needs close looking at, because this Act has completely taken out of the hands of the court the responsibility for imposing a penalty on a person. It has given enormous power to the Minister, and it is purely on the Minister's decision whether or not a firearm will be returned. In many instances, if the court convicts the offender, the gun is not returned. The court may have imposed a penalty of \$100 and the firearm could be worth between \$50 and \$2 000, so one finishes up with a situation that is quite unjust. There is no way that we can continue to support that type of legislation.

I point out, also, that in many instances the breaches of the law result from ignorance and lack of knowledge. Many of the offenders are from the Greek and Italian communities, and the National Parks and Wild Life Department could do a lot for this section of the community if it produced booklets in multiple languages that would clearly indicate, in basic terms, the requirements of the Act, where people could hunt legally, and the penalties for taking protected birds or animals. I believe that much more effort could be put into this side of the operations of the department as regards management and education.

Unfortunately, at present the department is acting more as a law enforcement agency than dedicating itself to wild life management and the education of the public. I hope that the Government will seriously consider rescinding the section of the Act that enables a wild life officer to confiscate a firearm, because I think that provision is totally beyond the powers that should be provided in the circumstances. That power should be retained purely for a court; this is the manner in which we live in Australia. The court should be the only penalty-imposing authority in the State.

We have four types of national park, namely, national parks, game reserves, recreation parks, and conservation parks, the last of which cover about 3 397 832 hectares in this State. I stress that, purely because in the main conservation parks are not open to the public. National parks and recreation parks are open to the public, and game reserves are open only on gazetted occasions throughout the year. The total area of national and recreation parks is comparatively small compared to the total area of conservation parks. I question whether or not the Government should cease purchasing conservation parks and devote itself more to the management of the areas it already holds. We have seen the purchase of areas such as Nullarbor, Hypurna, and Canopus stations, comprising vast areas of country, but the department would seem to have limited resources to maintain these areas by controlling noxious weeds and vermin, maintaining the dams, and keeping the areas fenced.

Reserves are of little use to wild life unless the department has the finance and manpower to retain water on the reserves and provide the necessary food; otherwise, the wild life will tend to use national and conservation parks as a place to gather during the day, and at night will come out of the parks and cause havoc to neighbouring farms because, naturally, with the grain produced on the properties and the water the farmer provides, that is where the wild life will feed and drink. I believe it essential that the department now devote what resources it has to maintain adequately the areas under its care and, if necessary, to enter into contracts with neighbouring farmers to crop certain areas of the park so that the wild life will remain there.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 3, at 2 p.m.