HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 20 September 1978

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

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

In reply to **Mr. ARNOLD** (19 September).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has been selective in his quoting of the South Australian Government submission to the I.A.C. on protection for the citrus industry. While there has been considerable consultation between the industry and the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, the industry has been seeking a very much higher level of protection than the South Australian Government. Of course, we want to maintain a stable and prosperous citrus industry, but we do not want to see a boom in planting caused by over protection leading inevitably to surpluses in five to 10 years when these trees come into production. There are already signs of considerable expansion in citrus plantings. The South Australian Government also has to be consistent in its views before the commission, where it has argued for moderate levels of protection in other industries. Recent discussions between the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and representatives of the citrus industry have tried to work out a compromise whereby the very high level of protection provided by a quota would be moderated by the entry of over quota juice under a moderate tariff. These discussions have now been set back by the Federal Budget decision to tax quotas.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE presented a petition signed by 278 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility adequately to control pornographic material.

Mr. HARRISON presented a similar petition signed by 132 electors of South Australia.

Mr. ABBOTT presented a similar petition signed by 21 electors of South Australia.

Mrs. BYRNE presented a similar petition signed by 136 electors of South Australia.

Mr. BANNON presented a similar petition signed by 14 electors of South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 82 electors of South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a similar petition signed by 76 electors of South Australia.

Mr. GROOM presented a similar petition signed by 120 electors of South Australia.

Mr. KLUNDER presented a similar petition signed by 40 electors of South Australia.

Mr. RUSSACK presented a similar petition signed by 253 electors of South Australia.

Mrs. ADAMSON presented a similar petition signed by 100 electors of South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY presented a similar petition signed by 51 electors of South Australia.

Mr. WHITTEN presented a similar petition signed by 41 electors of South Australia.

Mr. GROTH presented a similar petiton signed by 30 electors of South Australia.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 50 electors of South Australia.

Mr. WILSON presented a similar petition signed by 589 electors of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD presented a petition signed by 41 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to increase maximum penalties for violent offences.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE presented a similar petition signed by 500 residents of South Australia.

Mr. HARRISON presented a similar petition signed by 311 residents of South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 149 residents of South Australia.

Mrs. BYRNE presented a similar petiton signed by 20 residents of South Australia.

Mr. NANKIVELL presented a similar petition signed by 54 residents of South Australia.

Mr. KENEALLY presented a similar petition signed by 87 residents of South Australia.

Mr. RUSSACK presented a similar petition signed by 367 residents of South Australia.

Mr. HEMMINGS presented a similar petition signed by 118 residents of South Australia.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 245 residents of South Australia.

Mr. MATHWIN presented a similar petition signed by 268 residents of South Australia.

Mr. WILSON presented a similar petition signed by 251 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MASSAGE

Mrs. ADAMSON presented a petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia praying that the House would enact legislation to ensure the restriction of the use of the words "massage", "masseurs" and "masseuses" to those who genuinely practised the art of massage within the provisions of the Physiotherapists Act, 1945-1973.

Petition received.

PETITION: MARIJUANA

Mr. NANKIVELL presented a petition signed by 16 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not pass legislation seeking to legalise marijuana.

Petition received.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery distinguished visitors in the persons of Datuk Sim Kheng Hong, Deputy Chief Minister and Minister for Finance and Development in the State of Sarawak, and Senator Law Hieng Ding,

Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment in the Federal Government of Malaysia, and I invite them to take seats on the floor of the House.

I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to escort our distinguished visitors to seats on the floor of the House on the right-hand side of the Speaker, and to introduce them.

Datuk Sim Kheng Hong and Senator Law Hieng Ding were escorted by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Mr. Tonkin to seats on the floor of the House.

QUESTION TIME

MONARTO

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether land at Monarto will be included in the sale of Government land, as outlined by him in the Budget speech? As honourable members know, losses on Monarto last year, including interest charges, totalled more than $3 000 000—a third of the value of the land held by the Monarto Development Commission. Further, this $3 000 000 has brought the total Monarto cost to more than $25 000 000, and this figure will continue to escalate dramatically by more than $10 000 000 if the project remains inactive, as planned for five years. It is a wasteful burden on taxpayers, both present and future.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If we proceed to sell the land at Monarto, we would have to repay both the loans and the grant moneys made available to this State by the Commonwealth in respect of its purchase. Undoubtedly, a loss would be made on the sale, and in those circumstances there would be no relief to taxpayers of South Australia. All we would do would be to make the position of taxpayers in South Australia worse and, at the same time, endanger the future of the development of the metropolitan area in Adelaide. The honourable member's proposition is absurd, ill researched, and ill thought out. I notice that he has made great play of the selling off of Government land. It seems rather strange that he should make this a major part of his Budget proposals, when the Government has made perfectly clear in the Budget speech that, in relation to surplus Government land, an investigation is already under way for that purpose.

GAS RESERVES

Mr. DRURY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether natural gas reserves in the Cooper Basin will be sufficient for South Australia's future domestic use?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The present position regarding actual proven and probable reserves in the Cooper Basin is that we do not have proved up the gas requirements for South Australia beyond 1988. For that reason, the Government took action in relation to further development of the Cooper Basin. As a consequence of the State's purchase of the Commonwealth interest in the Cooper Basin, the State is promoting exploration for further gas in the basin through South Australian Oil and Gas, a company set up jointly between the State Government and Sagasco to hold the former Commonwealth interest. An exploration programme of $5 000 000 a year commenced this year and, under that programme, three wells have been drilled. The first, Munkarie, was a commercial gas producer; the second was a dry hole; and the third, Kirby, came in over the weekend and seems to be a commercial gas producer.

The basis of the future exploration for oil and gas that has been agreed with the other producers is that South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation will sole risk further exploration in the Cooper Basin, unless other interest-holders want to come to the party and finance the normal share of the exploration to which they would be entitled. In that way, we can ensure that further exploration that will be required will be undertaken. Everyone associated with the industry is confident that there are sufficient adequate reserves in the Cooper Basin for our future requirements.

With that in mind, we have contracted with the producers for the provision of about 100 billion cubic feet a year for each of the years 1988 through to the year 2005. In addition, we have taken out a first option with the producers on all other gas that is discovered over and above the 2·8 trillion cubic feet that was originally pledged to Sydney.

There are one or two complications in relation to this matter of which members should be aware. Three gas fields have been discovered in the Queensland portion of the Cooper Basin, namely, Roseneath, Epsilon and Durham Downs, and at least two of these fields, Roseneath and Epsilon, have been dedicated to the Australian Gas Light Company in Sydney. The procedure of dedicating gas fields in the South Australian part of Cooper Basin was dispensed with and it was unitised. We had originally hoped that the whole Cooper Basin could be unitised, and discussions will take place soon with the Queensland Government in order to achieve appropriate arrangements for the whole Cooper Basin.

The gas that has been discovered so far in the Queensland portion of the Cooper Basin could not support any viable pipeline to Brisbane or Moonie. Indeed, even if further gas was discovered in the Queensland portion of the basin, it would be most unlikely that there would be sufficient demand for gas in Brisbane to justify providing a pipeline. The annual requirements of gas in Brisbane are estimated to be about 25 billion cubic feet, and that quantity of gas would not be sufficient to make viable any pipeline to Brisbane from the Queensland portion of the Cooper Basin. It is obviously in our interests, and in the interests of Queensland, if those gas reserves in Queensland cannot be exploited for the benefit of Brisbane, that they should come into South Australia and New South Wales, with Queensland gaining the benefit of the royalty that would be achieved by their development. This matter will require detailed discussions with the Queensland Government.

I conclude by saying that, whilst everyone is confident that sufficient gas will be found in the Cooper Basin both in South Australia and Queensland for our needs, if that gas is not available, extensions of the Cooper Basin can be achieved by connecting with the Mereenie and Palm Valley fields. Nevertheless, I believe that the supply of gas to South Australia is so important that we must ensure that the requirements of gas for Adelaide are not just future prospects but are in the proven and probable class.

SPECIAL BRANCH

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Chief Secretary say what arrangements have been made with the Federal Government or with ASIO for the transfer of information from the South Australian Special Branch of the Police Force, and whether that information is still vetted by Judge White? Earlier this year the Premier announced that Special Branch activities were to be scaled down and that Acting Justice White, as he then was, was to vet any information that was to go to Canberra. The Premier gave evidence to the Royal Commission that the South Australian and Federal Governments were entering into

immediate negotiations in relation to regularising, if I can use that word, the arrangements for the transfer of information from the South Australian Special Branch to ASIO.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Mr. Justice White is still responsible for the information in Special Branch. He and two officials of Special Branch are in the process of culling those records. Indeed, two or three weeks ago the Commissioner addressed a minute to me asking for an additional person to be appointed to Special Branch to ensure that the necessary current operations of the branch were not interfered with. The Government immediately gave that approval, so that another officer has been appointed to handle the work that the Commissioner thinks should be done. Regarding the vetting of information, that matter was to be dealt with at the highest level at the Premiers' Conference by agreement between the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the various States. I do not have information about the terms of any such agreement, if it has in fact been reached. In the meantime, there is no intention on the part of the Government to interfere with the proper operations of Special Branch or the transmission of information to other organisations from South Australia.

CASUAL WORK

Mr. OLSON: Will the Attorney-General investigate press ads relating to Argus Imports Australia Proprietary Limited in association with Smart Time Proprietary Limited of 112 Ward Street, North Adelaide? I have received complaints from constituents that ads, which have appeared in the press in relation to casual work at rates of $90 for two nights and $140 for three nights with no door-to-door sales, are misleading. In answer to this advertisement, inquirers are advised to attend training for two evenings and to bring along $25 to cover insurance. No payment is received for these attendances, as the advertisement suggests. After attending training for two nights my constituent brought home two suitcases containing linen, crockery and cutlery, with a full retail price of $745, on a monthly instalment plan. When asked for the names of clients or contacts, my constituent was advised none was available. However, he was advised to visit his friends. My constituent stated that he did not wish to take the job and asked that his $25 be returned. This was refused, and he was told that the money had been sent to Sydney. This firm is enlisting, each week, between 10 and 12 unemployed young people who hope to earn a living, but, in essence, it is effecting a rip-off of between $250 and $300 a week. Will the Attorney investigate the circumstances of the matter with a view to introducing legislation to curb this devious operation?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As the honourable member has reported this matter to us this afternoon, it sounds rather more like a case of fraud than mere misrepresentation in the narrow sense. I will certainly have the matter investigated. I am not sure whether this practice is an attempted rip-off through a veiled claim that $25 is a reasonable insurance premium or whether it is a breach of the miser misrepresentation legislation. I will certainly consider the matter and bring down a report for the honourable member and other members of the House.

EXHAUST EMISSION CONTROLS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Transport say what action the Government has taken to review the application and effects in South Australia of exhaust emission controls on motor vehicles? A leading article in the *Advertiser* today alleges that widespread avoidance of these controls is taking place by motorists who have purchased new vehicles since 1976, those vehicles being subject to Australian Design Rule 27A, and who have removed or tampered with the equipment added to the exhaust systems of those vehicles.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I read the article, as I expect many other people did, and I was rather flabbergasted to think that the *Advertiser* would give credibility to a claim by a person who admitted in the article that his claims could not be substantiated. Quite frankly, I could come to no other conclusion than that the Adelaide *Advertiser* failed dismally in its duty in informing the public this morning by giving such prominence to such an article. I know of no circumstances similar to those suggested by Mr. DeGaris in that article. If there have been any such circumstances it is the duty of Mr. DeGaris to draw them to my attention or to the attention of some other responsible person within Government to see that the matter is investigated thoroughly, because if any of the actions suggested by Mr. DeGaris are in fact occurring then they are a breach of the law and as such they would be dealt with.

Australian Design Rule 27A was brought in as a result of the unanimous decision of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. It is a three-stage rule, the first two stages having already been introduced. There is some backing and filling in relation to the third stage by some people, but not by the Government of South Australia. South Australia and New South Wales have stated, as a result of Cabinet discussion, to ATAC that the introduction date of 1 January 1981 for the third stage is no longer debatable. We have made that quite clear and we have no intention of withdrawing from that decision, notwithstanding the fact that investigations are being carried out. The Federal Minister wants to back away, but he did not get the support of either South Australia or New South Wales in his attempt to do so. As far as we are concerned, the third stage of A.D.R. 27A will come into effect as scheduled. I can only repeat that I think the article this morning was irresponsible, and I believe the *Advertiser* was irresponsible in publishing it without being able to substantiate the claims made, when Mr. DeGaris himself admitted that the claims he was making could not be supported.

BURBRIDGE ROAD

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Transport examine the potentially dangerous traffic situation that exists at the intersection of West Terrace and Burbridge Road? The area to which I refer is just west of West Terrace, where traffic proceeds along Grote Street and then west along Burbridge Road. Traffic builds up in three lanes at this intersection, and 50 metres after the crossing there is a sign indicating, "Form two lanes". There are no adequate markings on the road to indicate to the motorist which of the three lanes should yield to make way for the formation of two lanes. Sometimes people proceed rapidly across the intersection after hurrying to catch the lights. I have seen some dangerous situations arise, and I believe the situation could be improved.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to get what information I can for the honourable member. From my recollection of the area, I understand the road is under the care, control and responsibility of the Adelaide City Council. I believe there are plans to realign the road in an

attempt to get better geometry for that end of Burbridge Road. I will discuss the matter with the Highways Commissioner and get what further information I can for the honourable member.

HOUSING TRUST DEBTORS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister for Planning say what action he has taken or will take to reduce the ever-increasing amount of sundry debtors to the South Australian Housing Trust? There has been a massive increase in debts of about 41 per cent for the year 1976-77 and 46 per cent for the year just completed. In 1975-76, the sum was $918 000; in 1976-77, it increased to $1 301 000, an increase of $383 000, or about 41 per cent; and for this year, 1977-78, it is $1 906 000, an increase of $605 000 or 46 per cent. At page 435, the Auditor-General's Report states:

> *Sundry Debtors*—The amount outstanding from debtors was $1 906 000, an increase of $605 000 compared with the previous year. Significant amounts outstanding included $348 000 from tenants and ex-tenants for maintenance of properties, etc. (up $100 000); $310 000 arrears on advances under agreements and mortgages (up $129 000); $259 000 for arrears of rent (up $102 000); and $127 000 interest receivable accrued (down $21 000). Outstandings included S.A. Teacher Housing Authority, $283 000 and Department for Community Welfare $66 000.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will discuss the matter with the General Manager of the Housing Trust, get full information and bring down a subsequent reply for the honourable member.

FALSE TEETH

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health whether South Australian dentists are obtaining cheap false teeth from Hong Kong and Singapore rather than having the work done in South Australia by qualified local dental technicians. My question is prompted by a report which appeared in the *News* of 24 August, under the heading "Imported dentures a huge 'rip-off' ", and which states:

> Dentists are making huge profits by fitting patients with cheap false teeth and crowns from Asia, according to Victorian Opposition labor and industry spokesman, Mr. Simmonds. He said the dentists were sending impressions for false teeth and crowns to Hong Kong and Singapore rather than giving the work to local laboratories.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They are getting a false impression.

Mr. WHITTEN: True. The report continues:

> The claim was supported by Mr. Ron Barnes, of the Dental Technicians' Association of Victoria, who said dentists were making more than 400 per cent profit on cheap imported equipment and forcing the local industry into recession. Mr. Simmonds said porcelain crowns, which cost dentists $57 in Asia, were being fitted in Melbourne for up to $300 each. The Repatriation Department also was paying between $220 and $240 for the crowns.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Any hope I had of making a quip has been destroyed by way of interjection. I appreciate the concern shown by the honourable member in raising this matter. I will have consultation with my colleague in another place, as the matter more properly lies in his portfolio area. If the situation suggested in the article were to apply in South Australia, it would be an alarming one, presumably, from the point of view of employment of many dental technicians, and so I shall be pleased to get for the honourable member information which I hope will put his mind at rest.

STATE SUPPLY DIVISION

Mr. WILSON: Will the Chief Secretary say whether he has ordered an investigation into losses amounting to $167 000 suffered by the Light Square operation of the State Supply Division for the financial year ended 30 June 1978? If he has not, will he give the reasons for those losses and say what action he has taken to ensure that the situation is not repeated? The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1978, at page 232, under the heading "Results of operations for the year", referring to the State Supply Division, states:

> The net deficit for the year was $170 000, of which $167 000 related to Light Square operations, where the main losses occurred on storage, $83 000, and the supply of meat to Government institutions, $72 000.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I shall be happy to get a report for the honourable member. The matter was considered a few months ago when I asked for a report, and the investigation is continuing. The Light Square property is very old and the freezing facilities are inefficient, needing renewal or replacement. The operation of the whole area must be considered to see whether or not it should be continued. The enterprise was taken over from the old Produce Department.

Mr. Wotton: State Supply.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It is still a division of State Supply, but the old Government Produce Department handled the Port Lincoln abattoirs as well as this operation. The future of the whole complex is under investigation. If it is to continue, the cold stores will have to be renewed, at considerable expense. They are largely providing a service now to private enterprise, and it is questionable whether the Government should be providing that service at a loss, or indeed incurring the considerable capital expenditure that would be necessay perhaps to convert the operation to a profitable one. The matter is being investigated, and I shall get the information required.

INDUSTRIAL FUNDS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether the Government is concerned that the general view of South Australia in the eyes of Australian industry is such that a major injection of capital into industrial space development is less in South Australia than in all the other mainland States? An article appearing in the August 1978 issue of *Rydge's* makes the point that the Lend Lease Corporation has undertaken to enter into the production or development of industrial complexes for Australian industry, and that in the current period it will inject $167 000 000 a year over three years. This is broken down into $68 000 000 for Sydney, $60 000 000 for Melbourne, $15 000 000 for Brisbane and a similar sum for Perth, and only $9 000 000 for South Australia. Therein is my concern that Australian industry generally is looking at South Australia as being a State that does not require the injection of these important capital funds.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The development by Lend Lease Corporation of industrial estates naturally looks at the local market. The position in South Australia is that we have industrial estates developed. We have more and cheaper developed industrial land available than is the case in any other State. One cannot buy in Sydney or Melbourne, at anything approaching the same price, the

kind of industrial land that has been made available to industry in South Australia. In those circumstances, why would a private enterprise undertaking come in to develop land for a market that is already extremely well supplied?

Dr. Eastick: What about the buildings that go on the land?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They also have to face a market. No other Australian State has provided the industrial buildings to industry from public funds that this State has provided. We have spent tens of millions of dollars on them. The other States do not do that. If the honourable member examines the industrial incentives in other States, he will see that most of them do not apply to their metropolitan areas, whereas they do here.

Mr. Venning: They don't need them.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that, before the member for Light climbs on the bandwaggon that one of his colleagues has endeavoured to get rolling in an attempt to hit at industry and its development in South Australia, he should examine his facts.

Dr. Eastick: You should consider the question in full.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

SURS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say why the Government has failed to spend $10 000 000 in total funds allocated for the State Unemployment Relief Scheme? When does the Government intend to commit these hidden reserves? Does the Government admit that $14 500 000 is available for spending in the current financial year, rather than the $4 500 000 referred to by the Premier in his Budget speech? I refer to page 577 of the Auditor-General's Report which shows that the deposit accounts under SURS have slowly been growing, so that at the end of June 1977 the sum allocated was almost $5 200 000, and by the end of June 1978 it had grown to $9 997 000. In other words, there is a total amount on deposit of about $10 000 000. This fact is confirmed if one looks at the appropriate section under the scheme, where one sees that only $19 700 000, as listed by the Auditor-General, was actually committed and spent during the year. The remainder of the money, apparently about $4 800 000 for 1977-78, was, as I understand it, certainly passed over to the fund, but then simply placed on deposit. Therefore, if the total allocation for this year of $4 500 000 is added to the existing reserves already on deposit, one can see that the total sum available for SURS is $14 500 000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The announcement the Government has made as to the commitment of these funds is perfectly correct. I pointed out that there would be a carry-over effect from last financial year into this financial year, because some of the projects would carry over and come into account in this financial year, while the money had been allotted during the previous financial year. The sum available is the sum I have specified clearly. If the honourable member cannot read his accounts properly, he should ring the Treasury officers and have it explained to him.

URANIUM

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier say whether discussions have been held recently with trade unions and other representatives from the Iron Triangle cities, whether those discussions included the Government's present policy on the mining and treatment of uranium, and whether there is likely to be a change in the Government's total ban on uranium? I understand that members of trade unions and people concerned about the future of Whyalla and other Iron Triangle cities are conscious of the enormous benefits that have been offered by the mining and treatment of uranium in South Australia and that they have made representations to members of the Government asking that it change its policy of an absolute ban on uranium mining and treatment. What prospect is there that the Government will change its present position, and when will that change be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's understanding is defective; I have received no such representations.

TEACHER TRAINING

Mr. ALLISON: Has the Mininster of Education made any recommendations to or entered into any negotiations with South Australia's colleges of advanced education regarding a greater diversification of teacher training to enable an increasing proportion of students to obtain either a general degree of a technologically oriented degree to ensure that more teachers can be employed effectively on career oriented courses in secondary schools and/or colleges of further education? For many years South Australia has suffered from an acute imbalance of technically trained personnel. Figures released 2 to 2½ years ago stated that Australia had ·9 persons with technological training to each person with a degree, as against the United States, United Kingdom, Western Europe, and U.S.S.R. average of between 6 and 9 persons with technological training for each person with a degree. Does the Minister think that under the present situation, where teachers colleges are not producing a surplus of what we consider to be normally trained teachers, there is a prospect of keeping school students competitive in a highly technological era by giving teachers a greater opportunity to teach more effectively the career oriented courses?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Chairman of the Board of Advanced Education, Dr. Sandover, has been particularly concerned about this matter and has had extensive discussions with the colleges. It has been clear for some time that it will be necessary for the colleges to expand and diversify their course offerings, particularly as the demand for generalist teachers is likely to continue to reduce over the next few years. There are problems about the way this whole matter is approached, not the least of which are that the current staffs of the colleges have tenure that they are not always equipped to take new courses, that the Tertiary Education Commission funds current courses, and it is necessary to get the appropriate change of direction ratified by the body that is ultimately providing the funds. Some of the considerations that led the Government to set up the Anderson Committee of inquiry and some of the same considerations which lay behind the recommendations of Dr. Anderson for the amalgamation of colleges were along the lines suggested by the honourable member. That is to say, it will be difficult for colleges which are small and which may face a dwindling enrolment, because of market factors, to provide these sorts of course. The rationale, for example, for the amalgamation of two colleges such as Kingston and Murray Park is so that there will be a stronger, larger, more viable college that can take on board some of these

concerns. It depends how far one wants to go. If one is talking about technological courses, the honourable member would know that a good deal of the recruitment to the Further Education Department is now directly from industry and that courses are available at Torrens College of Advanced Education for people who wish to upgrade the academic side of their expertise. As to the practical side, industry is more or less doing the job for us.

I would expect that, once the new co-ordinating authority in South Australia is operating, this will be one of its prime concerns. I hope to be in a position to request of this House later in this session that it assist me in giving that idea statutory effect. I also draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Commonwealth Minister (Senator Carrick) has in hand the setting up of a committee of inquiry into teaching education throughout Australia. Much of this is now public. He has also secured the agreement of the States (or maybe the States have secured the agreement of Senator Carrick) that there should be State working parties in each of the States to examine the position and assist Professor Auchmuty and the committee of inquiry into the matter. South Australia will certainly be taking up this option of setting up its own State working party.

AGRICULTURAL SPRAYS

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to authorise officers of his department to carry out investigations as to whether or not the careless and casual attitude of many agricultural spray operators could be causing harm to consumers? In this month's issue of *Farmer and Grazier* there is a disturbing report on the dangers to spray operators. The report states as follows:

> There is an alarming casual and careless attitude by many spray operators in using chemicals, according to U.F.G. governing council member, Mr. L. A. Roberts. Mr. Roberts recently completed a study of the use of agricultural chemicals which involved discussions with the South Australian Health Commission, officers of the Department of Agriculture and farmers and graziers.
>
> He told the most recent meeting of governing council that the misuse of agricultural chemicals could have disastrous results. "For one grower, the loss of fingernails and the peeling of skin inside the mouth was a very forceful reminder that protective measures were needed when using chemicals," Mr. Roberts said. "Health officers have stated that there is no apparent health hazard provided the chemicals are used at prescribed strength and that all necessary precautions are taken."

The last paragraph causes me some concern.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will take up the matter with my colleague in another place.

DEPOSIT AND SUSPENSE ACCOUNTS

Mrs. ADAMSON: Can the Premier say why the Government is allowing the build-up of deposit and suspense accounts as detailed in statement F of the Auditor-General's Report? The balance at 30 June 1977 was $50 300 000, and at 30 June 1978 it was $64 100 000. There is a build-up of $4 800 000 for unemployment relief projects and a build-up of $3 000 000 for advances for housing, which raises the question whether the Government is allowing funds to build up for use at a politically opportune time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The deposit accounts provisions are quite normal. The honourable member pointed to the advances for housing position. That was money called back in order to provide us with the necessary money to meet the matching provisions of the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement. If the honourable member read my financial statement she would see that the new State Housing Agreement requires a matching provision from the State and therefore it was necessary for us to provide that cash money.

The provisions for the deposit and suspense accounts are quite normal. The Government has not made any specific use of those as against other areas of Budget expenditure. If the honourable member goes back through political history in South Australia she will know that in 1965 the Labor Government then used money from the deposit and suspense accounts as against the requirements of General Revenue, and there was an enormous outcry from the Opposition that we were somehow raiding the trust funds of this State. If the honourable member is proposing that we should do that, perhaps she had better look back at the things inconsistent to that proposal which have been said by her colleagues previously.

C.B. RADIOS

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Attorney-General raise at the next meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, the matter of the irresponsible use of C.B. radios, with a view to seeking Commonwealth legislation to control this practice adequately? I, and I imagine most members of the House, have had occasions when constituents have brought complaints about the irresponsible use of C.B. radios to my attention. They have mentioned the adverse effect of C.B. radios on their television sets, radios, etc.

I have referred these complaints to Telecom inspectors, who have had a varying degree of success, or perhaps I should say lack of success, in overcoming this problem. I should like to give the House an example of the irresponsible use of C.B. radio in Port Pirie. A person there, who has a powerful C.B. radio, is apparently having a running war with other C.B. radio operators in Port Pirie. I have had cause to listen to a tape recording of the sort of language and discussions that take place. These discussions are causing much concern to elderly folk and people generally in Port Pirie.

The matter has been referred to the police, but as it comes under Commonwealth legislation and is controlled by Commonwealth inspectors the Police Department is powerless to effect a remedy. I understand that the mere hearing of a voice on radio is not sufficient evidence for the police to take action against the user, even though they might know who the person is. This is a serious problem, and I imagine that all members have received this sort of complaint.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall be pleased to endeavour to do as the honourable member requests. I point out to him that items can be placed on the agenda of conferences of Attorneys-General only by agreement of all State Attorneys-General and the Federal Attorney-General. I will write to them and seek their co-operation in having this matter placed on the agenda, because I believe it is a serious problem which is growing daily. I think it is important that we should try to get the Commonwealth to undertake some action to make it easier for the police to control the misuse of C.B. radio sets. I will write to the other Attorneys and let the honourable member know the result of my representations.

DEPRESSED FARM WOMEN

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Community Welfare's attention been drawn to a report referred to in the *Advertiser* of 14 September in relation to the Naracoorte Branch of the Community Welfare Department and headed "Farm women depressed"? The report mentions, among other things, various forms of depression, and states:

> The branch says its most ardent critics were people who had never approached its social workers or bothered to find out how the department operated.

I have had some complaints from people with varying family problems, and, in all cases where I have referred them to the Minister's officers, we have been able to work out satisfactory family balances. Some have been most difficult, and I think that applies right across the board. The article tends to place a blanket air of depression on the areas to which I have referred, and I should be grateful if the Minister could give some information on the background of this report.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I saw the press comment, and I have had an early report on the matter. I thank the honourable member for the way in which he has pointed out that, contrary to the view of some members, officers in my department work extremely hard at difficult matters of human relationships, with a fair degree of success. I welcome this recognition by the honourable member of their hard work.

The *Advertiser* report arose, I think, from an item carried in the local press, of which Mr. Peake is the proprietor, and I understand it was subsequently picked up by the *Advertiser* and expanded. The report contained some relatively minor inaccuracies, which did not affect the substance of it, in relation to who said what, the location of a doctor, I think, and so on. The report arose from the desire of the officers—and most district officers operate in the same way—to integrate their activities with those of the community. I am sure the honourable member appreciates this.

Some time ago, when I visited the Naracoorte office, the member for Victoria had another engagement and was unable to be present, but it was pleasing to see the degree of acceptance of the activities of the staff (there is some disagreement, which I regard as healthy), and the number of local people who attended the function. As it was a tea and biscuits function, attendance could well indicate a genuine desire to mingle with members of the staff.

I believe that the district officers, with the information received from medical and other sources, were simply trying to show that life on farms can be difficult, and that in times of economic stress for farmers that situation could well be exacerbated. I will not go into the political arguments about why farmers might have been undergoing an economic recession until recently. I think it is healthy that departmental officers on the scene recognise this and are trying to do something about it, as the honourable member has suggested. I shall get a more detailed report for him as soon as possible.

BUS SHELTERS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me information concerning the present policy in relation to the erection of shelters at bus stops on State Transport Authority metropolitan routes, and say what body makes the decision as to the sites of their erection, what is the cost of such shelters, and how that cost is met?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Basically, the State Transport Authority assumes the responsibility in a general way, but with a cost-sharing agreement between local government when the programme is embarked upon. I am not sure of the actual cost of the shelters, but I shall get that information for the honourable member. We have embarked on a fairly ambitious programme over a five-year period in the erection of bus shelters, because there was a lamentable lack of them; many more are still required. We are pursuing this programme in this year, and I hope that we will in the future improve the lot of those who wait for buses in all kinds of weather. I will obtain more detailed information for the honourable member.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government intends to change the structure of the Environment Department and, if it does, what form these changes will take and when they will be made? Last week I asked the Minister in a Question on Notice whether the Government intended to introduce any changes in the areas of responsibility presently undertaken by the Environment Department. The Minister replied, "No, not at this stage." I have been informed that an instruction has now been handed down within the National Parks and Wildlife Service Division that no more of that division's own stationery should be used, and suggestions have been made that the symbols presently used by the service are to disappear. It appears that there are moves to do away with the identity of that division, which would possibly mean structural changes in the overall department.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As usual, the honourable member has put two and two together and come up with about eight. The instruction, which was issued at my request, dealt with stationery and the symbol used by national parks. One of the problems we have had with that division, as I see it (and others agree with me), is that we have a number of people and a great set of attitudes that persist because of their following the line that they are still a commission, rather than part of the Environment Department. I said yesterday in the House that national parks represent a small part of the responsibilities that the Environment Department has. The division, which deals with projects and assessments, does not have its own separate identity or letterhead. The Policy and Co-ordination Division does not have its own separate letterhead or symbol. The Administrative Division does not either, and I do not see any reason, except in certain circumstances (and I do not intend to outline those to the House today), why the National Parks and Wildlife Service Division within the department should enjoy any different standing within the department than that enjoyed by any other division of it.

One of the ways in which I hope to get this division to appreciate that it is one of the parts of the Environment Department is by discontinuing the practice that has applied in the past, because it tends to make it think that it is a separate entity, whereas it is not. Its officers are part of that family, and they have to operate that way. The honourable member may have noticed that a brochure was distributed at the Royal Show stating "National Parks and Wildlife, a division of the Environment Department", and I insisted on that. In other words, I want people to become aware of the fact that that is only part of the Environment Department and that there are other parts of that

department which would have an important and responsible role to play for the community at large.

That is why the instruction was issued. There is nothing more in it than that. All the changes I saw necessary to have been made at this stage have been made. I do not intend to make any others. I have told the House that I propose to set up some trusts, which will be concerned with the management and development of national parks. The honourable member is fully aware of that. The prime purpose for that is to get an added injection of funds. The interests of members of the National Parks and Wildlife Service employed now and in the future will be protected. I do not want to go into all that detail, as it has been explained to people in the division. One of the things that has concerned me is the attitude that continues to persist that they are separate and on their own and are not part of the Environment Department, whereas in fact they are.

B.Y.O. LICENCES

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Attorney-General say how many applications the Licensing Court has received for liquor licences for B.Y.O. restaurants in South Australia and how many have been issued since the new legislation came into effect? The Minister would be aware of the opening of Bertie's B.Y.O. in the Southern Cross complex in the city last week. Is the Minister also aware of an application from the Silver Spoon restaurant, which is located in my district?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have not kept up to date on the number of applications received on a day-to-day basis. The last time I had a report on this matter, one licence had been granted and one further application was before the court. I will obtain further information for the honourable member and let him have a report on the matter. Whilst the Government supports the concept of B.Y.O.'s, the fact that there have been so few applications from the public at large for these types of licence seems to indicate the Government's previously held view that there was not a particularly strong demand for them.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill is identical in principle to a Bill passed by both Houses of the New South Wales Parliament recently. Before the Bill was put to the New South Wales Parliament, the New South Wales Premier (Mr. Wran) announced that he intended to introduce a provision for electing Legislative Councillors similar to that existing in South Australia. This created some disquiet within the community, and pressures were brought to bear on that Government, resulting in a Select Committee being set up. The results of the Select Committee's findings were that the type of legislation now law in New South Wales was recommended, and that State, through a referendum of its people, showed that most people in that State believed in the Bill as it was introduced. So, action has been taken in another place of this Parliament to have a similar provision inserted in the South Australian legislation so that some problems and deficiencies, two in particular, which exist in the legislation will be corrected.

There are two clear deficiencies in the existing South Australia system that should be corrected. The first is that the system used does not guarantee that each vote cast has an equal value. We have heard many advocates of one vote one value over the years in South Australia, particularly from the Premier, who sits in charge of this Government at the moment. Those who believe that each vote cast should have an equal value have a chance, by supporting the Bill, to show clearly the strength of their belief.

The second deficiency in the existing legislation is that a voter does not have the right to vote for a candidate; he can vote only for a preselected group and cannot vary the nominated order of that group. If a Party puts up a group of candidates, an elector might believe that one of those candidates is not worthy of his support. He may have some reasons to have knowledge of that candidate's previous practice in life to which he objects on a moral ground or on some other ground, but he cannot cast a vote against that candidate under the present system.

The candidate is locked into a group for which the elector is forced to vote if he wishes in the main to support a particular political philosophy. He cannot eliminate one candidate and put that candidate at the bottom of his list of preferences and bring another candidate he would prefer further up the list. The system we have in South Australia is really no more than a nominated system, a system that is often criticised by members of the Australian Labor Party. I hope that members will see the benefit of the Bill. It gets rid of those two deficiencies and brings about an opportunity for one vote one value to be more readily recognised with equal value for each vote cast. The Bill attempts to remove these two serious blemishes on our voting system.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 71 of the principal Act, bringing the forfeiture of deposits into line with a subsequent change in the voting system. Clause 3 amends section 96 for similar reasons. Clause 4 defines the mode of voting. A voter must express a preference in order for at least 10 candidates. The voter may proceed further if he so desires.

Clause 5 defines an informal vote but, as with New South Wales's legislation, if a person places numbers in 10 squares, the vote may be counted as formal in certain circumstances, even if the same preference has been recorded for two separate candidates (other than No. 1) or if there has been a break in the continuity of preferences. Clause 6 sets out the method of scrutiny and counting of the votes cast. It is the same system as used in New South Wales and in all other systems in Australia using proportional representation. Clause 7 amends the fourth schedule to the principal Act by striking out Form D, and inserting in lieu thereof a new form.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1978. Read a first time.

Mr. RUSSACK: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For more than 130 years local government has served South Australia faithfully and well. In 1965, the Government set up a committee known as the Local Government Act Revision Committee on Powers, Responsibilities and Organisation of Local Government in South Australia. The report of this committee, which was released in July 1970, stated:

> The committee places, in the forefront of its report, the importance with which it regards local government. The committee emphasises that local government is very worthwhile indeed. There is no other form of activity which can contribute as much to the local areas of this State. An understanding of the importance of local government is fundamental to an understanding of the task that was given to this committee, and it is fundamental to an understanding of this report which the committee now presents. Local government plays a fundamental part in the government of this State. The more that fact is realised, the more effective local government can become, and accordingly the more it can contribute to the development of the State itself.

Because of the undoubted importance of local government, there is a general and firm desire that local government should be recognised in the Constitution of South Australia.

When opening the Adelaide Constitutional Convention in Perth on 26 July this year, His Excellency the Governor-General of the Commonwealth, said:

> The presence of local government representatives is of real significance; it focuses attention on this level of Australian government and administration, and the Hobart session of the convention resolved to invite the State to consider formal recognition of local government in their Constitutions. A Victorian Bill has already been drafted to give effect to this.

The Bill, in fact, has been introduced in the Victorian Parliament. The Victorian Minister of Local Government, the Hon. A. Hunt, M.L.C., stated:

> Copies of the Victorian Bill have been circulated to other States as suggested by Standing Committee A. It is hoped that all other States will take up the challenge and will ensure that the votes they gave at Hobart did not amount to mere lip service and that each State will, in fact, give very serious consideration to modifying the Victorian precedent to meet its own needs and to move forward with constitutional recognition of local government in every State.

In acknowledgement of this initiative this Bill being introduced today has been modelled on aspects of the Victorian legislation.

It is obvious, because of its involvement since the inception of the Constitutional Convention several years ago, that local government has been acclaimed as an indispensable partner in our system of government, in which local government is much closer to the people, to the point of delivery, than are State and Federal Government. At the Perth Convention, the Premier of Western Australia, Sir Charles Court, said:

> We also welcome local government in our presence because I think it is fair to say that because of the Constitutional Conventions local government has now achieved a greater significance and a greater understanding within the community of the role of local government.

The quality of life of a community depends on, and, in fact, is enriched by local government and the standard of administration it provides. There is every indication in this State that the many hundreds of councillors, who contribute thousands of hours annually in an honorary and devoted manner, have raised the esteem in which local government is held by the community at large.

During the past decade the responsibilities of local government in this State have become much more onerous. However, local government has accepted the challenge and has discharged its duties commendably. Solidarity has been strengthened in the co-operation and leadership of the Local Government Association, which continues effectively to unify local government in South Australia and, with its continuing liaison, with the Local Government Secretariat in Canberra.

The Right Hon. the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Mr. George Joseph, and delegates of the South Australian Local Government Association have taken a keen interest in all the meetings of the Australian Constitutional Convention since 1973, particularly the matter that is being considered in this Bill.

Local government in South Australia has expressed a strong desire for constitutional recognition. The unhindered passage of this legislation will recognise the true significance of local government in this State. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for a new Part IIA entitled "LOCAL GOVERNMENT". Clause 3 provides for a new section 64a, which directs that there shall be a system of local government for South Australia. New section 64a(2) provides that a local government system need not apply in areas not significantly and permanently populated. Provision is also made for cases in which the functions of local government may need to be carried out by a public statutory body. I commend the measure to the House.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I am pleased that the honourable member has brought forward—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, your deputy is telling me I am not allowed to speak.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Thanks very much. We have a new speaker here now?

Mr. Goldsworthy: No, you are making up the rules as you go along.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must move the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I understand that Standing Orders permit me to speak immediately to the debate if I choose to do so.

Mr. Goldsworthy: No, Sir.

The SPEAKER: No. The honourable Deputy Leader is out of order.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable Deputy Leader will cease interjecting.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do it on motion.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry I am not allowed to speak to the motion at this stage, so I will move the adjournment. It is a shame.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

> That in the opinion of this House, because of the critical dependence of South Australia on the Murray River as a major water source, the River Murray Waters Agreement Act should be amended to extend the powers of the River Murray Commission:
>
> (i) to cover all tributaries of the Murray system; and
>
> (ii) to include the control of water quality, by setting and enforcing standards of water purity, and independently monitoring all known effluents entering the river.

I do not intend to speak at any length on this matter at this stage. The purpose of the motion is to leave absolutely no doubt about the importance that the South Australian Opposition places on the availability of a reliable supply of high quality water under the provisions of the River Murray Waters Agreement.

We see this State's future inextricably tied to satisfactory negotiation of the provisions set out in this motion. We are not satisfied that the South Australian Government has pressured the other signatories to the River Murray Waters Agreement Act to agree to the verbal agreement which they reached in 1976 relevant to water quality. Certainly, action has been taken, and we accept that, but we believe it is a matter which so vitally concerns the future of South Australia that every effort should be made. If this motion indicates that the Opposition is totally behind the Government in whatever efforts it may be making in this sphere, let that interpretation be placed upon it.

The Hon. Wal Fife, M.P., on 30 November 1976 made the following statement:

> The River Murray Commission is to have its responsibilities extended to incorporate water quality matters, and arrangements are being made for these new responsibilities to be assumed as soon as practicable.

Mr. Fife at that stage was representing, I think, the Right Hon. J. D. Anthony, Minister for National Resources, and was seeking the restructuring of the River Murray Commission. The decision to include water quality matters within the responsibilities of the River Murray Commission was taken by the four Governments that were party to the River Murray Waters Agreement Act, I understand, following the tabling in Parliament of the River Murray working party report on 21 October 1976. In other words, this matter has been the concern for some time of the Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia as well as the Federal Government. The amendments which will be necessary to give effect to the recommendations of the River Murray working party report have not been submitted to the Parliaments, as far as I can understand, of the participating parties, and we heard from the Minister of Works during the rather interesting exchange which occurred, summing up the State's position on the subject, when the establishment of a paper mill in the Albury-Wodonga area was proposed. At that stage the Minister undertook to ask for a copy of the environmental impact study. I am quite certain that he had knowledge of the position paper No. 6 in relation to salinity control and knows the situation very well indeed.

I do not intend at this stage to go into any of the detail of the measures which we believe to be necessary. I agree with the recommendations of the working party; I am pleased that the respective Governments are in agreement, but I am disturbed that there has been no sign of any amending Bill foreshadowed for early introduction into this Parliament.

I do not intend to develop my argument beyond that point today. I hope that the Minister, when the appropriate time comes, will be able to assure the House that the Government really does mean business on this point and that it will put the greatest possible pressure on all other parties concerned (the Commonwealth, the Victorian and New South Wales State Governments) to make certain that South Australia's water quality is preserved. The question of control of the tributaries is, I think, self-explanatory. Obviously, everything that goes into the Murray River system above the South Australian border is potentially something which will come across our border and come into our drinking supply in Adelaide.

No other capital city is so dependent on the Murray River as is Adelaide. I repeat that I hope we will see that amending legislation come into the House in the widest possible form, and the Opposition undertakes for its part to do everything possible to get agreement to have that legislation introduced in all Parliaments concerned with it. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1971-1974. Read a first time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1971-1974 has probably caused more problems industrially than has any other single piece of legislation. It has escalated insurance costs for companies, increased the number and value of claims, caused major rehabilitation problems for injured workmen, created employment problems for workmen with existing injuries, attracted ridicule from the legal and medical professions, and prompted severe criticism from certain justices of the Supreme Court. I do not wish to embarrass the Government with details of those problems.

Since 1974 there have been several attempts, or proposed attempts, to amend the Act. The Liberal Party led the way in 1976 with a major Bill introduced into the Legislative Council by the Hon. Don Laidlaw. That Bill failed, along with others, due to fundamental differences of opinion between the Government and the Opposition. It would be a waste of effort to repeat that fruitless exercise.

In June this year the Government finally conceded that some action had to be taken to resolve the problem, and so appointed a committee to review the Workmen's Compensation Act. I support such a review. The task that the committee faces is difficult, and it would be even harder to reach a general consensus as to how the problems should be rectified.

The terms of reference of the committee will enable a complete change in the concept of compensation to be recommended. Such a change could include a 24-hour accident cover for the whole community. However, it is important that any costly extension of existing compensation should be adopted only on a national basis rather than just a State basis, especially if it would further disadvantage South Australian industry.

It was particularly gratifying to see an emphasis in the terms of reference of that committee on rehabilitating the injured worker. My opening remarks when debating the 1976 Bill were as follows:

> A weakness of the existing Workmen's Compensation Act is that the entire emphasis of that Act is placed on compensating the worker for the injury, whilst completely ignoring the important human factor of assisting the worker to return to the work force. As a result, there is a growing number of human tragedies caused by previously injured workers who are unable to find an employer who will risk employing them.

That comment is even more valid today. Hopefully, the committee will reach agreement on workable, realistic and humane solutions. I wish the committee members every success in their task.

With the recent appointment of this review committee, one may ask why the need for this Private Member's Bill. Specific amendments to the Act arising from the

committee of inquiry are unlikely to come before Parliament within the next two years. This would mean that certain major anomalies within the Act that are causing unjust and unnecessary problems would continue for at least the next two years, or longer.

However, the problems caused by hearing loss claims and anomalies must not be allowed to continue for another two years. It is virtually impossible for a person with an existing hearing loss to find employment in a trade area, and this is sufficient reason alone to amend the Act immediately. I shall come to that later.

This Bill makes five amendments to the principal Act. Four of those amendments were proposed by the Liberal Party in 1976 and accepted by the Government, although they were eventually lost with the rest of the proposed amendments. In 1976 the Minister of Labour and Industry went as far as allowing these four amendments to be written into the Government's Bill when it passed through the House of Assembly.

The first amendment enlarges compensatable journeys to cover a journey to obtain a medical certificate in connection with an injury, not only for which a workman has received compensation, as in the existing Act, but also for which he is entitled to receive or is seeking compensation in connection with any such injury. The additional cover proposed in this Bill is of significance to a worker in a decentralised area like Whyalla who may have to make a lengthy journey to Adelaide to seek special medical attention.

The second amendment deals with the disclosure of medical reports. Under section 32 of the existing Act, an employer is bound to disclose his medical reports to a workman at any time before or during proceedings. This clause inserts a corresponding obligation on a workman in any proceedings under the Act, but not prior to such proceedings.

The third amendment, that of clause 5, amends section 52*(a)* and inserts an additional reason for an employer to give notice to discontinue compensation payments; namely, the failure of a workman to present a continuity of medical certificates. If an employee on compensation fails to supply those medical certificates, that is a justifiable reason to discontinue payments. Of course, there would be a time period in which to notify the employer that the discontinuance had occurred.

New subsection (3) provides that, where a workman issues an application challenging his employer's right to discontinue weekly payments at the expiration of the period of notice, the weekly payments to the workman shall be suspended from the expiry date, pending determination of the merits of the claim if the employer can demonstrate to the court that he genuinely disputes his liability. The court must hear summarily any such dispute. The period of the notice remains at 21 days.

Under the fourth amendment an injured workman will no longer receive certain preferential treatment compared with a person at work. At present he receives, whilst absent on compensation, average weekly earnings, which includes payment for public holidays, as well as additional payment for these public holidays. This means that he is entitled, at present, to double payment for public holidays. This amendment corrects this anomaly. I stress again that these four amendments have already been accepted by both sides of this Parliament, so there is no reason why they should not be readily accepted again.

The final amendment, and by far the most important, deals with compensation for noise-induced hearing loss. At present, employers are required to compensate for the total hearing loss of the worker in a noisy area, irrespective of whether there was already extensive hearing loss before the person started work with the employer. A pre-employment hearing test by a qualified medical practitioner is no protection against a claim for total noise-induced hearing loss. The *G.M.H.* v. *Barkway* case verified the unjust vulnerability of the employer. The only exception to this is if a lump sum payment has been made already by a previous employer.

This means that a present employer may have to compensate for hearing losses that may have occurred over 30 years ago, even though the person may have been employed with the employer for much less than 30 years. Employers are also liable for hearing losses of a worker in a noisy area, even if a major part of that hearing loss occurred outside of the workplace. It is well-known that noise levels from rock music or motor racing may exceed the noise levels at which permanent hearing loss will occur.

Yet another anomaly is that interstate workers who have already received compensation for hearing loss in another State are able to apply successfully for further compensation for the same hearing loss if they work in a noisy industry in South Australia. Therefore, double compensation can be received.

Clause 7 repeals section 74, which allows these farcical anomalies to continue, and replaces it with provisions that allow for compensation of noise-induced hearing loss which is of occupational origin. A hearing test carried out by a suitably qualified medical or other specialist within the first two months of employment is sufficient proof on behalf of the employer of hearing loss which had already occurred and which is not compensatable by the existing employer. The employee must be informed of the result of the hearing test. If the workman refuses to submit himself to a hearing examination there is no liability to pay compensation. The main benefit of these amendments is that unjustified claims for hearing loss will be dismissed. In addition, many tradesmen with existing hearing loss will not be excluded from jobs because of their disability.

A highly respected industrial medical clinic recently referred a number of such persons to me. It was tragic to see the human suffering and distress caused to these capable and willing tradesmen.

During the last week, this private member's Bill has received considerable support from people responsible for educating and training deaf children or children with major hearing deficiencies. Although the hearing loss may have been present from birth, many employers still will not take the risk of employing such people when they are ready to find jobs.

I have received the following letter from Mr. K. V. Borick, of Parents of Hearing Impaired Children:

Dean Brown,
Parliament House,
Adelaide.

Dear Sir,

The Parents of Hearing Impaired Children strongly support your proposed legislation.

Our organisation represents parents throughout South Australia and we have established contacts both interstate and overseas. We have been given active support by the Minister of Community Welfare and by his department.

It is difficult for our children to get adequate secondary education and almost impossible for any but the very fortunate to proceed to a tertiary level. Any further hurdle to overcome when it comes to getting a job represents an unreasonable burden.

Yours faithfully,
K. V. Borick
President, Parents of Hearing Impaired Children.

The council of the Strathmont High School, which has a speech and hearing centre, has indicated its support for these amendments to the Act.

Last year, the Minister of Labour and Industry acknowledged these anomalies relating to hearing loss and promised to amend the Act.

This private member's Bill is moved to eliminate unnecessary human hardship and unemployment as soon as possible. It is moved without prejudice to the findings of the committee of inquiry set up by the Government. It is moved in the hope that this Parliament can reach a consensus rather than develop further conflict over amendments to these vital parts of the Workmen's Compensation Act.

The Bill does not attempt to make all of the amendments to the Act that the Liberal Party believes should be made in due course. Only amendments known to be acceptable to both sides of Parliament have been included; I stress that areas of previous conflict, which have destroyed other attempts to amend the Act, have been excluded: therefore, there is no reason why any member of this House should not support the Bill.

In moving the Bill, I indicate my willingness to consider any reasonable minor variations that may assist its acceptance. I seek the support of all members of this Parliament to help rectify these problems.

Mr. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should introduce legislation immediately to initiate a programme to phase out succession and gift duties between all members of a family, over a period of not more than three years.

I take this action, which I believe is a most essential one for the wellbeing of the South Australian economy, in the full knowledge that South Australia at present is the only State out of step with the rest of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Government and the Government of every other State have recently taken action to phase out succession duties and, in many cases, gift duty legislation. The present position can be summed up easily. Following the action of Queensland, the other States and the Commonwealth were quick to see that there were decided disadvantages in maintaining on the Statute Book this form of capital taxation.

First, to turn to the form of taxation itself, it has always been considered particularly iniquitous. That people who have built up an asset, particularly in the rural community or in small business, should, on their death, see the farm, the rural property, or the business in a position where it must be disposed of as a viable economic unit in order to pay succession duties has never made sense to me, and I believe it has never made sense to members opposite.

The fact that any economic unit, functioning viably, returning revenue to the State, and helping with the general income of the State, should be destroyed so that the State could have a once-only chop at a proportion of those funds seems absolutely ridiculous. Many people have been ruined and have been forced off their properties, families who have held properties for years, and families who have been in business for years have been forced out of business by the heavy effects of succession duties.

In Queensland, there has been no death duty or gift duty since 1 January 1977. On the Federal scene, four Bills were introduced recently into the Parliament to implement the Government's promise to abolish estate and gift duties, and the major changes proposed in those Bills were that estate duty should be abolished in relation to the estates of persons dying on or after 1 July 1979, and no duty was to be payable in respect of property passing to or for the benefit of a spouse, child, grandchild, parent, or grandparent of a person who died or who dies on or after 21 November 1977.

Gift duty is to be abolished in respect of gifts made on or after 1 July 1979. No duty is to be payable in respect of gifts made on or after 21 November 1977 to or wholly for the benefit of a spouse, child, grandchild, parent, or grandparent of the donor. Exempt gifts to members of the family and gifts made on or after 1 July 1979 will not be aggregated with dutiable gifts made before that date in ascertaining the rate of duty payable on the dutiable gifts.

In New South Wales, there is no death duty on estates passing from spouse to spouse as from 1 December 1976. The Government intends to abolish death duties and has indicated that its intention in this regard will be quite firm and definite in this year's Budget. The news has come through quite clearly that New South Wales—and I suspect it may have something to do with the earlier election now being called—will phase out death duties. That will happen over a period of three years, and that is a responsible approach to the matter.

In Victoria, no duty is payable on estates passing from spouse to spouse or from parent to child after 21 November 1977, and Victoria has taken further action to phase out succession duties. In South Australia, we know the situation only too well. Up until this time, the Government has bowed to pressure from the electorate by taking what I believe was a sensible and worthwhile step of abolishing duty on estates passing from spouse to spouse, but that is as far as the matter has gone. Until then, South Australia and Tasmania were the only States not taking the matter further. In Western Australia, no duty is payable on estates passing from spouse to spouse as from 1 July 1977.

On 20 September 1977, 12 months ago to the day, the Government announced its intention to abolish death duty in progressive steps so that no death duty would be payable on or after 1 January 1980. We have recently heard that Tasmania's Budget contains provisions to ease out death duty. From January, there will be a 50 per cent reduction in duty on estates passing to children, and from January 1980 the tax will be abolished. Tasmanians will now have to pay slightly more stamp duty on each cheque, and other charges, but the major factor is that, by 1 January 1980, Tasmania also will not have succession duties on its Statute Book. I believe that the decision to phase out duties in this way is a responsible one, from every other State. If we can judge the effect of this by looking at Queensland's revenue position, it has been most successful from its point of view.

The Government may deny, as the Premier has, that people have left South Australia and gone to live in Queensland, but I do not think that there is anyone in the community who does not know of someone who has taken that step or is contemplating moving to Queensland. It is not just the climate; people who are able to move and who can mobilise their capital believe that they will get a better deal in Queensland. Queensland has had an inflow of capital that has been extremely valuable to that State Government. Now that other Governments have announced plans to abolish gift and death duties by, at the latest, 1 January 1980, they will also attract the attention of people in South Australia who see no reason why they should be victimised and discriminated against by this State's Government, in direct contrast to the treatment they could be given by the Governments of other States.

I believe that the situation is one which we cannot afford to ignore. Obviously, the Premier believes that we can ignore it. He believes that South Australia can go cheerfully along continuing to impose capital taxation of this sort by way of death duties, and that it will have no effect on investment (and development, if it comes to that) in this State. We have already seen from the Budget documents how much worse off South Australia is compared to every other State. I do not have to talk at any length about the massive working deficit South Australia has incurred in the past financial year, compared to the balanced Budgets of other States. South Australia, labouring under that particular handicap, may have a case for deferring the introduction of a programme for the abolition of death duty, but why does the Premier not come out and explain the position?

I am certain that, if we are to maintain our investment in this State, keep investment here, and attract investment in the future, we will have to fall into line with the rest of Australia. Unless the Premier can give some clear indication on this matter, not only will we have workmen's compensation legislation, long service leave loadings, industrial democracy, and all other matters keeping industry and investment from coming to South Australia, but we will also have State death duty keeping them from coming here. We simply cannot afford not to find the money to make these concessions. It may be that the money is not available now, but it should be made available by the Government's paying more attention to its control of expenditure.

Mr. Mathwin: It should get its own house in order.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, and it should get its accounting in order. Then, we would have the money to make this concession straight away. Nevertheless, one must accept that difficult times are with us. Financial stringencies that affect every State might make it impossible to abolish death duty in this State immediately. It is for that reason that the motion has been couched in the terms as drawn. In other words, I believe that we should fall into line with the rest of Australia and aim to abolish death duty in this State by 1 January 1980. Even at that stage, we will be labouring at a disadvantage with Queensland, which has no death duty. At least, the Government will have given clear warning that the situation, whereby South Australia is the odd State out, will not be continuing.

The South Australian economy cannot afford to continue with this restrictive, odd-man-out policy. If it is a matter simply of giving notice and allowing budgeting and planning for the withdrawal of this tax over the next two years, I believe that that ought to be done. I cannot understand why the Government has adopted this attitude. I can understand its difficulties with budgeting, but it has no-one to blame but itself. It may try to blame the Federal Government for the general stringencies that have been imposed on all States, but it cannot blame that Government for the incredible mess the State Government has made of this State's economic management over the past two years. It may be that this Government holds to ideological reasons for not introducing this taxation cut. I would have held that that was perhaps the major reason until only recently, when the Wran Government, which seems to be taking most of the running away from the South Australian Government in setting new trends, announced that it was abolishing death and gift duties.

Mr. Mathwin: That's an election issue.

Mr. TONKIN: I realise that, and I wonder whether, in the most cynical way, the Premier is waiting to make his announcement of the abolition of death duties in this State as a pre-election issue. If that is so, and if he is politicking on this matter, he is behaving in the most reprehensible way. While he is delaying the announcement of what could already be decided as the Government's long-term policy, he is keeping investment away from this State and driving existing investment out of this State.

Mr. Mathwin: It's sabotage.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, he is sabotaging every effort to rejuvenate the State's economy. It seems to me that we cannot afford not to take this step. It could be that an ideological stance is being taken but I do not believe that that is possible now that the Wran Government has made its move and now that the Tasmanian Government (the other Labor Government) has made its move, too. I cannot believe that even this State Government could possibly be so cynical as to put the welfare of its own prospects at the next election ahead of the well-being of South Australia as a whole and of the South Australian economy. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LAND VALUATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr. Eastick:

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

(Continued from 23 August. Page 703.)

Mr. DRURY (Mawson): I oppose the motion for the second time within about a year. This motion, which deals with valuation methods based on actual land use rather than potential land use, is apparently a perennial one. Last year, it was also moved by the member for Light. The honourable member makes no apology for moving the motion again, and neither do I for replying almost in the same vein as I did last year.

This matter centres around the actual or potential use of land as a basis for valuation. To refresh the memory of the House, I turn to case law, because the basis of valuation is market value, which was established in the case of *Spencer v. The Commonwealth of Australia* in about 1905, and that decision has been held to be valid ever since by the courts. In addition, in the early 1950's in Sydney there was the case of *Royal Sydney Golf Club v. The Valuer-General.* At the time New South Wales had developed zoning regulations and had legislated for them. The golf club appealed against the Valuer-General's assessment of its property questioning whether the assessment should include the principle that the general law of the land should apply to property valuations. The court held that the general law of the land should be taken into account when applying valuation principles.

Since then, in 1967 we have had introduced and in force ever since, land use control regulations in this State. In this way land owned by a person can be valued much more accurately to ascertain its potential than was previously the case. Before 1967, a valuer had only the Building Act and council by-laws of various sorts to guide him in his valuation. He had to make an expert judgment based on a considerable volume of sales evidence, as all valuations must be.

Mr. Mathwin: Really, it was an assessment, wasn't it?

Mr. DRURY: If the honourable member wants to call it an assessment, fair enough, but, whatever the tag, it is still a valuation. Before 1967, the potential of the property was measured in a much more difficult way. Subsequently, zoning laws defined certain parts of a local government area as being suitable for a certain use. Therefore, larger sections of council areas were defined for residential use, and property there had to be valued as residential properties. Even in those residential areas we had a certain hierarchy, if you like, of uses. A residential 1 zone contained land that was suitable only for single detached premises. A residential 2 zone contained land suitable for single detached premises or semi-detached premises, in some instances, and, by consent, even flats. In a residential 3 zone approval had to be given for flats to be erected. Zoning in that area even allowed for dwellings of 14 storeys to be erected. A similar method applied in determining industrial and commercial land, and so on.

Mr. Mathwin: People were given ample opportunity for objection.

Mr. DRURY: True. That established the basis for the valuation of the property. A valuer must still measure the potential value of the property. It stands to reason that a person who owns a block of land on the corner of Rundle Mall and King William Street would not, if he decided to sell it, say that it was suitable only for the erection of a dwelling. Obviously, it would be suitable for a much more intense use and, therefore, it would be worth more. That principle has been laid down by courts since before the turn of the century.

In part this motion states:

> . . . the Government by persisting with land valuation methods which fail to relate the prescribed value to the actual land use is condoning claims for rates and taxes which under existing land usage are manifestly unjust and not recoverable . . .

The honourable member said that there were difficulties in this matter. I draw the attention of the House to the situation that exists if Queensland, where the Valuer-General has recognised that these difficulties do exist. The Valuer-General in Queensland has stated:

> It is the second type of concession, which is indirectly allowed to certain classes of ratepayers by provisions of the valuation statute, which is of particular concern to my department. Pursuant to section II(I) (vii) of the Queensland Valuation of Land Act, the Valuer-General is required when valuing land exclusively used for purposes of a single dwelling-house or for purposes of the business of primary production, to disregard any enhancement in the value of such lands because they have a potential use for industrial, subdivisional or any other purpose.
>
> This has meant that where land has a much higher potential use than its actual use, such potential cannot be taken into account when making the valuation if the land is exclusively used for one of the above-mentioned purposes and the valuation is therefore limited to a residential value or, as the case may be, a primary production value. This, of course, is a departure from the generally accepted principle of valuation that all land should be valued at its highest and best use, and has been the cause of considerable difficulty about which delegates have heard me speak previously.

This matter was raised at the Valuer-General's conference. The Valuer-General, in his report in 1977, stated much the same about section II(I) (vii), when he said:

> Within this section the meaning of "a single dwelling-house" was broadened to include "a dwelling occupied by the resident owner . . . These amendments were designed as a concession to some landowners caught up by surrounding development and located in areas of higher potential than that for which the land is used.

Obviously, the divergence from valuing land on a potential use basis to valuing land on an actual use basis has caused problems to the Valuer-General in Queensland, who is obviously beset by them.

Mr. Mathwin: And all the residents are happy.

Mr. DRURY: Not necessarily. If the member for Glenelg knows that all the residents of Queensland are happy he can say, "All the residents of Queensland". I now refer to a couple of other State reports, the first of which is the Rural Rating Inquiry, a report for the Victorian Minister of Local Government, by the Committee of Inquiry into Rural Rating. It is dated 12 April 1978, and is as follows:

> Property value rating system: The present system of taxing on land values has its imperfections but the committee is of the opinion there is no better system for the purpose of collecting municipal revenue.
>
> Valuations: Major inequities can arise due to the infrequency of valuations. A system of valuing for rating purposes based on concepts other than market value at highest and best use, such as productivity or current use value, is not capable of an objective test and therefore is not supported.

It could be that the term "current use value" is another way of saying "actual value". In referring to the rates and taxes attached to land valuations in 1975 in Western Australia, the Western Australian report states:

> The committee has received submissions recommending the extension of the principle of notional values. It has been suggested that the land be valued on the basis of its use regardless of zoning or proximity to urban development. The committee sees many difficulties in ascertaining the value of a property on any basis other than the capital sum which the fee simple in the land would sell under such reasonable conditions of sale as a *bona fide* seller would require and in the case of annual value the estimated full fair average amount of rent at which the land may reasonably be expected to be let from year to year.

The same report, at page 32, states:

> The committee sees many difficulties in ascertaining the value of a property on other than accepted valuation principles.

Accepted valuation principles have been laid down over the decades by the courts and they have been held to in many instances by the courts. They have been varied from time to time only when it has been seen as necessary to do so. The principle of the highest and best permitted use has not been departed from since the Spencer case in the first decade of this century.

The member for Light mentioned the difficulty of appealing against the equalisation factor. The value of the land has an equalisation factor applied to it. The equalisation factor could be described as a superstructure to the value of the land. The equalisation factor is arrived at by considering the sales of similar properties, and from those sales ascertaining a factor that will be able to adjust the value of the land within assessment periods. This arose in 1975 because the inflationary period through which Australia had passed had caused property values to increase tremendously. I can recall when I was a valuer in the Federal Government that from 1972 to 1973 property values in some sections of Adelaide increased by almost 50 per cent. Properties which would have fetched $15 000 in 1972 increased in value to between $22 000 and $24 000.

Mr. Mathwin: Most of the people live there because they want to. They shouldn't be punished because of speculators.

Mr. DRURY: It was not a matter of speculation. People have to have shelter; they must buy a property in which to live. I do not dispute the fact that sometimes there is an

element of speculation, but the basic fact is that one of the fundamental needs of a human being is shelter, the others being clothing and food. The equalisation factor is therefore not pertinent to the value of the property as laid down in the Act.

If a ratepayer wishes to object against his rates and/or taxes (council, water or land), he objects to the Valuer-General's valuation. The provisions of the Act require valuation notices to be issued and it is up to the property owner to make an objection. A problem can arise if a layman is not aware of property values. I would suggest that, if the member for Light has constituents with this problem, they should be told to contact the various departments, from which they will get good service. If the need arises, they may hire the services of a professional valuer in private practice who will take up their cases and investigate whether or not they have a valid reason for objecting.

All those matters do not alter the fact that the motion wants to change a fundamental method of valuation. It wants to change the method from valuations based on potential land value to those based on actual use. I do not believe this can be done because it would bring in its wake all sorts of problems. It is true that various methods can be devised for valuing land for rating and taxing, but they will inevitably involve more costs to the taxpayer than are involved at present. The method used in the American State of Illinois, where they go through a remarkable rigmarole, includes, first, the value of agricultural products sold per acre; secondly, the gross value of production per acre of principal crops; and thirdly the sale price per acre of land sold for agricultural use. They want to combine productivity and land valuation. The method is that first; to obtain the value of agricultural products sold per acre reference is made to the U.S. Census of Agriculture reports. Secondly, the statistics of gross value of production per acre of principal crops are published annually by the Co-operative Crop Reporting Service of the Illinois Department of Agriculture. Thirdly, 10 per cent of a three-year average sale price per acre of land sold for agricultural use is determined from real estate transfers for each county as coded "agricultural use" by the county assessor. They arrive at a formula that would baffle Einstein. I do not understand it, and I am sure those who have to work with it would have more than their fair share of problems.

If we simply accept that it as a just and equitable method to value properties on the basis of the potential use, we will have by far the least troublesome method of valuing. The assessments are made by competent valuers, and I do not think the member for Light would dispute that. The fact is that, when we base taxes on property values, we relate the market values of properties of people's own properties to a method which will tax them.

Dr. Eastick: Hoping against hope that they don't all come on the market at the one time.

Mr. DRURY: The courts have foreseen that situation by introducing the concept of a hypothetical purchaser. I do know that the agitation for the productivity method of valuation had been with us for decades and will continue to be with us. I even recall that, whilst I was employed by the Federal Public Service, properties were still bringing good prices regardless of the wheat quotas and in times of drought they are still bringing good prices.

Mr. Venning: Last night you said wheat quotas didn't affect values.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River must cease interjecting.

Mr. DRURY: No I did not. As this motion is put forward on an annual basis, I suppose we will see it again next year, too. With enough practice I will be able to stand here without notes and speak about this matter. I do not think I can add anything more to what I said a year ago, and at this time next year I will not be able to add much more. A valuation based on actual values will produce greater costs to the taxpayer because of the change-over methods and all the rigmarole it will involve. All these things will not make the matter any easier. I do not say that taxes make life easier, but, nevertheless, we have to have taxes and they have to be raised in the most equitable way possible. I see no variation from that by taxing on property values and using potential values.

Mr. Mathwin: They are not all—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg should cease interjecting.

Mr. DRURY: I oppose the motion and I do not see that the arguments put forward carry sufficient weight to cause the Government to change the method of valuation used in this State.

Mr. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRESPASSING ON LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 September. Page 861.)

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): The Bill before us today has received the attention of my officers and me; we have looked carefully at its contents. It is worth noting that the matter, as I understand it, originally came to the honourable member's attention as a result of a considerable interest he developed in persons seeking hallucinogenic mushrooms.

Mr. Goldsworthy: No, interest developed by my constituents.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the honourable member's constituents have a considerable interest in hallucinogenic mushrooms it is appropriate that the honourable member should take an interest in them too. The Government, at this time, does not intend to support the Bill, but I think that I can give the honourable member sufficient assurances during the course of my remarks to reassure him that the Government does not entirely oppose the general intention he had in introducing this Bill.

The Trespassing on Land Act was enacted in 1951 by the Playford Government and has not been amended since then, although various proclamations have been made under the Act to extend its geographical area of operation. I understand that the honourable member thinks that an Act that has been in existence for so long probably needs some amendment, and the Government agrees.

The Bill before the House is the result (I do not think it is unkind to say this) of a particular situation which has arisen in the honourable member's district and which was brought to his attention. He sought to take action to relieve what he saw as the wrong done to his constituents. In seeking to do that, the honourable member has, to some extent, been forced into a rather *ad hoc* approach to reforming the legislation relating to trespassing on land. Accordingly, I believe that the Bill before us has many defects and is not anywhere near a perfect law reform of this Act.

I will go into more details to explain the Government's position on this matter. In the early 1970's, the Government set up the Law Reform and Penal Methods Reform Committee under Justice Mitchell. That committee has now reported to the Government in four reports

dealing with various aspects of its terms of reference. It has reported to the Government that there is a need drastically to amend the Trespassing on Land Act, which is, in fact, a criminal statute and was therefore covered by the ambit of the terms of reference of the committee. The committee recommended that the Trespassing on Land Act should be repealed in its entirety.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Where did it say that?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In the first report. The report said the Act should be repealed in its entirety and that a new omnibus piece of legislation dealing with the criminal law should be introduced. The Government has indicated publicly on one or two occasions before that it hopes to have the new Criminal Law Act introduced into Parliament during this session, if not actually dealt with. Proposals dealing with the Trespassing on Land Act will be part of the new Criminal Law Act.

I now wish to refer to areas in which the Act has certain limitations.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Did the Mitchell Committee recommend its repeal?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, it recommended that the whole of the criminal law should be in the one statute. The following matters are ones where we believe the Trespassing on Land Act has limitations. First, it applies only within such parts of the State as are specified in proclamations made under section 3(1). For the benefit of honourable members, the areas which have been proclaimed to date are as follows: the District Council of Port Wakefield; the District Council of Marne; the District Council of Sedan; the District Council of Yorke, Bute, Minlaton, Warooka, Port Broughton, and Clinton; the District Council of Districts of Eudunda and Burra Burra; the District Council of Kadina; the District Council of Peterborough; the District Council of Franklin Harbor; the District Council District of Tanunda; the District Council District of Yorketown; the District Council District of Coonalpyn Downs; the District Council District of Meningie; the District Council District of Kimba; the District Council District of Balaklava; and the District Council District of Robertstown. In fact, it may be that some parts of the honourable member's electorate (quite possibly those parts where the specific complaints came from) are not, in fact, covered by the Act as it is at present. I am not saying that that situation could not be resolved as it stands at the moment. Certainly, proclamations could be enacted to provide for that. However, as I understand the situation, it has been traditionally the approach of the Government that the Act has been extended only in circumstances where local corporations have requested its application.

Secondly, the Act applies only to enclosed fields. That is a matter the honourable member is seeking to deal with in the Bill. Thirdly, some difficulties are associated with certain parts of the Act relating to section 6, which deals with remaining on a field after a request to leave. The request must be made by the owner, occupier, or a person in the employ of such owner or occupier, and by no other person. That means that a spouse of the owner, for example, cannot make such a request, nor can his brother, his sons, and so on. They are people who quite properly should be able to make such requests.

When, under section 6, a request is made that a trespasser should leave the property, the person making the request must be careful to state that he is the owner, occupier, or employer, as the case may be, because it has been held that, in cases where such identification was not stated to the trespasser, a successful prosecution could not be laid under section 6. All these matters indicate a considerable need for amendment to the legislation.

One question which is quite important and which needs to be dealt with is whether or not the Trespassing on Land Act should apply in the fashion in which it now exists. I believe that the community at large does not appreciate or at least is not certain in which parts of the State the Act applies. It may be of interest to citizens of South Australia to know that, in many parts of the State, mushrooming or picnicking on a property that is fenced is an offence under the Trespassing on Land Act. Many people, particularly city dwellers, probably have no idea that the law provides a criminal sanction against persons who go on to enclosed land.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They have to enter unlawfully.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Certainly, but it is clear under section 5 that a person who goes on to such land could well be in breach of the law.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's not clear.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is not clear; it needs to be cleared up. That is the point I am making. Those are the matters which the Government believes need to be clarified and upon which the Mitchell Committee has made certain recommendations. At this stage, the Government believes that the proper course is that this legislation should not proceed, and that the matter should be dealt with, with the rest of the criminal law, when the consolidation of the criminal law as it stands at present is introduced and dealt with by this Parliament at a later date.

The Government has some sympathy for the honourable member's intention in introducing the Bill, but it believes that it is more desirable that the matter should be dealt with as a whole and that we should not simply attempt to patch up the existing legislation. I do not believe that the present legislation is particularly beneficial, because its application in South Australia is extremely limited. Of the 130 local government bodies in South Australia, only a dozen or so come within the provisions of the present Act. That is not a satisfactory situation. If we are to have such laws, they should apply uniformly throughout the State. A citizen should not be in a position, in travelling from one district council to another (and the borders are not marked out in this State with any great precision, heaven knows), of finding that he can innocently and unintentionally commit an offence. The Act as it stands, and as it would stand if we adopted the proposals of the honourable member, would mean that the law would be unsatisfactory and uncertain, and uncertainty in the criminal law is not desirable. For those reasons, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I believe the Bill is of some importance and, whilst I shall leave the Deputy Leader to answer the comments of the Attorney-General, I should like to express the general concern of landholders regarding trespassing on property. The Attorney states, quite rightly, that some people perhaps do not know the law in relation to trespassing. Even if a property is fenced, and even though there are no stock on the property, it appears quite legitimate for people to enter the land as long as they do not enter for some illegal purpose.

The legislation covering wildlife provides that people cannot, without committing an offence, enter private land for the purpose of hunting. They must give their names and addresses to the owner of the land, if requested, failing which they are liable to a fine of $200, and they must leave the land. However, the definition of "hunting" is difficult to understand. A person who goes mushrooming carries a knife and, under the wildlife legislation, a knife is considered a hunting weapon, so they would have

to justify carrying the knife for cutting mushrooms, not for hunting.

Our wildlife legislation protects birds, animals and native plants from interference, but we do not protect land that is fenced, where there is no stock on the property. Taking the case of mushrooms belonging to the owner of the land, he may have planted the spawn with the object of selling the mushrooms at a profit.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That is a crop.

Mr. EVANS: It is difficult to prove that they have been planted for a crop and that stock have been taken from the paddock so that they do not tread on the mushrooms. Even if the mushrooms grow by natural seeding and the stock are taken out to prevent the mushrooms being damaged, people trespass, taking the mushrooms, and becoming very hostile—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It's a criminal offence if they are grown for profit.

Mr. EVANS: The Attorney says that if a person can prove that he planted them, that is a crop, but it is possible for them to grow naturally. A farmer sees a chance of getting a profit, to which he is entitled, and he takes the stock out of the property to protect the mushrooms. Automatically, any other person has a right to move on to the land and to take the mushrooms for whatever purpose he wishes.

I remember an incident that occurred a few years ago. A person in the Hills had a large blackberry bush near his home and he was keeping the blackberries for some visitors to pick on a certain day. On the previous day, when he came home in the late afternoon, he noticed people leaving the property, taking with them as many of the blackberries as they had been able to pick from the bush; in fact, they had used a ladder from his shed to reach the bush. When he challenged them, they said, "What are you growling about; they grow wild", and he said, "I'll grow bloody wild, because they belong to me, not to you."

The owner of the land took the registration number of the motor car. Having a contact, he was able to get the address of the person concerned. He came to the city on the following Sunday, to a home in one of the eastern suburbs, and threw a rug on the lawn and, with his family, proceeded to have lunch and to pick flowers. The owner of the property became hostile and threatened to ring the police to have the farmer removed from the lawn.

There seems to be an attitude among some people that, because land is in large areas, they have a right to go on to it, regardless of who owns it, and to take whatever they think is growing wild, except for native plants, because they are liable to a fine of $200 for taking protected animals or native plants. There is a real need to change the law, and I will leave my Deputy Leader to argue the point. This Bill is trying to go part way to what we are attempting to achieve, regardless of how long it may take the Government to introduce legislation to cover the overall situation.

I have often wondered why we have a Noxious Weeds Act, although we allow people to pick noxious weeds like blackberries and cart the seed throughout the State. I wonder why we allow that breach of the law to continue regularly during the blackberry fruiting season. People generally respect another person's property, but a certain section of society will move on to a property, regardless of the type, and show no respect for the land or for shutting gates. Some even feel inclined to push the fence down to enable the smaller members of the family to get through it. Such people show little or no respect to the owner in the event of their being challenged.

I hope that the Attorney-General will accept the Bill, which would not create any hassles. When the Government gets around to preparing the necessary legislation, it will no doubt encompass the whole area and be discussed in the Parliament in more detail. The trespass law, as drawn at present, causes considerable ill-feeling, which would not exist if the law were amended. I congratulate my colleague for introducing the Bill, which will cover one part of the trespass problem, and in the future I hope that we will be able to take the other necessary steps.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I do not think that "disgust" is too strong a word for my reaction to the Attorney-General's reaction to the Bill. We know that the Government hates the Opposition to gain any kudos for introducing any successful legislation. We have seen it happen time and time again in relation to matters that would tend to bring some common sense into an issue. We have seen the Government's attitude towards pornography. I must confess to being surprised at the Attorney's attitude, and I am concerned that he is hiding behind the recommendations of the Mitchell committee and saying that, because the Bill does not go all the way, it is not worthy of support. I could give the House numerous examples of the Government's introducing "band-aid" legislation to cover a situation temporarily when its intentions in the long term were to introduce a major new Bill. The Local Government Act springs readily to mind. We see minor amendments being introduced from time to time, but that does not deny the fact that the Government intends to rewrite the entire Act. The Attorney's argument will not hold water. For him to say that the Government intends to make a major revision of the law could mean that we must wait for years for that to happen. The Attorney says that he hopes to introduce the necessary legislation in this session, but I will believe that when I see it.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Your colleagues in the other place have had something to do with that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: From my conversations with them, I do not believe that they would impede this legislation. Three years ago the Government said it would introduce a Bill to control off-road vehicles, and people asked when it would see the light of day. We would be given a date, then we would ask again, and be given a date six months later. Then, the Government had to replace the Minister for the Environment, because he got into too many problems on that matter and others.

Mr. Wotton: We were told yesterday they weren't in a hurry to introduce the legislation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We have had about six firm dates thus far. I do not approve of the Attorney's hiding behind the Mitchell committee report, which consists of four volumes and which makes for solid reading. It could be years before most of the legislation recommended in the report sees the light of day. The Attorney-General's attitude will be cold comfort to people, especially those in the Hills, on to whose properties hundreds of people come.

The Bill seeks to make modest amendments to the Trespassing on Land Act that are in sympathy with the recommendations of the Mitchell committee's report. The Mitchell committee's recommendations go further than my amendments seek to go: the committee suggests that the law should apply to all land. The Attorney has said that the Government hopes to introduce the necessary legislation before the next session, but I point out to him that, if it does not see the light of day before next autumn, many landholders will be angry when they realise that the Government has not supported this Bill. The amendments seek to include in the Act orchards and vineyards, which

are unfenced and which are obviously worked, and the same applies to most orchards in the Hills. The member for Coles went further and included market gardens, which is a sensible provision but which I overlooked.

Mrs. Adamson: So did the market gardeners.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: My word! I should be surprised if the Attorney did not want to see them protected. The market gardening area to the north is an area of which he may have some knowledge. The Attorney and his colleagues, who will all support him like sheep, have no knowledge of the problems in the rural community.

Mr. Wotton: That's what the rural community has come to expect from this Government.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and I believe that the Attorney's officers have little first-hand knowledge of the rural community's problems. Although we have had troubles with the law of trespass for years, the problem that arose in the Lenswood area was a major one, and it brought the matter to a head for me.

I admit that there is some vagueness about clause 5. If a person goes on to another person's property and is doing no harm, I do not believe that a successful prosecution could presently be launched. The element of vagueness to which the Attorney alluded is contained in section 5, which provides:

> A person who unlawfully enters—

I do not seek to change that phraseology—

> or remains on an enclosed field. . .

In other words, if someone enters an orchard, hangs around and the owner tells him to get off, he does not have to get off. What an absurd situation!

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He must get off.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am sorry—unless he has entered unlawfully there would not be a successful prosecution. Our lawyer friends in the Chamber are prominent in airing their legal knowledge, particularly those on the Government side—

Mr. Slater: You haven't got any.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We have had them. One of them sits on the cross-benches now, and he loves to air his legal knowledge from time to time. He does not do it as obviously as the Premier does it, because the Premier gets up in this place and pours scorn on we simple souls because we do not understand all the intricacies of the law. The trouble with some of these lawyers is that they have become so used over the years to defending crooks and the like that half of them do not have the nouse to know what is right and what is wrong; they get themselves tangled up in a complicated legal argument to prove anything. The Attorney is in that category.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Where do you think the member for Mitcham is this afternoon?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not be deflected. We know that the member for Mitcham is a part-time member. We know he says that this is only a half-time job, and he demonstrates that frequently to the House. Section 5 does not allow for a successful prosecution of people who go on to the property but do not do any harm. If someone goes on to a property simply to cross the property on a country hike and did not do any damage, no-one would want to prosecute him.

Last year the situation in the Lenswood and Forest Range area got completely out of hand. It is difficult for the police to secure a conviction for a drug offence, the penalties for which are quite severe. Had the Attorney taken the trouble to apprise himself of the facts and the difficulties faced by the police he would know that it is difficult to prosecute successfully for a drug offence, the penalty for which, I think, is about $1 000.

The only course open to police in the area is to prosecute for trespass. It can be shown that some people are up to no good because of the damage and the litter they leave behind. The maximum penalty under the Trespassing on Land Act is just not a deterrent. I understand that, as a result of activities last season, four cases were prosecuted. The maximum fine can simply be laughed off even if the prosecutions are successful. Such a prosecution cannot be successful if there is not a fence around the orchard.

It seems to me that the Attorney is not clear about what is covered by the other situation whereby a fenced paddock must contain stock. A trespass would not be committed if stock were moved or wandered through an open gate into an adjoining paddock; as the area on to which people went would not therefore contain stock. The Attorney did not believe me in relation to that example, but such a provision is contained in section 4 of the Act which defines "enclosed field" as an area of land which is enclosed by fences, hedges or walls and has sheep or cattle grazing thereon. Subsection (2) of that section provides:

> *(a)* an area shall be deemed to be enclosed by fences, hedges, or walls, notwithstanding any gap or break in such fences, hedges or walls.

A paddock is considered to be an enclosed field even if it contains an open gate into another paddock and even if that paddock contains no stock. If someone walks into the paddock from which the stock has left, one is not trespassing. However, if one walked through the open gate into the adjoining paddock that contains stock one is trespassing. That absurd situation was pointed out to me by a landholder at the Forest Range meeting. As I said earlier, the hall was literally overflowing with people who had come from all over the surrounding area because this is a problem to them.

To sum up, I am bitterly disappointed in the Government's attitude. I believe it is small minded. All I can try to do is follow a course followed by the Government many times when it has introduced "band-aid" legislation to control a situation that has been urgently in need of control. I consider my Bill to be slightly better than the "band-aid" legislation because it has wider significance than just controlling the situation. It is certainly intended to control a situation that is urgently in need of control.

The Government, in its lack of wisdom through its small mindedness, has sought to defeat this Bill with a half-baked suggestion of the Attorney that the Government will some time in future draft legislation which, hopefully, will be introduced this session, and that the whole compass of this legislation will be repealed and something new will be written into the criminal code.

The Attorney alluded to the first report of the Mitchell Committee, but the fourth report shows that that committee quite clearly believes that this legislation should be extended. In referring to this matter, the committee quotes the Law of Trespass Act that applies in New Zealand, and states that sections 7 and 8 of the Trespassing on Land Act should be transferred to the criminal code. The committee concludes by stating:

> In particular, they should not be confined to enclosed fields.

That is precisely what I am trying to do in this Bill. For the Attorney's benefit, I repeat that people in the Adelaide Hills will be disgusted with his attitude on this matter. The Attorney knows nothing about the area concerned, and he knows that it is not politically sensitive to the Government. He would hate the Opposition to get kudos for passing this legislation. He could not give a damn about the people in the Adelaide Hills. However, they will

remember this next year when people, during the season, come in their hundreds on Adelaide Cup Day. I am sorry that the Bill will receive the fate it will receive. I thought better of the Attorney, but I should have known better.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (15)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Becker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Mathwin, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan (teller), Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 11 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 September. Page 872.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose this Bill. If it were to do merely what has often been publicly claimed for it, it would be unexceptionable but it does not do merely what is claimed for it. It does several other things which have been outlined to a few of the people to whom it has been presented and which I am astonished that any member of the Liberal Party should support. The Bill introduces to South Australia a censorship system of Ministerial discretion so wide that it is a gross intrusion, if it were to be carried into legislative effect, upon the civil liberties of the subjects of South Australia.

It is claimed in some of the pamphlets issued in its support that it is similar to legislation passed in Great Britain. Indeed, that claim, which is made by a pamphlet that has been promoted by some members opposite and by the Festival of Light, is one of the most untruthful misrepresentations as to the state of the law and the facts that South Australia has ever had the misfortune to see, and I am astonished that this disgraceful pamphlet has been issued by people who claim "godliness", when it is one of the most untruthful pieces of work that I have ever come across. I will cover some of the things with which it purports to deal because this pamphlet has been circulated, and obviously the honourable member who introduced this measure in another place has co-operated in it; he is quoted extensively in it. The pamphlet is headed "Urgent action needed". It gives a graph of rapes reported to the police in South Australia and Queensland from 1964 to 1974-75, and then states:

> End the South Australian rape menace. Support the Bill to ban sadistic pornography.

One would be led to believe by simply reading that pamphlet that the graph on the front of it, the illustration, is intended to portray (that is the implication of the wording of the pamphlet) that the number of rapes taking place in South Australia and Queensland is evidence of the influence on society towards rape activity by the existence in South Australia of publications which are permitted under the Classification of Publications Act as it stands at the moment. That is the only conclusion one can reach from this statement, and it is an outright untruth.

In the first place the graph itself refers to the period up to 1974-75, and those are the latest figures available from Queensland. The Classification of Publications Act only came into force in South Australia in 1974-75. Before that pornographic publications in South Australia were prohibited by law and prosecuted. It is quite untrue and baseless to refer these figures to any relationship with pornography at all, and yet this is put forward by these people as being truth. More than that, what they have done is to take the figures for alleged rape. The definitions in the criminal law in South Australia and in Queensland are markedly different. In South Australia the offences covered by the offence of rape are more and wider than they are in Queensland. What is more, in South Australia the law in relation to rape has been reformed so that it is easier to prove and to report rape without the unpleasant consequences which obtained previously for women making complaints.

The fact that that has not been done in Queensland is one of the reasons why reports of rape are fewer in Queensland than they are here. Of course, the only really comparable figures that one can take with Queensland are not complaints of rape, because the complaints do not actually prove whether or not rape has taken place; the comparable figures are prosecutions and convictions for rape. That is the proof of the rate within the community because that is the only way in which one can establish the incidence of rape. The mere fact that someone comes along and complains that a rape has occurred has not in the practice of the police ever been shown to mean that that results in any evidence that in fact rape has actually occurred. There needs to be a proper investigation for it to be established whether a rape has occurred. The figures to be contrasted are those of convictions for rape.

The publishers of this pamphlet, those people who parade their godliness, must have known before they published this pamphlet that Queensland has consistently had, per head of population, a higher number of convictions for rape than this State and that has been the position since 1965-66, and is still the position. More proof of rape occurs in Queensland than here, even though the law in South Australia makes it easier to prove rape and the definition of rape here is wider.

These people would have South Australians believe that, in fact, the existence of pornography in South Australia has some influence on the incidence of rape, yet the actual figures of convictions for rape show that that is not the case, and they know it, yet they have set out to mislead the people as they have.

Mr. Chapman: The inference there is that they convict on less evidence in Queensland than they do here.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not true.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier, so far, has been heard in silence. Honourable members on both sides of the House will have an opportunity to speak.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The proof of rape under the Queensland law is more difficult than it is under South Australian law. The law has not been reformed in Queensland and, in fact, Liberal members in Queensland have complained that the Queensland law has not been reformed as it has been here.

Let me turn to what is proposed under this Bill. The Classification of Publications Board is to be altered. In addition to the provisions for the Classification of Publications Board, it is now proposed, in clause 11, that:

> (1) The Minister may—
>
> *(a)* of his own motion;
>
> or
>
> *(b)* upon the application of any person,
>
> assign a classification to a publication in pursuance of this Act.

He may prohibit a publication and that prohibition may take place where, in his discretion (because it is a Ministerial discretion), the publication describes ". . . abhorrent phenomena". That is as wide as the world.

What the honourable member is proposing is to introduce a censorship system which could put an enormous weapon of repression in the hands of a Minister. That is something that this State in no circumstances should accept. It is not the case that other countries which have dealt with this topic (and the complaint has been mainly about child pornography) have dealt with it in that way. Again, the pamphlet to which I referred is being completely untruthful in that regard. It states:

> The attached petition supports a much-needed Bill that is expected to be debated in the House of Assembly on 13 and 20 September. In Britain a similar Bill was passed recently with unanimous support by Labour, Conservative and Liberal Parties.

The English Act bears absolutely no relationship to this Bill at all; it is nothing like it. If, in fact, it were the English measure that were introduced, I would support it.

In fact, a Bill similar in effect and using similar language was foreshadowed by me on the first day of this session and will be introduced into this House next week. The English measure does not do anything about introducing a Ministerial system of censorship and repression of the kind proposed in this measure.

The basis on which this State has previously insisted is that there is no system by which what people can read, see, or hear is determined by an administrative decision—not by a Minister, and not by a group of people. The only way in which that is finally to be determined is by the criminal law. If people are satisfied to test the law, then they have their recourse in the court. The South Australian Parliament has always turned its face against any provision by which a group of people, or one person, is set up as being the judge, subject to no appeal, of what other people are able to read or see.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Attorney-General can stop prosecutions from going to court, can't he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He may refuse his certificate—when has he ever done so?

Mr. Goldsworthy: He did on *Oh! Calcutta!*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to speak in this debate if he so desires.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He has never done it. No Attorney-General in South Australia, of this Government, has refused any request by the police for prosecution under section 33 of the Police Offences Act—not one! That, of course, is another untruth which is contained in the pamphlet. I am glad the honourable member has seen fit to refer to it. The pamphlet states:

> Under the present Act the board has no power to prohibit even the most violent, sadistic and obscene publications. It can only refuse to classify. The sale of unclassified material is not in itself illegal. The seller merely runs the risk of prosecution under section 33 of the Police Offences Act; that is all.

"That is all"! It is only a fine of a few thousand dollars! Such people are also liable to imprisonment. The pamphlet continues:

> The new Bill would give a specific power of prohibition. How easy is prosecution for selling a publication that the Board has refused to classify? An actual prosecution requires the agreement of the Minister. At the present time, therefore, the police could get evidence of the worst kind of pornography being sold but not receive permission to prosecute.

The implication is that they do not receive permission to prosecute. That is not true, and every member of this House knows that because questions have been asked and answers given in this House. The publishers of this publication know that, too, yet they have been prepared to misrepresent the situation to the people for political purposes, and no other. This is a political campaign, not a campaign of truth or concern.

The position which has obtained in South Australia and which this Parliament has always stood for is that, if there was something that people chose to publish, then, in those circumstances, if that publication contravened the law, the test was in the court. It was not for an administrative act to prohibit a publication and say that because an administrator has said something is not to be published, it is an offence to publish it, for that is the introduction of the system of censorship which is against every Liberal principle. It is against the provisions of the rule of law. There are not many lawyers opposite, but I suggest that members study the originators of the concept of the rule of law, because it requires that an administrator does not make the law: the law is there, legislated for by Parliament, and people take their test before the courts.

The introduction of the Classification of Publications Board did not set up a system of administrative censorship; it afforded a defence to certain offences in the law, provided people observed certain conditions as to modes of sale. It also meant that the tribunal concerned could say that it would refuse a classification, and allow the person involved to take his test before the court.

This Bill introduces a new principle by which a group of administrators or a Minister may simply say, "I prohibit that material", and it is an offence for anyone to publish it, regardless of whether the courts would agree with the conclusion of the administrator. That is censorship and repression of the worst kind. I am astonished that any member opposite, given their supposed commitment to Liberal principles, could for a moment lend support to it.

The honourable member who introduced the measure to this place did not actually talk about it very much. I have read her speech with care, and for the most part it was a diatribe on the subject of the Classification of Publications Tribunal and its administration, and bore very little relationship to the Bill before the House. I draw her attention to these words—

Mrs. ADAMSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Premier is referring to me as the member who introduced the Bill. I did not introduce the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I beg the honourable member's pardon. I am referring to her, and I am referring to hers as the main speech on the Bill to date.

Dr. Eastick: What about the person who introduced it?

Mr. Bannon: The member for Torrens.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I apologise to the member for Torrens.

Dr. Eastick: What about the member for Coles?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not an argument across the House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Precisely what the relevance is of this to the point, I am not certain, but honourable members opposite are having their fun.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I draw the attention of the member for Coles to her statement, as follows:

> The law in South Australia is more or less a Magna Carta for porn dealers. They know they can produce anything and nothing will be prohibited under the Dunstan regime. We must remember that we have a libertarian Government that will not prohibit anything.

The honourable member knows full well that that was a shameful statement. It is untrue, it is baseless, and she should not have made it.

Mrs. Adamson: There's no power to prohibit—that's true.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that her words have a very much wider meaning that that. I have read them to her. The prohibition comes from prosecution, and this Government has prosecuted, it is prosecuting where there are offences, and we have constantly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is a far closer and more effective control of classification of publications and their sale in this State than there is under Liberal Governments in Western Australia and in Victoria.

Mr. Chapman: Why do you think they're signing—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have spoken once today to the honourable member for Alexandra, and I spoke to him yesterday. If he continues in this way I shall take the necessary action.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am asked why people are signing petitions. I have given some reasons why they are signing petitions. The people have been sold a pup on this petition because they have not been told in it what they are supporting in the Bill. Nowhere here is it stated that in fact what is proposed is to give enormously wide powers to a Minister simply to prohibit a publication and to make it an offence to go against his prohibition.

Mrs. Adamson: Don't you support Ministerial responsibility?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not support Ministerial responsibility of that kind. I would not accept that kind of responsibility as a gift, because I am not going to set myself up in a position in South Australia where I say to other people in the State, "I am stronger than you are. I have looked at this material. I am more adult than the rest of the population. I can decide what is good and what is bad for other people to read, and I will tell the rest of you people in South Australia what you may read and what you may not." I will not do that. If that is what the honourable member believes should be done, let her go out and say it, but it was not told to people signing this pamphlet. Nowhere did they say that they would introduce a system under which a Minister could tell every person in South Australia what they can read and what they cannot, on a very wide definition, which means that if the Minister thinks something is reprehensible he can say that it is not to be published.

Mrs. Adamson: And be judged accordingly.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Coles has spoken, and I think she was more or less heard in silence. I am sure the honourable Premier did not interject while she was speaking.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly did not. The correct procedure for this House to follow is to maintain the principle of the rule of law. The judge in charge of the criminal law investigation in South Australia has recommended, with the other members of her committee, that there should be an amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act specifically dealing with child pornography. She has acknowledged the position which the Government previously pointed out—that the law already covers the matter. However, she suggests that there could be some advantage in putting in an explicit provision rather than relying on the general provisions under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act of indecent procurement and procuring an act of gross indecency.

The Government has said that it will legislate to that effect. By doing so, it will in fact cover almost exactly the same area as the English law has covered, and I refer to the Act before the House of Commons. The House of Commons has made no provision at all for the kind of censorship which is contained in this Bill. It has maintained the provisions of the rule of law, and I believe that that is right for us to do as well.

Mr. Dean Brown: How many prosecutions have you pulled—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Bannon: You're a disgrace.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ross Smith also will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Venning: If he stays.

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

Mr. Venning interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A few moments ago—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Rocky River continues in this vein (he got the benefit of very grave doubt yesterday), I shall name him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Davenport, a few moments ago, in typical fashion, accused me, across the House, of pulling prosecutions under section 33 of the Police Offences Act, implying that I have in some way prevented the police from taking the full action and responsibility that they should take under the Police Offences Act. That is a disgraceful, defamatory, and improper accusation against a Minister of the Crown. I accuse the honourable member of using this as a cowards castle for doing that. I invite him to repeat his statement outside, and I will sue him.

Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I invite you to do that, because I will take you for a good deal of cash over it. There is absolutely no truth in the member's statement. It is a darned untruth, and he knows it. It is disgraceful, shameful, that he should traduce a Minister of this House in this way without the slightest evidence.

The SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member for Rocky River will not interject once more today. The Chair is in charge of the House, and he is trying to do today the same as he did yesterday. I will not take it any longer. If he does it once more, I will name him. I hope that interjections will cease, and I call the honourable member for Henley Beach to order.

Mr. WILSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. In all fairness to the member for Rocky River, I point out that he was about to take a point of order; he was not interjecting. I think that other members could confirm that.

The SPEAKER: I still maintain that he said something, because I heard him say it.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Sir, I point out that it is unparliamentary to use "he" and "you" across the Chamber, as the Premier has been doing.

The SPEAKER: That is so, and honourable members have the opportunity to take a point of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have issued an invitation to the member for Davenport, and I invite him to take it up. If he will not do so, he ought to have the intestinal fortitude and the grace to apologise for a disgraceful imputation he has made against me, as a Minister, which is baseless and untrue, and which he knows is so.

Mr. Dean Brown: You will release all the information in relation to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member to order. If he continues in that vein I will deal with him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The proper course is for us to proceed in the way in which other Parliaments have done, and done properly, namely, to maintain the rule of law effectively, and that will be done by the measures the

Government will introduce. There will be no question after those measures (and there can be no question) that there is any room for the publication or distribution or making of child pornography in this State, nor indeed will there be room for the publication and distribution of material of sadism, masochism or violence within that State. The other measures, which I have previously outlined to the House, will tighten up certain provisions in relation to prosecutions in sex shops and of the people who are the owners and managers of sex shops who sometimes have avoided prosecution by having the actual offences committed by their underlings. The fact that that is so has been brought to the Government's attention, and mearsures will be introduced to that effect.

They are proper, reasonable and, I believe, effective measures in accordance with the proper traditions of the law, but I am astonished that any Liberal member could have introduced the measure now before us. Given the expressions of belief and principle that have been uttered in the House by Liberal members previously on this particular issue (members like Sir Baden Pattinson and the predecessor in the seat of the member for Davenport) in the debates on the Police Offences Act, they would never have contemplated a measure of this kind, nor should they have, because it offends every principle by which those who call themselves Liberals should abide.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): For a person with his head so far in the sand, the Premier has made considerable noise this afternoon. This is a continuing debate—one that has been going on for a long time, and it will continue, because of the Government's failure to get on with the job and to move in a manner other than sweeping the matter under the carpet. The fact of continuously sweeping the matter under the carpet, as the Premier has done again this afternoon, is lower than pornography itself.

On 7 March 1974, we debated the matter of the distribution of pornography in South Australia—on that occasion, it was on the lolly counters alongside the ice cream containers in delicatessens. On that occasion, as the debate at pages 2339-40 of *Hansard* indicates, the Premier voiced some of the same platitudes he has voiced this afternoon, saying, "Give us the detail, and we'll undertake the prosecutions." The detail was tabled in the House, albeit against Standing Orders, and subsequent detail has been made available by other members, but the Government has done precious little about it. Publicly, the Premier refused to take any action on that first occasion to which I have referred. A matter of two weeks later, we suddenly found that a regulation had been gazetted which went part of the way but by no means all of the way to offset the information I had brought to the attention of the House. We even had the Prime Minister of the day (the Rt. Hon. E. G. Whitlam) buying into the argument and making public statements about the situation occurring in South Australia.

Again this afternoon the Premier invited members to cite cases where the Government had failed to proceed with prosecutions. Regrettably, the detail is not immediately available. My colleagues are searching for it and, when I refer to this matter again, I will bring forward details we know to exist.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's right.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Davenport to resume his seat. I also warn him that, if he continues in that vein, I will name him.

Dr. EASTICK: In answer to the query the Premier raised earlier this afternoon, I point out that on the second occasion on which *Oh! Calcutta!* appeared in South Australia the then Attorney-General refused, under section 33, to give it a certificate. I do not allege that, but I believe that it is a fact. I want the complete details to be able to present them to the House, which I will do in due course, but it is the Opposition's genuine belief that that is the precise situation.

The Premier went on to say that there was a sizable $2 000 fine for anyone caught undertaking certain of these practices, but what is a $2 000 fine in a multi-million dollar exercise? It is trifling. In the Opposition's opinion, an unsatisfactory situation presently exists in South Australia, and it has been permitted to continue for a long time. There is a considerable degree of community concern. It is spontaneous concern, and by way of example I cite that I have never had so many people, over a three-year period, enter my electoral office, asking for petition forms so that they could prepare and circulate petitions relating to the distribution of pornography. That position was greatly increased on the occasion of the public demonstration regarding child pornography.

Obviously, the Premier this afternoon was able to indicate a particular publication which was circulating and which sought action by the public. There have been many instances of spontaneous action by interested groups of people in the community before the distribution of that document, and those spontaneous actions are continuing. The concern of people is real, and it is based on their unfortunate experiences in so many different ways. It is based on their experience as parents who have been put into difficult positions when their children have come home from school with publications that have been circulating in the school yard and when their children have come home with pieces of paper with coloured front pieces that they have found tucked under bushes on the way home.

Mr. Mathwin: And on bus seats.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. The number of public recitals to members of this House of the places where children and other people have had access to this material is quite real. It is causing concern to the public: it is a continuing concern.

Nothing that the Premier has said this afternoon of the Government's intention next week, the week after, or the week after that will in any way allay the fear of large numbers of people in the community that the position is out of hand and that the Government has miserably failed the people of South Australia in this important area of community and social concern.

The Premier stated, as it has been claimed, this afternoon that this has become a political issue. It is a political issue because the Premier has closed ranks behind him on this and earlier occasions and has prevented members of this House exercising a free vote on this type of issue. It is political because of the actions of the Premier and his colleagues. It will remain a political issue so long as the Premier forces members who sit behind him to approach this subject on a Party-tied vote arrangement. It does him no credit whatever.

A number of other issues need to be raised on this matter that require positive evidence to refute a number of the claims and statements made this afternoon by the Premier. So that this exercise can be undertaken, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: POLICE OFFENCES ACT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Across the House this afternoon I implied to the Premier during a debate that I accused the Government of making sure that certain prosecutions under section 33 of the Police Offences Act had been pulled by the Government. On 2 August 1977, I asked some questions of the Government. It is interesting that those questions were not answered. I challenge the Premier to make available to me all the relevant information.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that he is not allowed to debate a personal explanation. I want him to stick to that explanation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I still believe that the statement I made both this afternoon and by way of questions 12 months ago, needs to be covered by the Government, and I still seek the answers to those questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will withdraw leave if the honourable member continues in that way. This is a personal explanation concerning himself. Does the honourable member wish to continue?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, Sir.

MINORS (CONSENT TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL TREATMENT) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 705.)

Mr. GROOM (Morphett): From the outset I make it clear that I will not support the second reading of this Bill. I propose briefly to set out some of the reasons for the view that I have adopted. First, I do not believe that the common law is so unclear as to make this legislation necessary. I will proceed to enumerate my understanding of the common law.

It seems that minors can consent to a tortious act. If that were not the case, the situation would be quite ridiculous. For example, all touchings that normally take place in a social setting in which consent is normally assumed must necessarily be tortious assaults if a minor is so touched. If a minor can come into contact with people and be interfered with socially, a minor must be able to consent to a tortious act.

The common law is clear that, if a minor can consent to a tortious act, he must be able to consent to medical and dental treatment. It seems that the common law sets out two relevant factors to determine whether or not a minor has given proper consent. The first limb from the case law seems to be that the minor must be aware of all relevant facts so that he might make an informed judgment. These relevant facts are such things as the nature of the medical procedure, the reason for the procedure and the risks.

The other relevant factor is that the minor must have the means, knowledge and experience to appreciate fully the risk and the nature of what is being consented to. Maturity is a question of fact to be determined in relation to each case, not a question of age. Age is probably a factor but it is not the determining factor.

It is also quite clear from the case law that parents have the capacity to consent validly to medical procedures in relation to their children. In my view, that has been established sufficiently by case law and also by custom. The area in which there is some confusion in the common law, but not in my view sufficient to render legislation necessary, is a conflict between child and parent. It is unlikely that a court would decide that a child mature enough to consent validly to medical treatment should then have that decision interfered with by a parent.

It seems that the courts would, in the event of a conflict between parent and child, uphold that, where the child was of sufficient maturity to undergo medical or dental treatment, the child's consent would be the only valid consent. I believe that the law is sufficiently clear, and the principles I have enumerated are my understanding from reading the cases.

If there are any misconceptions about the present state of the common law, that is not necessarily the fault of the Judiciary. A main misconception seems to be a belief that minors cannot consent to a tortious act. That misconception, has arisen evidently. Yet minors are interfered with in a variety of social settings. It is not sufficient to bring about legislation.

I have not been able to find any satisfactory evidence in the Select Committee's deliberations to say that the common law has been unsatisfactory in any way in practice. In simple terms, that means that there is no apparent mischief in the common law that needs to be remedied.

I also notice in this context that the Australian Dental Association wrote to the Select Committee and indicated that it opposed the present Bill. I presume in its amended form. A submission was made by the South Australian Branch of the Australian Medical Association to the Select Committee, in which the association stated:

> This branch believes that the profession does not need any further protection than is already provided under the common law.

The association then referred to the possibility of the Bill being amended to refer to the age of 16 years, and it stated:

> This branch council is totally opposed to the Bill in its present form or in any amended form along the lines anticipated above.

The Australian Dental Association seems to be happy with the law as it now stands, and the Australian Medical Association, in its submission, seems to be quite content with the way in which the common law is operating. I cannot see that there is any mischief in the common law that makes this legislation necessary. There is no case before the courts at present that points to a mischief in the common law, and I am not in favour of legislation being enacted when it is generally unnecessary.

Lawyers from the United States of America have told me that as much of the legislation in that country is in codified form, people are brought before the courts and all that is alleged against them is that they have breached, say, section 222 of the New York Criminal Code, or something like that, and a defendant cannot make any sense of the allegation against him of a statutory breach. Enacting legislation just for the sake of legislation takes away much of the philosophy behind the common law and much of its flexibility.

Further, if the Bill is passed, it may create legal problems. First, I am concerned about to what extent, if any, it will affect the Emergency Medical Treatment of Children Act where it is already provided that the age is 18 years. Generally, if parents who refuse, for example, blood transfusions for their children, doctors nevertheless can go on and give that treatment or perform an operation. The Bill before the House sets the age at 16 years. If a child can validly consent to medical treatment at that age, it must also be the position that a child can validly withhold consent at 16 years, and I am concerned that a conundrum may develop regarding children between 16 years and 18 years in relation to the emergency treatment provisions.

The reason for that is that the parent of a child who is, say, 16½ years may say, "You are not to have a blood transfusion," and, if this legislation is passed and a child can validly consent at that age, that child will then be able

to say, "No, I am not having a blood transfusion," and doctors, who may well know that the transfusion is in the best interests of the child and likely to save the child's life, may face a legal conundrum about whether they can proceed.

I am also concerned in relation to girls of 16 years. A conundrum may develop around the situation that, if at that age girls can consent to medical and dental treatment without the approval of their parents, doctors may prescribe the pill for them, and that may place doctors in an awkward situation if they ask too many questions. Because, apart from the fact that there are some medicinal qualities for the pill that are not associated with sexual intercourse, if a doctor is aware that a girl of 16 is having sexual intercourse and if he prescribes the pill to enable her to continue those activities, when the present law provides that a girl under the age of 17 years cannot consent to sexual intercourse, that doctor is aiding and abetting an offence. I am concerned that a clear conflict in the law may develop in relation to girls having the pill prescribed for them when they are, say, 16 and not being able to consent to sexual intercourse until they are 17.

I do not think the law ought to move in a piecemeal way. I know that the Mitchell law reform commission recommended 16 years as being the age for medical and dental treatment as well as being the age for consent. However, I would prefer the law to move uniformly with proper community understanding of what is proposed.

I think one beneficial aspect of the Bill is that it highlights the need for parents to play a far greater role in the upbringing of teenagers. Who is more responsible—a parent who gives a child a proper sexual education in the formative years, particularly in the teens, or a parent who abdicates that responsibility and, when the daughter gets pregnant, simply says, "You can have an abortion"? It is clear that far greater parental involvement and responsibility are required on the part of the community. I do not believe that parents can leave everything for the State to solve.

Further, if the age is specified at 16 years, there will be a problem about the extent to which the common law is preserved. That may be a matter for interpretation by the courts, but what concerns me is that, if the common law is vague in any way (and I do not accept that it is) and if the age is specified at 16 years, there will be an increasing reluctance on the part of doctors to give medical and dental treatment to children under the age of 16 years without parental consent, even where the child is clearly capable of appreciating the nature and quality of the medical treatment about to be administered.

If the common law is said to be unclear (and I do not accept that it is), that must place doctors in an awkward position regarding children under the age of 16 years. Amendments may meet many of the objections that I have raised, but I believe that, before the law moves in a piecemeal way in relation to the age of 16 years, there ought to be more public debate and community participation in the matter.

Mr. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Wotton:

That, in the opinion of this House, and in recognition of the most valuable voluntary services rendered by so many dedicated and concerned people to the community, the Government should take action to preserve and protect the status of voluntary workers in the community and charitable organisations,

which Mr. Groom has moved to amend by leaving out all words after "That" and inserting the following:

this House commends the South Australian Government for its long-standing policy of support, assistance and encouragement of voluntary effort within the community and that the spirit of partnership which prevails between the Government and voluntary sectors is the best means of helping people in the community who are in need.

(Continued from 13 September. Page 866.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I congratulate the member for Murray for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The amendment moved by the member for Morphett contains a statement that I cannot accept, and I have no doubt that that member recognises that I and other members on this side would not be able to accept it. Let us be clear that we are not damning the Government, which, with the concurrence of the Opposition in relation to Budget discussions, has made available sums of money to a number of volunteer organisations. We accept the reality of that; the situation there is as it should be, with the Government giving sums of money for assistance to volunteer organisations so that they can fulfil their commitments to the community.

However, the matter goes far beyond that. I make that point because I would not want Government members to believe that we wanted a restriction regarding making funds available in a responsible way to the various bodies. Unfortunately, many of them will receive less than they want, but I believe that the manner of determination and distribution of the money made available has been for many years, and will continue to be, determined in a responsible way. That aspect is appreciated.

The member for Murray, in moving the motion, was not concerned merely about one volunteer organisation that was under pressure from outside influences. The member for Morphett tended to suggest that the Opposition was concentrating its attack on this matter purely because of the St. John Ambulance issue, but the question goes far beyond that. If the member for Morphett considered the speeches made in this House over a long period about many volunteer organisations, he would recognise that the matter went far beyond just St. John Ambulance. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 1, clause 2—After line 15 insert the following subsection: (1a) Notwithstanding any law to the contrary no Minister or other person shall have power to give an authorization under subsection (1) of this section on behalf of or in place of the Attorney-General.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)
AND
PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 September. Page 979.)

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Last night at the closing of the Budget debate I was pursuing a line of criticism of the Government for its lack of attention and inducement to industry in South Australia. I criticised the Minister of Fisheries for his recent administrative bungling in that area, and I believe he should resign from that position forthwith. He was tested a few weeks ago during the attempt to administer Government policy relating to the scale fishery, and from the outset that has been recognised from within the industry and outside it as a disaster.

The Hon. Brian Chatterton, assisted by his wife (who is an officer employed by the Government to advise the Premier on matters of agriculture and fisheries), together have caused a situation in the fishing industry that is not acceptable to it, nor is it conductive to the good management of that industry. By their collective actions they have recently caused gross distress to families connected with those directly investigating and involved in the fishing industry.

They have caused distress to those who have invested large sums of risk capital and effort in their enterprising approach to that industry. They have destroyed incentive and confidence at every level of managed fisheries in South Australia, and not only to prawn fishing. Recently, that fact has been publicly reported. Hypocritical statements, blackmail, ultimatum and the like, flowing from this Government regarding the prawn fishing licence issue that have made me sick, to say the least.

The fishermen themselves have never denied that they should pay forthwith increased licence fees to continue in that industry. Indeed, they have agreed to pay immediately inflation indexed increased fees before further negotiations or discussions take place. As a result of agreement, for some assurances from this Government about permanency of licences, a reasonable amount of security within businesses, and a basic industrial protection for their multi-million dollar investment in that industry, the fishermen are prepared to pay substantially increased licence fees. Let there be no question about that. Quite apart from the reports we have seen, the recent radio messages we have heard, and the multiple television interviews with fishing industry and Government representatives, that is the situation at industry level. Prawn fishermen in South Australia have acted responsibly in the overall management of the resource of the industry.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is not what they are saying publicly.

Mr. CHAPMAN: They have said that and will repeat that when they go to the Premier. I hope that he will listen to a bit of common sense later this week. In the meantime, their confidence has been rapidly destroyed. As I have said, the distress to their respective families during this period has been significant, yet regardless of that determined and deliberate attempt to apply the heavy hand and blackmail tactics to that industry, the Government still stands firm in its dogmatic attitude. It is quite disgraceful, in my view, to continue in the vein that the Minister of Agriculture has, apparently supported by other members of Cabinet.

The confidence of the whole fishing industry has been wrecked. A wholesale drift of industry from this State must ultimately result, following the type of dictatorship and stand-over style administration that has been applied. I challenge the Government to refute the statements that I have made that the prawn industry has acted responsibly. It has offered to pay increased fees in the interim, and to pay fees that reflect the increased inflation rate that would apply to licence fees some years ago.

The Minister has made great play of the research element in the industry. He has frequently claimed publicly that his Government requires increased fees for contribution towards research. The research that the Government has put into this industry is bugger all. I retract that remark. It is absolutely minimal.

THE SPEAKER: I want the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I did.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member knows that, when the Speaker is on his feet, he should resume his seat. I hope the honourable member will withdraw that remark.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Indeed I do. The only significant research that has occurred in South Australian waters in the prawn fishing industry is research that the industry has voluntarily undertaken. Indeed, the only officers of the Government department who have gone to sea to pursue the research programme in the prawn fishing industry are those who have boarded the fishermen's own vessels at the fishermen's own expense, as a result of their offer. I repeat that the degree of Government research has, to say the least, been minimal. The data that has been collected and the co-operation—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How much do they want?

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

Mr. CHAPMAN: How can the Government possibly escape being branded the greatest hypocrites over its bungling of this whole issue? It professes to be a union oriented outfit, yet here we have a situation in which the Minister, who is the culprit throughout this whole exercise, demonstrates absolute incompetence. He has called on the fishing industry to pay up or move out. The Minister also said that he has hundreds of applicants on his books ready to go into the industry and pay the $5 000 or $9 000 fees that have been fixed. Where will those people come from?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is hard for me to hear the honourable member for Alexandra. The honourable member for Eyre is out of order. The member for Alexandra has the floor.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I should like the Minister or any other Government member to give the House a list of the hundreds of applicants. Indeed, I challenge the Minister to do so.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Henley Beach to order.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Sir. I want that list to determine who these people are and where they are coming from, because I have been told today that the Abalone Diving Association, the Tuna Fishermen's Association, the Rock Lobster Fishermen's Association (both northern and southern zones), the Scale Fishermen's Association throughout the seaboard area, processors, the Wholesale Fish Merchants Association, and even the Inland Waters Association, have backed the Prawn Fishermen's Association in this matter. This is an incredible situation and shows the utmost unity amongst the industry. All those associations, representing every managed fishery in South Australia, have agreed with the prawn fishery and are backing it to the hilt in this deal.

Obviously, these applicants to whom the Minister has referred have not come from within the industry and, if the

Minister's statement that he has hundreds of applicants is correct, I want to know who they are. They must be scabs on the industry. What a hypocritical situation! These people must be black leggers, because this Minister is a member of a Government that is union orientated. It says, "All in. Join the band and strike together. Stick around fellows: we will stand by you." However, in this instance the Minister is apparently ready to dispense with that sort of attitude and to deal with and issue licences to people who are not in the industry at all and who, indeed, are not licensed or a party to the associations involved. I repeat that, to say the least, this is a hypocritical situation.

All that aside, I am confident that when this Government settles down and gets the seaweed out of its eyes, and when the Minister has a chance to think about this whole subject seriously, he will recommend to Cabinet that it join with him and back down. There is no question in my mind that that will happen. It must happen.

Mr. Max Brown: No way!

Mr. CHAPMAN: Government members say, "No way". However, they said exactly the same thing when I stood in this Chamber only a month ago and described the farcical situation that the Minister was pursuing in relation to the A-class and B-class licence exercise in the scale fishery. Now, let me hear the member for Whyalla say, "No way!" The Government got itself into a floundering mess and did not know which way to turn. Finally, the Government ran itself into a corner, to such an extent that there was no alternative than to back off, and it will do the same again. The quicker that the Government does so, the better it will be, and the quicker some respect will be cultivated for this industry in South Australia. The sooner this happens, the sooner there will be confidence in this industry, as applies in other States.

This State is a standing joke amongst the fishing industry around the Commonwealth. I consider that the culprits in this joke are the Minister, his officers and, indeed, the Government collectively, for standing by the Minister in relation to the ridiculous attitude that he has demonstrated recently. What do members think will happen when this business blows away after the Government has backed down? What will the banks, whether they be the State Bank or the Savings Bank, in South Australia do? Do members think that they will invest in the fishing industry or support these applicants so that they can further develop their business, buy new boats, carry out maintenance, and employ people, which we in this State need so desperately to do? In no way will they do so! They will back off like crayfish themselves. They will not put money into a shaky situation that is under the canopy and control of an outfit such as this. With great respect to you, Sir, no-one with any brains would do so.

I suggest, as I did 10 minutes ago, that these people will at the first opportunity get out of the State, as Raptis and other fishermen have done recently. They are shifting their enterprises and bases to other States where they get a respectable recognition for their efforts.

I cannot refer to my concern regarding the present situation any more than I have done so. I call on the Government to use a little common sense. If it wants to save a little face, let the Government do so at the meeting between the Premier and industry representatives on Friday. I do not care a damn how they get results. I believe that they will back down and, if those involved can do so and save some face, I say, "The best of British luck to them." However, this must happen in the interests of harmony, industrial development, and of those people who have spent their lifetime in this industry developing it. I am not ashamed of any words that I have spoken in support of these people, irrespective of their income or attitude previously. However, in this instance the whole exercise is rotten to the core, and any Government member, be he a back-bencher or a Cabinet member, ought to be thoroughly ashamed of himself for having supported the activities of the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. B. A. Chatterton). That gentleman ought to be ashamed to show his face on the seaboard. I said recently (and I meant it) that, if these fellows get an opportunity, they will keel-haul Mr. Chatterton. That is what he deserves as a result of his activities in this matter.

Members interjecting:

THE SPEAKER: Order! I call on the member for Hanson.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): When the public was first made aware that the State Budget was to be presented to the House they were told that it was Mr. Dunstan's belt-tightening Budget. The South Australian public was led to believe that this Budget would be one of restraint and responsibility and that it would lead, regrettably, to further unemployment and difficulties for the State Government. One year ago, when I spoke in the Budget debate, I said the following (page 102 of 11 October 1977 *Hansard*):

> I think the Government and Opposition should be doing all they can to infuse confidence in South Australia to get rid of one of the worst bugs we have—unemployment. We should all be trying to ensure that industry is manufacturing to the limit and that buyer confidence is restored, and we should be doing everything we can to lift employment in South Australia. However, I have not yet heard of or seen anything in this document that will do that. I am very disappointed. The people of South Australia deserve better, and we must get down to reducing the present level of unemployment.

Yet all we have heard from Government members during the debate is the typical bashing tactics relating to the Fraser Government and unemployment to which we have become accustomed. The blame is being placed fairly and squarely on Liberal shoulders. However, when one looks at the State Budget, one cannot help but be reminded that it is another deceitful document. It is regrettable that members cannot amend or oppose the Budget without Parliament's having to go to the polls.

Any organisation that handles such large sums should be prepared to stand up and be tested on its documents. That does not mean going to the polls; it should be tested line by line, Ministerial portfolio by portfolio.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You wouldn't want to do that.

Mr. BECKER: I would love to challenge the Minister of Transport about his responsibilities and the spending by his department for the next 12 months. Let me remind the Minister that this Budget has again ignored inflation in South Australia, and that during the past four years this country has suffered extremely damaging inflation that was caused by the irresponsible management of his Party when it took office in Canberra. I am reminded of the little dog that ran up the paddock to the top of the hill where the forest was, and then didn't know which leg to stand on. That is reminiscent of the attitude of the Federal Labor Government when it raced in, head down and spent the people's money. Now we have to pay for that.

Exactly the same thing is happening in South Australia. South Australia has a $6 000 000 deficit. It has no reserves: there is nothing to draw on at all. It will have to pay interest on that amount, which is a further burden on South Australian taxpayers. I have examined the responsibility of the Budget document and made a comparison with the past 12 months. This financial year,

from the Revenue Estimates, the Government will receive $1 270 000 000. Last year it spent $1 167 000 000. This year, revenue to the State will increase by 8·86 per cent. Inflation at present is 7·9 per cent; hopefully, it will reduce to 5 per cent.

This State's Treasury has shown no respect for the citizens of the State, because it is ignoring the present inflation rate and increasing its earnings by 8·86 per cent, which is a rate greater than the average person in the community can withstand. On the expenditure side, the Government proposes to spend $1 270 000 000 compared to actual payments in 1977-78 of $1 192 000 000: the increase in expenditure is 6·63 per cent. That is getting somewhere near the average inflation rate for this financial year. I sincerely hope that the inflation rate will be much lower than that.

The Government has shown no respect for the taxpayers' purse in this State. As we examine the document we find that recurring expenditure in many areas was commenced as early as 1970, when this Government came into office and undertook its pet projects. It is now experiencing difficulty in maintaining those projects and in financing them, let alone paying the wages and salaries of the extra people employed.

During the past financial year there was the surprising disclosure by the Auditor-General that the Public Buildings Department was spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on rents for unoccupied premises. It was not only spending that money on rents, but on cleaning as well. We find that no-one in that department can tell us how much money was spent over a seven-year period. We have been able to obtain from the Minister that the figure is now more than $2 000 000. That sum, $2 000 000 over seven years, with compounding interest, could have provided another building to house the extra public servants.

There cannot be a Public Service growth rate more than 50 per cent during that period without finding alternative accommodation for those people. That is where the trap started for this present Government: it expanded at a rate for which its resources could not provide. It expanded at that rate and gambled with inflation, productivity, and development in South Australia. It failed. It failed because the honeymoon in Canberra came to an abrupt halt and left this State (like many States of Australia) in a desperate financial situation.

This is where the responsibility of sound management falls squarely on the shoulders not only of the Premier but also of his Ministers. I have said many times that, if one compares the Ministers in this Government to people in free enterprise, who have to manage the spending and incomes of these large amounts, the Ministers would not be selected for those positions because they would never qualify. We have an incompetent Government and an incompetent Administration. The Auditor-General's Reports of the past seven or eight years support that remark.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Get back to the State scene.

Mr. BECKER: I am getting on to the State scene. I wish the Minister had spoken about the State scene when he spoke on the Budget, but he always wants to blame the Federal Government. The member for Stuart is a member of the State Government and, had he taken heed of the speech I made 12 months ago, he would now join me in doing all he can to inject confidence in South Australia and he would do all he could to see that we do not have the rate of unemployment we have.

Sadly, I believe that this present Government is increasing the unemployment rate, because it is using the unemployed in this State as a political tool. If anyone has ever made capital gain out of an emotional issue of unemployment, the present Labor Government has done that. It has done that around Australia and tried to incite people to come out with some of the most hostile demonstrations we have seen in many years.

It seems par for the course that every few years the Labor Party mysteriously whips up emotional enthusiasm amongst the people to revolt against the Government of the day. We see unemployed people being used for that very issue. The State Government has much more to face up to. While the Minister of Transport may not have the same situation in his department, his colleague, the Minister of Works, knows that in the construction branch there are 600 people who are extremely worried about what their future will be by the end of this year.

Mr. Harrison: Blame Fraser for that.

Mr. BECKER: We do not blame Fraser, we blame the present State Government, which undertook projects it could not maintain. The long-term planning of this Government has failed and is failing the people of South Australia to such a degree that they will pay for that for many years to come. We in the Opposition will have to take over the responsibility that the Government should have accepted, in order to try to introduce confidence so that we can attract industry into South Australia and create employment opportunities, because the Government has failed in this area. If the Minister of Transport had in his department 600 people worried from week to week about what their future is to be, he would not be in here laughing. The Minister of Transport can laugh, because he has dodged the greatest issue that he ever faced. We were told a few years ago by the Auditor-General of the problems facing the railways and of Treasury losses on some of the country railway services. The Minister of Transport had to make a decision whether he would be able to continue to fund those losses and to convince the Treasury of this State that huge amounts of Loan and revenue money were required to finance the debt and to pay the interest. Do not forget that, as the debts mounted to more than £100 000 000, during the short period the Minister of Transport was in charge of that department, the interest kept compounding to such a degree that there was no way the Minister or his officers could foresee the future for the railways in South Australia, so he took the coward's way out and convinced the Prime Minister of the day (that poor man Gough Whitlam) to take over the South Australian Railways.

What a coward's method that was. What about the morale of the personnel in the South Australian Railways and those who were forced to go to the Australian National Railways Commission? The Minister of Transport dodged the issue. He was not game to face up to the problems involved, and now he has lumped these poor people into limbo and accused Nixon of all sorts of things, because Peter Nixon is having to face the problems the Minister of Transport had to face. The Minister, of course, has the benefit of knowing what the problems are and is trying to pre-empt any moves Nixon wants to make. It comes down to a matter of responsible management and, when it does that, the Minister of Transport has failed the State dismally.

In the Public Buildings Department and the construction branch, where we were able to build up a large work force, we find that work is being put out of the department. What is the future of daily-paid workers within the State Government? This Government is doing nothing to face that issue or to create employment. It cannot create further employment when it is ripping off taxpayers' money at a rate greater than that of inflation. It is doing that in this financial year, as it did in the past

financial year and the one before that. The Premier has never told the people of South Australia that he will tax them at a rate higher than the rate of inflation. He has never explained the reason for it, except that he has created the problems that he cannot finance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: Let us look at one of the pet hobbies of the present Government, an emotional issue created, regrettably, by the Hall Liberal Government. The Festival Theatre was to be built as one complex only. It was a $6 000 000 project to seat a couple of thousand people, just what we wanted to boost our cultural heritage and to bring culture to the people. The present Government was not satisfied with just a small theatre, and it decided to add to the complex, so $14 000 000 was spent to develop the Adelaide Festival Centre complex.

It is an attraction, it brings tourism to South Australia, and it provides leisure and pleasure for many people. It has created employment for about 80 or 100 people, but at what cost? Until 30 June 1977, the accumulated losses and deficits of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust totalled $7 540 000. The accumulated losses for the financial year ended 30 June 1978 amounted to $3 901 000, making a total of $11 441 000 of accumulated losses to keep the Festival Theatre going. That is just to operate it and to pay the interest. There is no doubt that whether a person lives at Bowden, Brompton, Lockleys, West Beach, Glenelg North, Pooraka, or anywhere else, he will be pleased to have contributed to the $11 400 000 to keep this $14 000 000 complex going.

To keep the Festival Theatre operating and to make it an operating complex, we have to bring in an organisation known as the South Australian Theatre Company. To 30 June 1977 the South Australian Theatre Company had accumulated deficits totalling $2 800 000. For the financial year ended 30 June 1978 another $1 100 000 was expended, making the total accumulated losses of the South Australian Theatre Company $3 986 000.

Adding that to the $11 400 000 to keep the Festival Theatre going, we have a total of $15 400 000. The member for Albert Park, who interjects, would be delighted to know that we have now spent more in interest and in operating costs than it cost to build the Festival Theatre. If that is not one of the airy-fairy dreams of this highly emotional Government, I do not know what it is. We will not talk about the Jam Factory, with a loss of about $1 000 000, or the South Australian Film Corporation, which is bankrupt.

Mr. Harrison: It's doing a good job.

Mr. BECKER: The Film Corporation has done a very good job with *Storm Boy*, and a few other films, but we have a tremendous amount of money tied up in deficits and interest payments in those organisations. The South Australian taxpayers cannot afford this luxury. We cannot afford to keep accumulating huge deficits so that a few people can enjoy the pleasures of the so-called arts in this State.

Mr. Groom: Would you shut them down?

Mr. BECKER: I would expect Government members to accept that they would have to convince certain people. They are always talking about the working class. I do not believe in class distinction, but apparently Government members do.

Mr. Groom: Would you shut them down?

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Morphett that this is not Question Time.

Mr. BECKER: It would be interesting to know what members opposite believe the average South Australian worker should support. I challenge Government members and the Premier to tell the people of South Australia that, every time a person attends a production put on by the South Australian Theatre Company, the taxpayers are subsidising that ticket holder to the extent of $12·04. In the financial year 1976-77, the taxpayers subsidised theatre productions to the tune of $9·06 a ticket.

Let us turn now to the statistics in relation to patronage. In 1977, 340 performances were put on by the South Australian Theatre Company, with an average patronage of 297. One can guess how many people attended the various performances; between one and probably 500 or 600, but an average of 297. The poor old worker paid $9·06 for every ticket sold. In 1978, there were 282 performances, a dramatic drop, and the average patronage was 331—fewer performances, more patrons, but almost a 33⅓ per cent increase in the subsidy required for each ticket sold. If any member of this Government can tell me that the average worker would be delighted to have made such a contribution, let him do so.

Let us see how the Budget treats the average worker, and let us look at the increased revenue the Treasury will get, this 8·86 per cent which is going to be ripped off the taxpayers in South Australia. Let us look at one area which has not been mentioned by the Government and which has never been mentioned in any of the protest meetings by the Premier or the other stoolies he has from the various union organisations, bashing the Federal Government and telling people to contact their local Liberal member. Keep it going—no-one has contacted me.

Mr. Groom: Why should they?

Mr. BECKER: Why the hell does the Labor Party spend such money on advertisements, telling people to contact their Liberal members of Parliament, about the Federal Budget, when the Labor Party in this State has brought down a Budget that will rip off the taxpayers at a rate greater than the rate of inflation? Let us see what this is doing for the worker. The business franchise tax relates to tobacco and cigarettes. The average worker likes to smoke and to have a drink—and good luck to him; I shall join him. In this financial year, the State Treasury will receive $10 300 000 from those people who indulge in smoking cigarettes, cigars and tobacco in South Australia.

The State Government enjoys a benefit of the 10c duty that the Federal Government imposes on every packet of cigarettes sold in Australia. The Premier did not tell the workers of the State that, because of this, he was going to rip off another 1c a packet from them. He did not say that this was worth $1 400 000 this financial year to the State Treasury. He did not tell the workers of the State that 260 000 000 cigarettes are sold in South Australia each month. Therefore, I believe that the Government is dishonest when it marshals the work force of the State to protest at the impact of the Federal Budget, when the State Treasury benefits from hitting the poor old worker who enjoys the luxury of a cigarette.

Let us get down to the other avenue of benefit to the workers, namely, the liquor tax. The Premier did not tell this State's workers that, because the duty on beer and brandy had been increased, the Government derives additional benefit from liquor licensing fees. He did not tell the workers that he was really against the discounting of liquor in this State. Here again, the Government benefits by several hundred thousand dollars a year at the expense of the workers. Hotel and other licensing fees will yield the State Treasury $11 800 000 this year, as against $10 900 000 last year. We can see how the Government treats with contempt the workers in the State. In times of high inflation, with a vicious and vindictive Government that is looking for money, those are two popular fields to

tax, because many users of tobacco and alcohol will not go without either. Regrettably, that is the tragedy.

Another point is that the average wage in South Australia is $9 a week lower than the average wage in the other States, again putting pressure on the average citizen in South Australia. The Government has already announced increases in water and sewerage rates and in electricity charges in this State. In every area of essential services, the Government steps in and attacks these forms of revenue. Motor vehicle charges are getting out of all proportion, but the Minister of Transport shows little regard for the worker in this respect, because most workers could not get to their jobs without their motor vehicle. On it goes, with the Government's continual effort of taxing the workers and, on the other hand, providing benefits and luxuries that it cannot afford to maintain in the future. The whole situation needs a continual review.

I was pleased, with the presentation of the Budget documents, to see incorporated for the first time the Auditor-General's criticism of various Government departments. This is the type of report I have been looking for for some time. I am not over-impressed by the first effort of the new Auditor-General. It is not a bad report, but I expected an even better one. In the Financial Statement, we find references to the Auditor-General's comments, the action taken, and the present position. Obviously, where some departments have paid scant regard to the comments, I have taken the opportunity to place the relevant Questions on Notice. Upgrading of financial management within the department of the Minister of Transport has not been implemented, so obviously something unusual has happened. Ministers should be far more responsible when dealing with their departments, because what they manage to save lightens the burden on the taxpayer. I sympathise with some of the officers in the Public Buildings Department when it comes to organising and preparing rental accommodation for the use of Government departments. The department is not always at fault, and that is why I placed question No. 563 on the Notice Paper.

I believe that, in future, the Government should take a hard line with property developers so that, when arranging to lease accommodation, the department should be used exclusively for all consultancy work, because it is competent and capable of doing it. However, some developers insist on the Government's using certain consultants. As a result, the department deals with two sets of consultants. At the same time, I would tell private enterprise that the Government would commence to pay rent only on moving in with the furniture and fittings, not six months beforehand, thus preventing so much shilly-shallying with outside consultants. In some areas the Government is being ripped off by private enterprise. As the Government is the client wanting to rent the accommodation, it should lay down its own terms.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Mr. Speaker—

Members interjecting:

Mr. VENNING: I thank members opposite for their applause, but I hope there will be sufficient silence so that I can hear myself speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make that decision. The honourable member may have the opportunity to be Speaker if his Party becomes the Government one day.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Sir; that will be after the next election.

Members interjecting:

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River knows as well as I do that I have been very patient with him over the past two days, and I do not intend to allow him to carry on as he is doing. I have told him that I will name him if he does so. I hope honourable members will hear the honourable member for Rocky River in silence.

Mr. VENNING: As a formality, I support the Bill. As the member for Kavel said yesterday, we have no option but to do so. First, I compliment my Leader on the way he led the debate yesterday afternoon. The press report he received in today's *Advertiser* dealing with the important matters to which he referred yesterday certainly got into the Government. Land at Monarto and real estate held by the Government runs into millions of dollars.

In reply to a question today the Premier, when asked whether the Government would do anything about disposing of its assets and putting the money where it was required, said that if the Government sold Monarto it would lose money. I know that the price paid to landowners when that area of land was taken over by the Government was well below the land's true value. The farmers could not replace the land sold with similar land anywhere in the State for the sum that was paid to them for the original land. Today, that land would be worth about $180 to $200 an acre. What the Government has done in many other areas is another story. The Government could dispose of the land it bought at 2½ to 3 times the sum that it paid landowners when it took it away from them four or five years ago.

Mr. Groom: How much land have you got?

Mr. VENNING: If the honourable member is keen to know what area I have, he should come and see me later and I will tell him about it. I will also tell him more about the people with whom he is associated in the Government's land dealings in the country. I am not alone. The honourable member was associated with some of the largest landowners in the State. The task of expressing a few well chosen words in this debate is easy and important, easy because there are so many issues that could be taken up by a member, and important because of the seriousness of those matters. My colleagues have mentioned some of those matters in this debate. In fact, the member for Hanson mentioned them a few moments ago one after another.

We dealt with the Frozen Food Factory last week in a motion by the Leader. I have never seen the Government more nonplussed than it was that afternoon. The Premier read the report from the Public Works Standing Committee on that matter, but the report was absolutely irrelevant to it. The Minister of Mines and Energy then came out with a tirade, the likes of which I have never heard from him. One could tell that he was in trouble, because he abused my colleague during the whole of the debate.

I believe that both the speakers on this side of the House did an excellent job in a serious debate on a serious matter. Unfortunately, that issue has yet to be resolved. I am concerned about it because the Government is not concerned about it, but this is the way this Government has operated for a long time.

I was going to say that the Government could run something, but I am at a loss to know what it could run successfully. A few of the legal eagles opposite could perhaps run a few things. I guess they run their own businesses fairly well. It will be interesting to see what financial interests they declare to the Parliament.

Mr. Slater: There won't be enough paper to put yours on.

Mr. VENNING: It is not a matter of paper; it is a question whether it will be wide enough for the figures put

down by legal eagles opposite. It makes one laugh when one hears that, if one is a landholder and is on this side of the House, one is wealthy. However, one's assets are in one's land and one must sell the land to get one's money. Once the farm is sold, that is the end of the line.

Mr. Wilson: Succession duties are very heavy.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, they are ready to grab you if you happen to die prematurely. It was interesting yesterday to hear the Leader ask the Premier a question about succession duties. He was again asked a question about them today. It was obvious to anyone listening that the Premier was going to refrain from doing away with succession duties until later.

Mr. Chapman: And drive everyone to Queensland in the meantime.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, but he will announce, as part of this Government's policy leading up to the next State election, that, if elected, the Government will abolish State succession duties. It is interesting to read the Premier's reply to my Leader, as follows:

> I have made clear that at this stage . . .

"At this stage"—they are the three words I wanted to point out. Later he said:

> In the present circumstances facing the State the Government does not believe, that, at this stage, it can proceed further . . . If the Govenment granted further concessions at this stage it would be difficult to maintain the services of the State.

It is obvious that the Premier will, just before the next election as part of his election campaign, announce that he will abolish succession duties, if elected, in the life of the next Parliament. What happens in the meantime? I imagine that the next election will not take place for two years. In that time many people will be caught by succession duties. Many people are leaving the State each day to go to Queensland. They could go to any other State and get concessions in this regard. People who cannot leave the State are burdened with succession duties and must sell half their assets to pay this iniquitous tax, yet, in a couple of years the tax will not exist. In the interim and retrospective to the time of the announcement, people caught in the net will have to pay dearly for a duty that is still being imposed in this State. On Monday 11 September the Minister of Mines and Energy announced that the cost of power in this State was to increase by a further 10 per cent. He said:

> The extra rate for big consumers will be similar to the system of heavier charges for water used above a certain quota . . . from 1 October electricity tariffs would rise by an average of 10 per cent. Most of the increase will be a levy to finance part of the capital needed for a northern power station at Port Augusta.

The history of the Electricity Trust contribution to the Treasury is interesting. It started in 1971, when the Premier introduced the Bill concerned and stated that, because the Electricity Trust did not pay income tax, he believed it should contribute to the Treasury. On that occasion the amount was to be 3 per cent of the gross sales of electricity. That measure was introduced in March of that year and the amount payable therefore in the year would not be payment for a full year, but the amount was $460 000.

In 1972 the trust had to pay $2 080 629. In 1973 the Premier was not satisfied with the 3 per cent, so he introduced another Bill and increased it to 5 per cent. At that time, he said:

> As was foreshadowed in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor on the opening of this session of Parliament, the Government must increase its revenues if it is to avoid an even more substantial deficit on the Revenue Account than it is at present obliged to budget for. The alternative, which is to decrease the range and standard of services that the people of this State have a right to expect, is beyond contemplation. The method of increase in revenue provided for by this Bill has been selected because it can be shared generally by the whole community and it requires no increase in administrative costs for its collection.

In that year, the amount paid to the Treasury was $2 241 906. All the time, with these additional charges having to be met by the trust, as well as the normal increases in costs to the trust, it had to increase charges for electricity. The first increase was of 10·5 per cent in 1974. In 1975 there was a further increase of 12·5 per cent in electricity charges, and the trust contributed $4 862 859 to the Treasury that year. In 1976 there was a further increase of 12·5 per cent in charges and the trust paid $5 810 217 to the Treasury. In 1977 there was an increase of 10 per cent in charges, and the trust paid $6 956 448 in that year. In every year since 1974 there has been an increase in charges, ranging from 10 per cent to 12·5 per cent.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What was the rate of inflation in those years?

Mr. VENNING: You want to remember that the purpose—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should say "the honourable Minister".

Mr. VENNING: The Minister ought to realise that this legislation was introduced to take the place of income tax.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What was the rate of inflation in those years?

Mr. VENNING: It may have been somewhat similar.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You know it was higher than the rate of increase in electricity charges.

Mr. VENNING: Even so, the Premier said that, because the trust did not pay income tax, he was imposing this charge. However, in 1977 the trust paid nearly $7 000 000 and, if income tax was paid on the trust's profit for that year, the amount would have been $3 000 000, so we can forget about inflation from the point of view of why this legislation was introduced.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is still the case that the consumer price index has increased more quickly than electricity charges.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, I agree with that, but when the Premier first introduced the legislation he said he was doing it because the trust did not pay income tax and he believed it should. He used the trust as a means of getting payment into the Treasury. Unfortunately, as the amount paid to the Treasury increases, the trust is required to increase charges, and between 1974 and 1978 there has been an increase in electricity charges of 55·5 per cent. It is amazing that the Government has been able to get away with that. When I have been in my district, particularly the Port Pirie area, pensioners have been concerned about the high cost of electricity. There was no concession to pensioners, and the Government could have helped those people.

Members opposite have said much about unemployment, and I have spoken about it previously. Members opposite who represent the Iron Triangle area almost wept about the unemployment there. I agree that unemployment is a matter of concern throughout Australia. It is fairly high, and it is particularly high in South Australia. We know what happened at the shipyards, and I believe that that was brought on by those associated with it. The wage structure in this country now probably is the highest in the world, and there are the loadings to go with it. It will bring disaster to the country unless someone shows

strength and acts.

We must compete with other countries that have a much lower wage-fixation method. I wish that members opposite, instead of weeping so much, through their association with unions and the like could get someone to see the light. If we are to survive, we must give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. One problem is that we are not getting the production that we should be getting with all the modern methods of production that we have in this country.

Yesterday I listened with interest to the speech by the member for Mawson. He got into rather deep water and, unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many of your colleagues should be wary of getting out of their depth. It is like swimmers going to West Beach. Some do not have to go far before they are out of their depth, and I would say that that would apply to many of the honourable member's colleagues. I advise them to stay near the metropolitan area, where they have lived most of their lives.

The member for Mawson spoke about wheat quotas and land values and said that, when we had wheat quotas in this State, land values held. That is a lot of rot. My sons bought a farm during that period and paid half as much as that they would have paid prior to wheat quotas being introduced or after they went off. It is sad to think that members opposite make statements about rural problems when they know little or nothing about them.

I have dealt with some of the matters that concern people in rural areas. One aspect still to be resolved is that of the non-metropolitan railways. When the Minister was negotiating the sale with his Federal colleagues, he did not provide for the retention of the non-metropolitan railways. He negotiated with the Commonwealth in a low-key way about retirement benefits. It was not until he fixed this up with the Commonwealth that he became outspoken on many Commonwealth Government actions. There is a threat that many non-metropolitan railway lines will close. Is the Minister prepared to buy them back, he being so loud in his protestations about the Federal Minister? I would like to test his enthusiasm to have them back. That would be a fair test of his sincerity. The energy crisis is developing, and these railway lines are already there.

I have ridden on trains between Adelaide and Port Pirie. The guards tell me that there are too many chieftains and not enough Indians. These things need to be straightened out. We all know that there is room for management improvement.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a complaint that is made in very many large organisations by more subordinate people, isn't it?

Mr. VENNING: Yes, but the railway lines are under threat of closure, so let us all pull our weight to try to retain these lines. The bulk handling organisation believes that the railways should handle grain. They can put in a rake of trucks at 3 a.m. and an agent can load them at his leisure, but when a road transport driver comes in he wants his vehicle loaded straight away. Another aspect of the matter is that additional road haulage throughout the State will cut our roads to pieces. Our Highways Department has all the modern equipment, yet it is unable to keep up with the present road works programme. You will know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because you travel widely in the State as you go to and from your home, that the roads are not as good as they ought to be. They could be a lot better. Roads and bridges were built many years ago without the equipment presently available to the Highways Department and our councils, the limitations on working hours, wages and so on. This valuable equipment is not used on weekends. I noticed in Canberra some years ago road works activities proceeding on a Saturday or Sunday, and going hammer and tongs. Good roads do not cost money; good roads pay. We should look now to see what we must do about transportation in this State.

Over the years one would see in the paper that the income of the Government had increased because of the rail movement of grain. Grain movement has been lucrative to the Government. A farmer pays a considerable sum to have his grain hauled to the terminal. Although grain cartage has never paid, it has paid much better than the cartage of superphosphate and so on. Do not let us give the railways away without a fight. We hope that with a combined effort, and perhaps a deputation or two to the Federal Government, we could retain those lines.

Mr. Whitten: Do you think you can convince Peter Nixon?

Mr. VENNING: I hope one day we might go further than that (to Mr. Fraser) and get a Cabinet decision on it, as I think a Cabinet decision should be made. We know that on one hand this closure would mean a big saving, but on the other hand there would be the problem of road maintenance. I support the second reading.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): It is usual for the Opposition to get up and criticise the Budget, to spend hours in debate tearing it to shreds, saying where less money should be spent and other areas where money should be spent. So far my colleagues have done an excellent job at doing just that: with South Australia suffering the worst unemployment of any State in Australia, South Australia having a higher deficit in June than any other State, South Australia being the only State not to grant a major reduction in succession duties, South Australia having a faster growth rate of Government employees than any other State, and South Australia having the highest per capita public debt of any State in Australia. I must confess that I was tempted also to pick the Budget apart and spend my 30 minutes criticising it. Then I asked myself: why add to the economic gloom, even though it is probably justified fully? Why point out that there are 42 000 unemployed people in South Australia and that that is the highest level in Australia on a per capita basis, when the Treasurer must surely realise such elementary facts about the State's economy? No Budget can be all bad. Surely with a Premier and Treasurer skilled in the art of cooking and poetry, not to mention his financial success as an author or his wide experience as an international traveller, this Budget must have some finer point, some optimisim, some generosity that we have all tended to overlook.

With this new determination not to knock the Government and not to see just the despair and suppression all around me, I set out to find and appreciate the good points, the pearls, the gems within the 1978 State Budget. I found 13 such gems or good points that I thought I could mention to the House tonight. First, despite high unemployment, despite the problems facing the 285 000 South Australian's employed in the existing private sector, the Premier has been so generous as to give $2 000 000 to industries that not even yet exist in this State. We cannot be sure that anyone can get it at all, but he has still been so generous as to put $2 000 000 aside. This $2 000 000 looks even more generous when it is realised that he cannot afford to give any concessions or direct grants whatsoever to the thousands of companies that employ the existing 285 000 in the private sector.

The second pearl that I could find in the Budget was to take out a comparison between grants to industry and

grants to films and arts. I first added up the grants to films and arts. I found the following: arts grants advisory allowance, $6 500; regional arts, $2 000; regional venues, $115 000; grants the arts $1 760 000; grant to the Jam factory, $620 000; grant to the South Australian Film Corporation, $1 405 600: grant to the South Australian Theatre Co., $903 400; grant to the State Opera, $585 000; grant to the production of films, $705 000.

I added that up, and it came to $6 102 500. I thought, "How generous it was of the Premier and Treasurer to give that $6 100 000 to the arts and then have to give as much as $2 300 000 to industry throughout the entire State."

Mr. Whitten interjecting:

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I added that up and, for the honourable member's benefit, I will detail that figure of $2 300 000 paid to industry. The Premier gave the Industrial Design Council, $53 000; the Australian Institute of Management, $5 700; $60 000 was provided for overseas trade promotions; payments to industry totalled $1 900 000; the Small Business Advisory Unit received $200 000; and special assistance for Whyalla totalled $163 000; making a grand total of $2 383 000 paid to industry.

I thought, "There is the second pearl or major triumph of the Budget: private industry, despite huge payments to the arts, managed to get $2 300 000." Then I looked through the Auditor-General's Report and found that last year the Premier was committed to pay to his own department a large sum for entertainment, purchase of liquor, and working luncheons, the expenditure for all of which in 1977-78 totalled $16 000. I thought, "Having had to meet that heavy expenditure on liquor, working luncheons and entertainment, how generous the Premier was when, in this year's Budget, he could afford $7 500 to assist the education of all those children in South Australia who have specific learning difficulties." There was the third gem of the Budget.

The fourth point with which I came up was that there had been a drop from $22 000 000 to $4 700 000 in State Unemployment Relief Scheme funds. Initially, that would seem to be a severe drop. However, I think we should be grateful to end up with even $4 700 000 when one sees that the Premier has had to spend $6 100 000 on the arts.

In addition to that, when one examines carefully the Auditor-General's Report, one finds that for the past few years the Premier has been carefully stashing away money in deposit funds so that he ends up with $10 000 000. That is money which the Premier claimed he had spent previously on unemployment relief but which has not actually been spent. This money was, I understand, committed to a line only two or three days before the end of the financial year.

The $4 700 000 to which I have referred was not committed to any particular project, despite the fact that we were told that $24 000 000 was being spent on the State Unemployment Relief Scheme this year. However, that money was whipped out of that fund two days later and stuck on fixed deposit. The good news is that it involves not $4 700 000 but $14 700 000, which could be spent on the State Unemployment Relief Scheme in the current financial year. Undoubtedly, the Premier and Treasurer, who has demonstrated his ability to do this in the past, will find good strategic political purposes on which to spend that $14 700 000.

The fifth gem or pearl that I could find in the Budget was that we were fortunate to save some money that had been allocated last year to the Small Business Advisory Unit. Last year, $250 000 was allocated to the unit, but we have such an excellent Treasurer in this State (we have heard so often how frugal he is; indeed, he boasts about it regularly) that the unit ended up getting only $38 215 instead of the $250 000 that was voted for it. So, that successfully saved the State over $200 000. This year, I see that we are not going to be quite so generous in this respect, allocating the unit only $200 000. Undoubtedly, we will find that these sums, which have been set aside to help small business out of their economic problems, will not be used to their full extent. I am not quite sure why.

The sixth reason for which one must praise the Premier is that he was apparently able to save money in allocations to decentralised industry. Two or three years ago, the Premier announced special pay-roll tax rebates to decentralised industry. He said that the Government would grant rebates of up to 5 per cent, although he imposed certain conditions that were opposed to what the Liberal Party recommended. These conditions ensured that it would be extremely difficult for businesses to get pay-roll tax rebates. So, in the 1977-78 Budget Parliament was generous enough to vote $451 000 for this line.

However, again, our frugal, and apparently successful, Premier ended up spending only $171 000 on this line. Therefore, this State was so successful that it saved $280 000 on so-called decentralised industry. Again, I repeat that, had a Liberal Government been in office, more than that sum would have been spent on decentralised industry. This may have ensured that that industry was more successful. But, after all, are we not trying, when examining the Budget, to put praise on the Premier this evening!

The seventh point that deserved praise was that Adelaide Week in North Malaysia was apparently not going ahead. I recall earlier this year hearing the Deputy Premier saying that it was worth while and an economic proposition for us to spend $300 000 of State funds to send a group of people from South Australia to North Malaysia, putting them up for a week there, and obtaining orders for $250 000 worth of South Australian produce. That Minister argued successfully (although the *News* editorial disagreed with him) that it was worth while spending $300 000 to get back $250 000, despite the fact that we had not included the costs of production or transport, or any other costs. Despite the fact that Adelaide Week has been cancelled this year in an attempt to save funds, I see that $22 500 is still being allocated on this line. I suspect that this is to be used to send our senior public servants to North Malaysia to tell the people there that the week was not on and that we were saving money.

The eighth point from which I had to take heart was that we were being generous enough in this year's Budget to allocate $40 000 to enable the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry to go on an overseas trip, away from the gloom, depression and unemployment here, and to get some light relief.

The ninth point is that the Premier, despite claims amongst some political reporters that his ratings are dropping, is still being particularly generous in his allocation for publicity, particularly in relation to his own department. When one looks at the Auditor-General's Report, one sees that the Premier was sufficiently generous last year to spend $702 000 on the Publicity and Design Services Section of his department. That involved a 100 per cent increase over the previous year's expenditure. Despite that heavy expenditure last year, I am pleased to see that we still have sufficient resources in this State further to increase that allocation this financial year. I am interested to see that the Premier, despite the hard economic times being experienced in this State, still has sufficient money to give an extra $3 400 000 to his own

department to ensure that it is not cut back in any way.

The tenth point that I found in the Budget was that, despite South Australia's lack of success in getting the Redcliff petro-chemical project, we are still allocating an annual grant of $12 000 to the Redcliff Petro-Chemical Project Working Committee to ensure that it can continue to fight for the cause of the chemical plant.

I am pleased to see that the Minister is present. I only wish that I could congratulate him, but I am pleased to see that we have not given up hope altogether. That, of course, must be good news. In times of such gloom, as we have in this State, it is well known that people tend to turn to gambling, and it is apparent from this year's Budget that that is what people will do. The State's allocation of funds from the Lotteries Commission will increase. Perhaps we should be grateful that that is occurring, and that at least that source of funds is not being reduced or held static.

The other pleasing news in the Budget is that there are to be no new taxes in the present financial year. I was confused, however, when I tried to match the total tax revenue for this financial year with that of last year. The Premier said that he expected to collect $304 000 000 from State taxes this year. I thought that, as there have been no increases in State taxes, one would expect that we collected that much last year. I found, on examining the Treasury documents, that we collected only $289 900 000 last year. Again, I take his word that there are no new taxes.

Mr. Venning: How do you work it out?

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

Mr. Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member continues in that way and interjects again I will name him. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The final point I found, which is apparently the gem of the Budget, or the point that we should be thankful for, is that South Australians are apparently still sufficiently well off financially to be able to pay full succession duties, unlike persons in other States, which have had to reduce their succession duties. It was good news that South Australians are able to afford such payments.

I did my best to find points for praise, optimism, and good news in the Budget. After a considerable time I managed to pick out 13 points. I now turn to the overall economic and employment future that I see for South Australia during the next 12 months. The most ominous indicator for South Australia has been the number of people unemployed from June 1977 to June 1978, during which time the number of unemployed persons in South Australia rose from 27 590 to 40 491, a rise of 47 per cent. The national rise was only 18·3 per cent. Those are Commonwealth Employment Service figures. In June 1977 South Australia had the second lowest percentage of unemployment of any State in Australia. It has the dubious honour of having in June of this year the second highest, and in August the highest unemployment figures.

I was amazed when I received the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures on unemployment last week. Based on those figures (and they are the figures that people like Mr. Mick Young hold up as the most accurate), this State has 7·9 per cent unemployment. Those figures are substantially higher than the C.E.S. figures. There is no other State in Australia with an unemployment rate higher than 7 per cent.

It is worth informing the House of the various percentage figures for unemployment in each of the States. They are: New South Wales, 5·8 per cent; Victoria, 5·5 per cent; Queensland, 6·9 per cent; South Australia, 7·9 per cent; Western Australia, 6·9 per cent; and Tasmania, 6·5 per cent. Those figures highlight the extent to which South Australia has a domestic unemployment problem that is well and truly over and above the national unemployment problem.

This deterioration in employment has occurred in South Australia despite it being the only State that has allocated vast sums to state unemployment relief schemes. On the Government's own admission, it has now spent about $54 000 000 (less the $10 000 000 left secretly stashed away) on unemployment relief schemes. I wonder what would have happened if that money had not been spent. I wonder whether our unemployment would now be well above the 7·9 per cent that it is.

Even more disastrous for the State is that, at the end of June, South Australia had the highest unemployment rate of any State in the 15 to 19-year age group, an age group with which we are all concerned. That rate was 19 per cent, and since June that figure has further increased. In South Australia, at the end of August, 22·9 per cent of unemployed people were in that age group. Even worse, from the long-term outlook, is the fact that the number of unfilled job vacancies in South Australia, the indicator we would like to look to if there is to be any light at the end of the tunnel, was below the national average on a per capita basis at the end of June.

From May 1977 to May 1978 civilian employment in South Australia fell from 446 000 to 436 000, which was by far the greatest fall of any State in Australia. That drop in South Australia of 9 800 accounted for 85 per cent of the national figure of 11 500 persons. In other words, here is South Australia, with 10 per cent of the population, accounting for 85 per cent of the national drop in civilian employment. It is no wonder that the Minister sitting on the front bench is trying to drag every possible red herring across the path. That fact is like a knife going through the Minister's stomach and the Cabinet's economic policies.

The manufacturing work force figures in South Australia show that from May 1977 to May 1978 the number declined from 126 700 to 117 600 persons. South Australia had a decline of 7·2 per cent, which was double the national decline of only 3·6 per cent. This, again, highlights the fact that South Australia has a localised unemployment problem, which must be due to no other cause than the complete lack of confidence by private industry in the State Government. Private employment fell from 297 000 persons in May 1977 to 284 000 persons in May 1978. For the same period State Government employees rose from 110 000 persons to 112 900 persons, and that is after the correction for the railways. These changes in employment mirror the fundamental change in employment structure that has occurred in South Australia since 1973. The structural changes can best be illustrated by examining the composition of employment here in South Australia.

Given that all sector figures equal 100 per cent as of May 1973, the changes in our employment structure have been as follows: in April 1973, if we took the total South Australian employment as 100 per cent, we found 71 per cent in the private sector and 29 per cent in the public sector (16·5 per cent in metals manufacturing, and 20·6 per cent working for the State Government). By April 1978 that entire work force had expanded to 105·4 per cent, but now we find that the private sector has dropped from 71 per cent to 65 per cent and the public sector has risen from 29 per cent to 35 per cent (metals manufacturing has dropped from 16·5 per cent to 12·5 per cent, a drop in terms of 25 per cent on a percentage basis and State Government employment has increased from 20·6 per cent

of the work force to 24 per cent).

The decline in the private sector, especially in the metals manufacturing sector, which is the basis of South Australian manufacturing industry, is particularly disturbing, especially for long-term employment opportunities in this State. I emphasise again that these figures show how there has been a fundamental and long-lasting change in the employment structure in industry in this State. If we examine briefly the future for manufacturing industry and commerce in the next 12 months, we come up with an equally gloomy picture. I am amused to see that the Minister of Mines and Energy, the only Cabinet Minister in the House at present, cannot stand—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will stick to the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was pointing out that I wished that the Minister would listen to the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, which highlight the desperate position in this State. Up-to-date information on the output of manufacturing industries in this State is not available. One general indicator, and the best of all, is that of the manufacturing work force. As I said earlier, during the past 12 months the manufacturing work force has declined by 7·2 per cent, and, during the past four years, it has declined by 12·4 per cent.

The ominous sign is that the rate of decline in the manufacturing work force is increasing at an ever-increasing rate; we are on a downward curve, and that curve is gaining pace. However, with increasing automation the manufacturing work force might not be an accurate indicator of actual production, even though it probably indicates a trend of declining overall manufacturing production. The latest available figures for the number of manufacturing establishments in South Australia show a decline of 133 establishments, or 5·8 per cent, between June 1976 and June 1977. That is more than double the national percentage decline—another statistic that the Government apparently will not accept.

In the preceding 12 months, the number of manufacturing establishments increased by 112, and again that shows that we are on a decline. I could quote to the House the outlook for this State's economy as produced by the State Economic Development Department. It is called, in official terms, the Department of Economic Development, but most Parliamentarians like to abbreviate these things. Abbreviated, it becomes "DED"; as someone said recently, that is a true indication of where this State's economy is heading.

I will not quote to the State Government what its own economic advisers say. I have asked for the release of these reports, and it has refused to do so, only because those reports, prepared by senior public servants, are backing up entirely what I am saying, using the same set of statistics and coming to the same conclusions.

I decided to examine another set of figures, the number of companies forced into liquidation or receivership in South Australia. In 1976-77, 93 companies were forced into liquidation, and in 1977-78 the number had increased to 161. In 1976-77, 59 companies went into receivership, and 56 companies went into receivership last year. Adding those figures together, in 1976-77, 152 companies were forced out of business, either into receivership or into liquidation, but in 1977-78 the number had increased to 217. Again, that backs up what I have said: we are on the verge of a very sharp decline in our employment sector.

If we are to consider solutions to this problem, we should study the speech made in this House yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition. There was one fundamental philosophy throughout that speech: we will not assist the unemployment situation in South Australia by creating artificial jobs in this State, as the present Government has attempted to do. The only way of retrieving the long-term employment opportunities in this State is to ensure that we have a viable private sector that has confidence in the State Government: unfortunately, we do not have that. I ask the Government, I plead with it, to change its economic policy and its unemployment philosophy. It is not working. Everyone realises it is not working, and this State desperately needs a change.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The member for Davenport has referred to all the gems in the Bills, so I feel like the fellow who married the widow with 14 children: there is nothing left for me to do, after the member for Davenport has dealt with the issue.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're not likening the member for Davenport to the widow with 14 kids?

Mr. RODDA: I do not think I could wish that upon the honourable member. The Financial Statement has been brought down by the Premier against a backdrop of the highest unemployment in Australia. It is a yardstick of economic management that none of us, as good South Australians, are happy about or proud of. It has been described by some members opposite who spoke yesterday as a nicely balanced Budget. I am in complete agreement with the description and sentiments of my colleague, the member for Light. Perhaps I could add a post script, but I think that the member for Light, in his concise way, aptly described the document.

The Federal Government has come in for more than its share of chiding, a good deal of blame, and money bashing, for not keeping the cash up to the State Government's continual demand. Spoilt children never grow into popular citizens, and the Government, like the rest of us, will have to pay some attention to putting into practice some of its thoughts about tightening the belt.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You sound very fatherly tonight.

Mr. RODDA: That might not be a bad thing for anyone who has taken the oath of office in this forty-third Parliament to put into practice. Unemployment, as the member for Rocky River said, has increased to such an extent that it is causing great concern. Business men and entrepreneurs are finding it exceedingly difficult to keep going with the few orders coming their way, putting them up against the high costs of production.

In recent weeks I have met tradesmen in this fair city, many of whom are from the building industry. They have lost their jobs, and they are finding work exceedingly difficult to get. They are getting worried about the situation they face. Reports are around that, if any of these tradesmen turn to subcontracting or seek a licence to do work on their own account (and this kind of work is available), they will lose their entitlement to long service leave payments accrued over the years. That is worrying. Is the Government putting such people into a straitjacket, if this accusation is true?

The industry cannot provide work for them in its present circumstance. About 90 per cent of them are married men. They cannot leave their homes or families and travel to other States to seek work, and work opportunities exist in some of these places. There is work such as building additions and repairs. If one of these tradesmen sought that kind of work, after vacating an hourly-paid job, he

might find himself forfeiting his rights in the long service leave "bin" that was provided for in the legislation that was passed in the House not so long ago amid a fair amount of clamour surrounding the conference that finally agreed to the measure.

The Premier said that he proposed to increase the Revenue Budget by only $80 900 000, or 6·9 per cent. Leaving aside the consideration of the special recall of funds from the pipelines authority and the special transfer from Loan Account, he proposes to spend $1 248 000 000 this financial year against an appropriation of about $1 167 000 000 last year. The Premier said that present tax rates would not be increased and that no new tax would be introduced. I know that the member for Davenport spoke on this matter, but it bears repeating. Unfortunately, there will be some increases in certain charges to recover the cost of services.

We are hearing loud noises about the high cost of water in some parts of the city and in some country towns. There has been a 10 per cent increase in ETSA charges (the Minister is on the front bench), involving a 6 per cent capital levy. That is really a straightout form of taxation. It is probably for a good use, but it is idle to say that there has been no increase in taxation, when this charge has been introduced. That fools no-one, when it hits the hip pocket nerve. I refer to a letter in yesterday's *Advertiser* from Mr. M. H. Bell, of Marden, a citizen of South Australia. He places a simple connotation on how he sees these Government charges. He sums up, in John Citizen's words, how South Australians feel about the Budget. Among other things, his letter states:

> Among much fanfare Mr. Dunstan introduced the South Australian Budget (12/9/78) accompanied by a statement that there were no increases in taxes.

That is not a politician saying it, but a good, honest citizen of the realm. The letter continues:

> I have since received my water and sewerage rate notice for $95·45. Last year it was $82·17. That means an increase of more than 16 per cent. ETSA has published the new tariffs effective from next month. Based on the same number of units consumed as on my last account, the increase is going to cost me $25·31—or an increase of more than 15 per cent.

Mr. Bell is becoming generous, and will pay the extra taxation to the Premier, who said that he was not increasing taxation. Mr. Bell will be making a contribution to the new capital works in the North of the State. The letter continues:

> Now I have received the renewal notice for the registration of my motor car. The annual fee is now $144. Last year it was $129—an increase of nearly 12 per cent. Three increases within two days of the Budget. Who else but Mr. Dunstan would show such impudence saying there shall be no increases. By the way—please note the percentage increases are about double the inflation rate.
>
> At the same time we see and hear Mr. Dunstan regularly "blasting" Mr. Howard's Budget. Yet should I so desire I could drink a little less beer and/or spirits so I won't be paying any more tax than previously. I could smoke a few less cigarettes so I am not compelled to pay any more tax. I could drive my car a few less miles each week so—am not compelled to pay any more tax—could, in fact, deprive Mr. Howard of collecting any more tax from me if that was my wish.

Mr. Bell then comes to the punchline of his letter, by saying:

> But can I do that to Mr. Dunstan? Certainly not.

He has had a great revelation. The letter continues:

> Like most of my fellow countrymen I must own a car and I am compelled to register and insure it. Likewise I must own my own home so I am compelled to pay water rates whether I use the water or not. For how much longer is the Dunstan publicity machine going to hoodwink the people of South Australia?

They are not the words of a politician, but are the feelings expressed from the heart of a fellow South Australian. I am sure that his comments must dig deeply into the heart of the Minister of Community Welfare, who has just resumed control of the front bench.

The rural industry is close to my heart. Last evening, by leave, the member for Light had inserted in *Hansard* a table prepared by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which set out the gross value of agricultural commodities produced in South Australia. This most interesting document gives the total production in this State from 1973-74 to 1977-78. The 1977-78 season was one of the driest on record. Productivity in money terms in 1973-74 rendered an income to South Australia of $805 000 000. Last year this income dropped to $689 000 000, a considerable blow to any Government. An examination of last year's Budget papers reveals that the Government did suffer, which we must acknowledge, from rail freights, inputs and shortfalls.

The member for Rocky River spoke about the impact on rail freight revenue. Barley yielded only $50 000 000 to the State last year, which was a drop of 46 per cent on the previous year's income of $93 000 000. Oats for grain yielded only $3 500 000 last year as against a $6 000 000 yield in the previous year. Wheat dropped to an all-time low in the five-year period, falling from $74 000 000 in 1976-77 to $49 000 000 last year, a drop of about 33 per cent. Other cereals yielded only $500 000 last year.

Fruit and nuts yielded $55 000 000 last year, grapes yielded $42 000 000, vegetables yielded $44 000 000, and all other crops yielded $27 500 000. Cattle and calves yielded $116 500 000, which was up 17 per cent in the five-year period. That increase was brought about by the drought, which necessitated the slaughter of breeding stock, and that is always a quotient of a bad season. We now have a better season and must build up our herds and flocks. Sheep and lambs went down from $39 000 000 in 1976-77 to $30 000 000 last year. Pigs and poultry increased slightly.

Last year wool returned $134 700 000 as against $153 000 000 in the previous year. Those figures are compared part and parcel with the first year of the period under examination of about $173 000 000. Dairy produce brought in $48 000 000 last year as against $44 000 000 in the previous year. That branch of the rural industry is serviced by irrigation. The total input last year was only $689 000 000.

The Premier forecast some gloom in his appropriations. It could well be that, with the excellent season that we are experiencing across the countryside, he may recoup more than the sum for which he is budgeting. The document inserted in *Hansard* by the member for Light is enlightening and valuable. The Government would do well to keep an eye on it for the impact it may have on the Budget.

The Leader has dealt extensively with succession duties, as have some of my colleagues. I represent a rural district where land values are not cheap. In a reply to a question asked yesterday, the Premier stated that he was not able at this stage to do anything about the abolition of succession duties. He said that the Government has gone as far as it can with succession duties concessions at this stage. He pointed out that the Government was first in the field with some concessions. At this time he is running a poor last. Queensland abolished succession duties two or three years ago and capital is flowing to that State. Succession duties were dealt with by administrative act in Victoria on 1

October two years ago. The table on page 280 of the Auditor-General's Report shows that, although $20 000 000 was budgeted for regarding succession duties, only $18 905 000 was received last year to 30 June. The Premier said that this was due to the concessions given to the spouse.

A large part of the sum of $18 000 000 comes from capital that is tied up with land. We have seen, unfortunately, relatively young people aged 45, 48 and 52 cut down by heart attacks in the prime of their life. Their properties have attracted duty bills of $80 000 and $90 000. They are not big properties but they are highly valued, and the families have had to go out and raise this money, paying high interest on the loans.

Although the Premier makes claims that the Government must have revenue, there is this "disinvestment" in what have hitherto been payable units that were making a contribution to this State and are now being stifled for working capital. Properties have been run down and sold off, and complementary areas, which have been valuable assets that earn income each year, have become fragmented. This action is cutting right across the productivity of the State.

If the Premier looked at the matter as other Premiers have done, he would see that the meagre $17 000 000 that he hopes to get this year from succession duties could be taken up. Succession duties are a cruel impost, and I will give an example. Seven days after Mr. Hamer, by administrative action, abolished the imposition of succession duties on the immediate family in October 1977, a young man suddenly dropped dead on his property on the Victorian side of the border, and a week later another young man passed on in similar circumstances on a property two miles down the road in South Australia. The people involved in the estate in Victoria have retained their capital. However, the South Australians (I think three sons are involved) are shouldering a bill and the place has been mortgaged.

These boys will get through, but they have had to go off the farm to work. I think one bought a power saw to do contract felling in the forests, and another is shearing. They work the farm at weekends. The comparison is that one group of people is paying interest on $40 000, with the place run down, and the other people are scot free with all their assets and capital available to produce. It would be interesting to look at the productivity of the two farms. The member for Eyre could corroborate my statement that people must have working capital, not successions that are whittled away through these iniquitous taxes. It is one of the worst forms of taxation that a Government can level. The Minister concerned is a fair-minded man and I am sure he will consider the matter objectively and remove the tax from the Statute Book, despite what is stated in the document before us.

I refer now to rural industries assistance. It is pleasing that, after a difficult start, an amicable arrangement has been made with the Federal Government to get funds to help farmers in drought-stricken areas. Here we see the opposite side of the coin to that applying with succession duties. Working capital is being made available through rural industries assistance. My district is not affected, but in places like the District of Eyre and the District of Mallee, the farmers did not know which way to turn in making arrangements this year when there was bickering about States making payments so as to attract the full grant from the Federal Government.

The scheme has proved to be a winner. The season is excellent, and a normal season will produce a good harvest. Much wheat will come in from the outside country. The great thing about the Australian wheat farmer, particularly the South Australian farmer, is that he is extremely resourceful and has a special ability when livestock numbers are down. Last year slaughterings were up to a maximum, and that included large numbers of breeding stock. The slack has been taken up by heavy sowings this year. I endorse what my colleagues have said. The Leader has dealt extensively with the Budget, and there are many things in it about which we are not happy.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to speak on this Bill. The speech made by the Premier last week was in similar vein to most of his Budget speeches since 1970. He has continually blamed everyone except himself, as the member for Victoria rightly pointed out this evening when he referred to a spoilt child. My experience is that the more spoilt a child the more he wants and, when he does not get what he wants, he makes a lot of noise. The Premier has done that when referring to the shabby deal that he is supposed to have received from Canberra.

Mr. Slater: The same as Charles Court.

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member listens, I will refer to Western Australia and to the other States. There is much that this State can learn from Western Australia, and the honourable member ought to go and see how well that State is administered. However, I was referring to the Premier's statements about the shabby deal he is supposed to have received from Canberra. We have had only four speeches from the Government back-bench on this Bill, and they were all made by members of the legal profession. I think there is a contest to see who will be the next Minister. Members are competing for the prize. I do not know whether the appointment will be decided on ability or whether the new Minister will have to have the nod from the union movement. I know that you would fill the position with great dignity, Mr. Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): There is nothing in the Bill about that.

Mr. GUNN: There may be, because funds will have to come from revenue to meet the cost of the thirteenth Minister. Appendix I to the Budget shows the increase in Commonwealth general grants to South Australia, from about $509 000 000 in 1977-78 to an estimated $558 800 000 in 1978-79. The Premier will have extra money at his disposal to spend.

The interesting thing about the speeches made by Government members is that those members obviously think that Canberra has an inexhaustible supply of money and that the Federal Treasurer can put his hand in a big bag every day and throw money around as the States require it. Any fool can spend money, and it is good fun spending money that belongs to someone else. However, a prudent person can manage his own affairs well, improve his position in life, prosper, and go ahead.

Government's role is to manage the affairs of the people of this State and the Commonwealth of Australia. It must make sure that it is getting value for the taxpayer's money, and it has to be careful about what areas it collects it from.

Mr. Klunder: What about the tax on wine?

Mr. GUNN: I do not agree with the tax on wine. It was a foolish decision. The problem started in 1974, and it has not been rectified. I make no apology for saying that. We have continually been attacked by the Government. Ministers parade around the country and say, "The State Government cannot do as much as it would like because the dreadful Commonwealth Government does not give us enough money. It should give us more." They do not say where the money should come from. It is quite obvious that they are advocating an increase in taxation.

The honourable member for Morphett had been masquerading as a friend of the small businessman, he is

the slick lawyer who has come into the House and realised that he has only got a short time here, and he is going to make the best of it. In the meantime, he is trying to delude the people in Morphett, particularly the small business men, that he is their friend and that his colleagues in Government will look after them. I want to know what he told them when they have complained about workers' compensation accounts that they had to pay.

Mr. Groom: They don't complain.

Mr. GUNN: He obviously knows nothing about small businesses. He has been misinforming the House; he is a wolf dressed up in a sheepskin. Obviously he has been misleading the people in Morphett.

Mrs. Adamson: A black sheep.

Mr. GUNN: He is certainly a black sheep. He makes out that he is a moderate. The people in business in Morphett want to be more careful. He is more dangerous than his radical colleague, the Attorney-General who at least stands up and comes clean about what he thinks about small business. The honourable member for Morphett spouts forth with a forked tongue. He does not inform people that he is a socialist, that he signed the pledge, and that he has to go along with people like the Attorney-General. I wonder whether he has read the speech that the Attorney-General made at the University of Melbourne on 22 June 1978 to his business colleagues and so-called friends in Morphett.

THE SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member is not going to reflect on the honourable member for Morphett.

Mr. GUNN: Certainly, I would not want to reflect upon my good friend the member for Morphett, but I wanted to make it quite clear to the people in his electorate that they should be careful when that gentleman is holding forth on behalf of the business community, that he will lead them down a path of disaster.

I want to say more about statements Ministers make that are quite incorrect. For some time the Minister of Transport has been attacking the Commonwealth Government. In the *West Coast Sentinel* of 30 August, he was reported as follows:

> Mr. Virgo said the total of $179 400 000 amounted to 1·52 per cent of the personal income tax collection throughout Australia. He said that he and other State Local Government Ministers were greatly disappointed that the Federal Government had not yet met its election promise to lift this figure to 2 per cent.

He was clearly endeavouring to instil in the minds of the people that the Commonwealth Government had gone back on its word. I have informed people in a number of newspapers throughout South Australia exactly what the Prime Minister had to say. He did not ever say that the amount of money would be raised to 2 per cent over the first 12 months of the Parliament. He said:

> Over the life of the next Parliament estate and gift duty will be entirely abolished.

This is most commendable. He went on to say:

> We have cut down increases in your rates by giving local government a fixed share of all personal income tax receipts. This year it was 1·52 per cent. Over the next three years we will increase that share to 2 per cent.

That is quite clear, and it was quite wrong of the Minister, Mr. Virgo, to endeavour to instil in people's minds that the Commonwealth had reneged on its obligation. I am confident that the 2 per cent figure will be met. I appreciate the difficult financial position in which the Commonwealth Government finds itself.

It was interesting to note today that Mr. Nixon has offered to return to South Australia the country railways. The South Australian Government was keen to flog them off to the Commonwealth and very keen to offer all sorts of advice to the Commonwealth Government. I wonder whether it is now prepared to stand up and accept some responsibility. The Government did not want them; it could not run them. It tried to tell the Commonwealth how to run them. The Commonwealth was placed in a position of having to make the difficult decisions. It will be interesting to see how the Minister reacts to this offer of Mr. Nixon.

We have been told that South Australia has the lowest per capita taxation in Australia. Of course, anyone who has examined the figures will know that is totally incorrect, because the Premier has had to get his backroom boys to prepare figures using mineral royalties. We know that unfortunately in this State we receive only about $4 000 000 a year in mineral royalties, while most of the other States receive an average of about $40 000 000 a year. The Premier has accused places like Queensland, when one makes a comparison with figures in that State, of having services that are in no way comparable with those in South Australia. Recently, I received some interesting press releases from Queensland. I remind the Premier of what he had to say earlier in the week. The Brisbane press statement published on 16 July was headed "Dunstan Buys into State Development", and it is as follows:

> Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen believes that Queensland's progressive development policies received an unexpected compliment earlier this month when Labor's South Australian Premier (Mr. Don Dunstan) announced his intention to invest in bountiful Queensland.

He was certainly paying a compliment to that State. In that press statement it was said that Mr. Bjelke-Petersen had said:

> Mr. Dunstan has claimed on many occasions that we have a minority Government in Queensland, but in the 1974 election the socialist Australian Labor Party gained only 36 per cent of the vote compared with the coalition's 59 per cent.

Despite that percentage, the Premier talks about minority Government.

Mr. Klunder: And you believe him?

Mr. GUNN: I have checked the figures myself. Does the honourable member mean to tell me that the combined vote of the National Party and Liberal Party does not exceed that of the Labor Party?

Mr. Klunder: What, 59 per cent?

Mr. GUNN: It got 59 per cent of the vote. No wonder the honourable gentleman had to leave the teaching profession if his arithmetic is no better than that. Obviously, they had to find a safe Labor seat to get him out of the teaching profession. The Premier had much to say about Queensland. I thought it would be interesting to remind him that 20 years ago $270 000 000 was invested in that State, although at present the investment pending for Queensland and other parts of Australia is astronomical.

I was interested to see the figures that appeared in the 9 May issue of the *Bulletin*. The table of figures therein showed potential new investment projects for Australia. Of course, the first State that came to my mind was South Australia, in which, I hoped, tremendous investment would be taking place. Unfortunately, according to the *Bulletin*, we have firm orders for only $121 000 000 this year, although we have a possibility of about $1 000 000 000 worth of orders.

However, when one examines the position in Queensland, one sees that it has firm orders this financial year worth more than $1 100 000 000. Yet the Premier has the gall to talk about Queensland's going backwards! That State has a possible investment of over $4 000 000 000. As this set of figures is difficult for one to read to enable one

to get the full benefit thereof in *Hansard*, I seek leave to have the table, which is purely of a statistical nature, inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Does the honourable member give the Chair the usual assurance?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

TOTAL VALUE OF ALL PROJECTS

State	Firm	Possible	Total
	$m	$m	$m
NSW	1 198	1 402	2 600
Victoria	1 017	1 433	2 450
Queensland	1 167	4 033	5 200
West Australia	1 455	6 945	8 400
South Australia	121	1 079	1 200
Tasmania	72	378	450
Northern Territory	10	840	850
Confidential	1 451	—	1 451
TOTAL	6 531	16 110	22 641

*Possible includes both the possible and long-term investment projections stated on the map.

Mr. GUNN: Those figures indicate clearly the degree of confidence in which business holds the South Australian Government. Earlier, the member for Davenport, in an excellent speech—

Mr. Groom: You couldn't have been listening.

Mr. GUNN: I was, and I enjoyed the honourable member's speech, which was up to his usual high standard. The honourable member's speech, which was full of positive suggestions, was well thought out and positive. I am looking forward to hearing more from the honourable member. It was disturbing that the figures that he quoted proved how badly we in South Australia are managing. I refer to the unemployment figures, about which members opposite have had much to say for the past few years but regarding which they have done very little. The members for Whyalla and Stuart and other honourable members have had much to say about this subject and the unfortunate decision to close the Whyalla shipyards. However, they said nothing whatsoever when Mr. Jones, the former Federal Labor Transport Minister, torpedoed the shipbuilding industry in Australia. They did nothing but stood idly by.

Mr. Max Brown: How can you possibly make that statement?

Mr. GUNN: It is true.

Mr. Max Brown: It is not, and you know it. What a cranky statement to make.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased that the member for Whyalla has woken up. It is obvious, from the way in which he is screeching and carrying on, that the honourable member has a guilty conscience. I refer the honourable gentleman to statements made by Mr. Jones when he was the Federal Transport Minister and how he got rid of shipyards, which statements have been reported in *Hansard*.

What did that honourable gentleman do with Adelaide Ship Construction Company? What did the member for Whyalla do about it? Absolutely nothing! Mr. Jones got rid of a shipyard in Queensland and then destroyed the shipyard at Whyalla. It was only after the election of the Fraser Government that the honourable gentleman got off his backside and started to make some noise. However, before the Fraser Government was elected, Labor members were too busy getting ready to mine and export uranium. They were basing their economic strategy on uranium mining which, if it was allowed to develop in this State, would create much employment. The Premier and his advisers were planning to bring that development into operation.

However, when the Fraser Government was elected, they became spiteful. They wanted not only to spite the Federal Government but also to make things as difficult as they could for it. They have been spiteful to the people of this State, denying them great economic benefits. They are completely out of touch with public opinion, which is still running strongly in favour of the mining and exporting of uranium.

Mr. Klunder: But you argued against that.

Mr. GUNN: I did nothing of the kind. The honourable member has been reading *Alice in Wonderland*. The honourable gentleman is going to have the opportunity next week to see where the Labor Party stands and whether it wants to deny the people of this State the great benefits of uranium, or whether it is going to adopt the narrow attitude it normally displays on matters of importance to the people of this State.

For the benefit of the honourable gentleman making a fair bit of noise at present, I quote what the position is. In August last year 59 per cent of persons interviewed by a Gallup poll favoured uranium mining. In September last year 57 per cent of people interviewed favoured uranium mining. In July 1978, 59 per cent of people interviewed clearly supported the mining and export of uranium; 27 per cent of people interviewed were opposed; and 14 per cent could not make up their minds. That means many people favour mining this valuable export.

Australia depends to a large extent on its mining industry for employment. In this State, and particularly in my district, mining operations are undertaken at Iron Knob and Iron Baron, but there has been a reduction in work done at Iron Knob from three shifts to one shift. Copper mining at Kanmantoo has ended. About 4½-years supply of copper is available at Burra, unless new finds are made. The new company that has taken over there is to carry out extensive surveys to ascertain whether there are other supplies of copper in that area. There is a limited operation of copper mining at Mount Gunson, but there are tremendous deposits at Roxby Downs. Last evening the member for Morphett was critical of mining companies making a profit.

Mr. Groom: Excessive profits.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member was critical of the profits they were making. He was throwing his words about loosely and attacking all and sundry. Has he examined the little document sent to us today about C.R.A.? This is a company that the honourable member would probably say makes an excessive profit. It happens to employ 26 000 people; it has about 40 000 shareholders who have invested more than $650 000 000 in the operation; and it pays more than $86 000 000 in taxation and nearly $40 000 000 in royalties to Governments. If that is not in the interests of the people of this country, I do not know what is.

The sort of nonsense the member for Morphett peddles is not only dangerous and short sighted, but it causes unemployment and a lack of confidence in the business community, particularly among those people that we are trying to attract to this country so that we can create more jobs. I wonder what Dow Chemical will think when it reads the nonsense that the honourable gentlemen has been peddling. The Premier is trying to get Dow to come to this State and invest, but the honourable gentleman knows that it will not come here unless it can make a profit, because the directors of that company have a responsibility to shareholders. That company coming here would be in the best interests of this country, yet foolish members opposite in this place make short sighted, negative statements, like those made by the member for Morphett, that are harming South Australia.

We on this side have been accused of knocking South

Australia. Statements emanating from members opposite have done more harm to business confidence and the future of this State than anything said by anybody on this side. It is time members opposite examined their own record, which is shocking. They will then realise why people are not coming to South Australia: because members opposite are not giving industry confidence and are placing far too many barriers in the way of small industries.

People cannot be bothered taking on more staff. They have to pay high workmen's compensation, and there are more forms to fill out than one can shake a stick at, and foolish industrial awards which should be looked at. If members opposite tried to examine the problems of the industry, instead of continually attacking it, they would be making constructive efforts to improve the situation.

Earlier this evening the member for Alexandra had something to say about the fishing industry, and I strongly support what he said. The fishing industry in this State has been managed, under the Labor Government, by a series of Ministers. They have failed miserably. Two Ministers did not have a great opportunity, so I will not be too critical of them, but the present Minister would be the worst of the lot.

Mr. Chapman: Absolutely.

Mr. GUNN: Absolutely. He does not have the confidence of any section of the industry. Unfortunately, this Government has continually proved that it does not know how to select its staff to administer its departments. It does not know the type of people who should be placed in charge of departments, and in many cases its selections have been quite unsuitable and the people appointed have immediately got whole sections of the industry offside.

The Government got rid of Mr. Olsen; it shanghaied him sideways smartly. For some time, the department went along its merry way, not achieving a great deal, but not getting into very much trouble. It was fairly bureaucratic, and it was difficult to get a reply from the department. Then the Government selected Mr. Kirkegaard. His appointment has really put the cat among the pigeons.

Mr. Chapman: He's about as popular as pork in a synagogue.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member said that; I did not. With the member for Alexandra, I attended a crayfishermen's meeting, and it did not take Mr. Kirkegaard very long to get the whole meeting, with one or two exceptions, completely offside. It was suggested that there should be worker participation in the industry, and that deck hands would have three or four cray pots, and so on, and the poor fellow with the boat, who is battling to make a living, would not count.

Then Mr. Kirkegaard selected the prawn fishermen. We all know that sections of the prawn fishing industry have been very successful, but that success has benefited the people of South Australia. We want more successful people here, not less. We do not want to drive them away. The Premier has no course of action other than to dismiss the Minister of Fisheries and his advisers, and action should be taken to remove the Assistant Director of Fisheries, who has done nothing but cause trouble, heartbreak, and concern within the industry. Every week, members on this side have cases brought to their attention.

Last Saturday morning, I got off the plane at Port Lincoln, from where I intended to fly up the coast. In the few minutes I was at the airport I had brought to my attention one of the most ridiculous decisions I have heard. One of the best fishermen in South Australia had had his licence taken away. The solicitor had to go to the magistrate to try to get it back, but in the meantime about 10 people had lost their jobs. That is happening all the time.

Mr. Slater: What did he do to lose his licence?

Mr. GUNN: He did not lose his licence. He had it taken away, without any just cause, because of the bureaucratic actions of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and the Minister, who does not know what he is talking about.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections, particularly bearing in mind that the honourable member has only two minutes left.

Mr. GUNN: On other occasions when the Premier has had trouble with portfolios, he has shifted Ministers sideways. We saw how the former Minister for the Environment was removed, not before time. I had intended to say something about that department, but I shall wait until we reach the lines. I put it to Government members that, if they want to see a soundly based fishing industry in this State, one which will make a significant contribution to the welfare of the people, they must do something about the current administration.

There is no point in having any industry at loggerheads with the Minister and his department. There is much difference between having a strong and capable Minister and having one who has only the ability to get people offside. If any member has discussed the matter with the prawn or abalone fishermen or with any other group, he wil realise that they must be given the right to transfer their licences with their boats, thus giving them tenure of security. Then, they will be prepared to discuss increases in fees, which, I believe, should not be based on the ridiculous system of the length of the vessel or the horsepower of the engine.

Mr. Chapman: On the Western Australian scale.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, they have led the way—

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

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): I will not cover the same ground as many others members have covered. They have covered the ground adequately and effectively and have made many points applicable to the Budget. However, there are several points I will bring forward. My first point concerns business in the country. In this Financial Statement, the Premier said:

> I have included in this Budget several measures which will help the private sector. One such is the Establishment Payments scheme which will help significantly to induce business to locate and expand in this State.
>
> My colleague, the Deputy Premier, announced last week the introduction of the Establishment Payments Scheme. This new scheme, which is estimated to cost $1 500 000 in 1978-1979 and more in a full year, is available either as a long-term loan or a grant to new and expanding industry in South Australia. It is designed to encourage economically viable and export-orientated industries to establish or expand in South Australia by means of a single payment related primarily to the increased employment and capital investment undertaken. The maximum payment to any one firm is $375 000 in nominated regions, $325 000 in the major service centres, and $315 000 in Adelaide and the rest of the State.
>
> Two factors have led us to introduce this new policy. In the first place, studies have shown conclusively that the success of regional development is intimately bound up with the birth rate of new firms. Most of today's big firms started off as small operations, and we would like to give every encouragement to the birth of new firms and their

subsequent growth.

Many businesses in country centres today, because of the seasonal conditions that have prevailed over the past two or three years, are finding it difficult to stay afloat or to obtain finance. I realise that the Government's proposal has been put forward with good intent, and I hope that there will be those who will take advantage of it, and who will be able to establish export-orientated businesses in regional centres. Many businesses which, as the statement says, started in a small way are still suffering growing pains and cannot obtain finance. I hope that the Government will be able to assist such people. I am aware of one firm in a Mid North town with a population of about 1 000. The firm employs seven married people, and it is experiencing a serious liquidity problem.

The proprietor has tried to gain finance through finance companies, banks and other financial institutions. He has been to the Premier's Department and everywhere possible for finance. I consider that it is not his fault as far as any maladministration is concerned because, over the years, he has engaged a business management consultant and, in his words, he was told by the Premier's Department that it could not fault his system.

Dr. Eastick: Do you know the reason for his liquidity problem?

Mr. RUSSACK: Seasonal conditions.

Dr. Eastick: Credit he has extended to others.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes. He cannot take advantage of rural assistance, yet it is through this problem that he finds himself in the position that he is in. He has had consistently on his books $90 000 owing from people from whom he knows he will get the money as soon as seasonal conditions allow. He has received the following letter from an acceptance company:

> We wish to advise that your account with this company has now been finalised. May we take this opportunity of thanking you for the manner in which your account was conducted by enclosing an A.1 credit rating card for your future use when arranging finance. If in the future you require money for home improvements, education expenses, motor vehicle purchases or, in fact, for any worthwhile purpose, do remember our real estate leasing and personal loan finance plans. For prompt, efficient and friendly service please do not hesitate in contacting our office.

That was in 1977. He contacted the company's office, but the company is not willing to assist him. As I said, he has approached many financial organisations. He was told that he could not obtain finance because he was not in the metropolitan area. He wanted that reason in writing. The following letter is from one of the finance companies he approached:

> We refer to your letter dated 7 August 1978 asking whether we would finance country properties. Unfortunately, I wish to advise that our current company policies do not allow us to lend outside the metropolitan area. Thank you very much for your inquiry.

Mr. Hemmings: What's the name of the company?

Mr. RUSSACK: It is the same company from which he received a letter last year. I would prefer not to disclose its name, but I would be prepared to show it to the honourable member later. That reason is general with just about all financial institutions. I commend the Government for what it is doing, but I suggest that there are other areas that need help and attention. If this man cannot get assistance in the next year three or four months he is likely to go under, and others to whom he owes money could also be seriously affected.

I should like to develop the point I made about other established businesses in country areas. In most country towns it is difficult to procure work. I know of a painter in a country centre who has been doorknocking to obtain work. The work that he has obtained is amazing.

However, others have had to put off employees because they have not had the finance to enable them to carry on. I ask that consideration be given to giving assistance temporarily to people in this situation, provided they can prove that their business is viable and that they can show that they can repay the money in a reasonable time.

The next matter that I wish to mention also will have an effect on business, possibly small business, in this State. In the *News* of 11 September, an announcement was made about electricity charges. The headline states "Power to cost you more," and the report is as follows:

> Adelaide householders can expect to pay up to 30c a week more for electricity from next month. And the increase will be even greater for people regarded as excessive users of power . . . Mr. Hudson announced "inverted tariffs" to discourage excessive electricity use. Under this system, increased rates will be charged for large domestic consumption of electricity. The extra rate is expected to affect about one in 50 South Australian consumers. It will apply to people whose annual light and power bill is over about $400 a year and/or whose off-peak water heating bill exceeds $200 a year.

A report in the *News* of 12 September states:

> The Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hudson, promised four months ago that the Government's decision to go ahead with plans for a 37½-hour week for South Australian electricity workers would not lead to an increase in power costs. He said the shorter hours would be applied gradually as productivity increased. Attacking the decision, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry said it would "inevitably" lead to increased costs. "Semi-government monopolies and a trade union should not be allowed to combine in a sweetheart agreement like this," the chamber asserted.
>
> It would be inaccurate and unfair to attribute the higher electricity charges announced by Mr. Hudson yesterday to the shorter working week decision reached so recently and still not fully applied. However, it will be hard to persuade everyone that there is no relationship at all between the two developments, though Mr. Hudson says the latest 10 per cent increase in charges —the second within 14 months—is due mainly to Federal Government restrictions on State borrowing. The result, of course, adds up to increases in charges exceeding the inflation rate during the past year or two.

Following that, a firm received this letter, dated 7 September, from the Electricity Trust:

> MONTHLY METER READING
>
> One of the conditions under which electric energy is supplied provides that accounts can be rendered weekly, monthly or quarterly as determined by the Trust and it is our policy to read meters for consumers with high electricity consumption at monthly intervals.
>
> Although past accounts have been prepared on a quarterly basis, because of the value of your account, we propose to render future accounts monthly. The next account will be based on readings to be taken approximately 1 October 1978 and, thereafter, accounts will be rendered at monthly intervals.

Attached is the account for the three months ending November last year. I know that this firm has regularly met its commitment for electricity accounts, and it has not received that letter because it has been dilatory in its payment. The company contacted the Electricity Trust and was told that there are about 3 000 firms similar to it, all about the same size, that have received notices and letters to the same effect. I am only relating what I have

been told.

These firms now have to meet that monthly account with money that on short term could probably have gleaned a little extra interest. They are worried because, if the meter is read monthly, and if the trust does not take into account that for a greater consumption there is a larger discount, this firm will, with many others, be paying a greater monthly electricity bill than it would be if the meter was read after each 90 days, as has been the custom in the past.

These are only small things, but they are hindering progress in businesses particularly in those that employ people. Everyone who is dismissed because of financial difficulty is another one on the unemployment list.

I guess that the Minister of Transport will be getting sick of me talking on these matters of local government and road works funding, but I will refer to them until some satisfactory reply is given about the situation in this State. The Minister has frequently said to members on this side, "Why don't you join with us and endeavour to get more money from the Federal Government, and then we could distribute more to local government?" I agree: if we could only do that. However, is the money that is received distributed equitably, or should there be a different way of distributing it?

Some statements made by the Minister, or recorded and attributed to him, are statements such as, "Electoral promise down the drain". One of the Messenger Press publications in the Tea Tree Gully area published the following report:

> Recent Federal grants to local councils have sent yet another election promise down the drain, according to SA Local Government Minister, Mr. Geoff Virgo.
>
> 'Councils counting on a realistic increase in this year's grants are right out of luck," Mr. Virgo said. The Minister was releasing details of grants under the Federal Government's personal income tax sharing agreement. He said South Australia's share represented an increase of only 8·5 per cent of over last years figure of $14·2 million.
>
> "In real money terms, this is no increase at all," Mr. Virgo said. Almost $1·8million will come to local councils.

I am trying to point out that there was an increase. I admit it was suggested that there would be a 10 per cent increase in the amount of personal income tax refunded to the States. However, there was apparently a miscalculation and, in real money terms, it involved an increase of only 8·5 per cent. It was stated in the *Advertiser* of 3 August that Senator Carrick had said that general revenue assistance to local government had increased from $80 000 000 under the previous Labor Government, to $140 000 000 in 1976-1977, to $165 000 000 in the past financial year, and to $179 400 000 this financial year. As a result of that increase, South Australia received $15 400 000 although to date a break-up of the allocations in the State does not seem to have been released. Although such releases relating to councils have appeared in the provincial press, I have not yet seen a break-up covering the whole State. I believe that a question has been placed on notice and that it will be answered.

I now refer to the Minister's statement that an election promise had gone down the drain, because I have a right to defend my Federal colleagues in this matter. In this respect Senator Carrick said:

> The Government—

referring to the Federal Government—

> of course adheres to its undertaking to increase local government's share of tax collections to 2 per cent during the life of this Parliament. The timing of the introduction of this increase will be considered in the light of the prevailing budgetary situation.

So, we can all expect, during the life of the present Federal Parliament, that an increase of 2 per cent will be passed on to local government by the Federal Government from personal income tax revenue. I refer also to certain reports regarding road funding. A report in the *Advertiser* (the date of which I am unaware, although I know that it was a recent one) states:

> The South Australian Government has cut its highway constuction and maintenance programme for 1978-79 because of reductions in Federal funding. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday that projects worth $1 200 000 have been cut out of the road programme.

I should like honourable members to take note of that figure. The implication is that $1 200 000 will be cut from road funds, because that is the extent of the reduction in road funds received from the Federal Government. The report continues:

> Mr. Virgo said that the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) had changed the basis of indexation used to calculate the grants in South Australia for national highways construction and maintenance. The original basis had been agreed on by Mr. Nixon and all State Ministers of Transport earlier this year. The effect of Mr. Nixon's move was to reduce South Australia's grant by more than $1 000 000.

The grant started at $1 200 000, and now it has been reduced by more than $1 000 000. Yet the report continues:

> The grant was now $16 133 000, only 6·95 per cent more than last year's instead of the 10·1 per cent as originally advised by the Federal Transport Department.

I have calculated what that reduction would amount to. Last year it would have been $15 084 618. With the 6·95 per cent increase, it amounts to $16 133 000. Had it been a 10 per cent increase, it would have amounted to $16 608 164, an increase of only $475 164. I do not know whether the Minister included the State contribution in the $1 200 000, but the funding which was expected was reduced by only $475 000. That is a fair amount of money, but I consider some of the press releases have been misleading in relation to road matters.

Yesterday in this House a question was asked by the member for Stuart about the Stuart Highway. The first part of the Minister's answer to the question was as follows:

> Regrettably, there is a real risk that no work will be done on the Stuart Highway in the current financial year unless the Federal Minister for Transport changes his attitude and gives approval for the work to proceed. I am sure members are fully aware that the States no longer are the masters of their own destiny.

He continued, later:

> It is a shame, because we are now the puppets of Canberra, and we can spend money only with the approval of the Federal Minister. He has withheld his approval of the expenditure funds in accordance with the provisions we have put forward and subsequently amended to try to meet his needs, in an attempt to cover up the sins of omission . . .

And so it goes on. The following question was asked today in the Federal Parliament of the Minister for Transport:

> Is the Minister aware of claims made in South Australia yesterday that there is a risk of no work being done on the Stuart Highway this year unless the Commonwealth Minister for Transport changes his attitude and gives approval for the work to proceed?
>
> Is this claim correct or is Mr. Virgo being mischievous again?

The Minister's answer was as follows:

> Yes, I am aware of the particular matter raised by the honourable member. The answer given by Mr. Virgo is a complete distortion of the facts. The real situation is that I

have approved South Australia's 1978-79 national highways programme. I did this on 13 July.

This programme when submitted to me by Mr. Virgo included works on the Stuart Highway; principally, the sealing of the 50 kilometres gravel section between Bookaloo and Mount Gunson, north of Port Augusta. Mr. Virgo proposed to spend only some $270 000 this year on this section plus $60 000 on other construction works on the highway.

In approving South Australia's program, I pointed out to Mr. Virgo my dissatisfaction with this low level of expenditure and urged him to increase this amount to at least $1 000 000. Mr. Virgo has since advised me that it is possible for him to spend $900 000 on the highway this year. I have informed him that I am pleased to note this increased commitment to the highway but I still wish $1 000 000 to be spent. I have further suggested to him that I would agree to a transfer of $550 000 from the national commerce road category to ensure that the higher priority works on the Stuart Highway can get underway this year.

This amount is surplus to the requirements of the present declared national commerce roads in this State. I did this because I am not satisfied, on the basis of the information provided by Mr. Virgo, that the Hawker to Leigh Creek road, which he wants me to declare a national commerce road, meets the necessary criteria; that is, facilitates interstate or overseas trade and commerce.

To June 1977, $25 500 000 was spent on the South-Eastern Freeway over a period of two years. To June 1978 an additional $8 000 000 was spent, plus $2 400 000 on the Swanport deviation. The South-Eastern Freeway comes under the heading of national roads. I suggest that some consideration be given to the diversion of money to the Stuart Highway, so that its present condition might be improved.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): What has been termed by some people in the community as the "Dunstan decade" is now known as the "Dunstan decay". People are leaving the State in increasing numbers, much as the Premier denies this. Anyone with connections in business in the community knows, however, that it is correct. Many businesses have closed down and moved from the State. Unemployment is rife and is increasing in South Australia, perhaps more rapidly than in any other State. South Australian unemployment has jumped from being the lowest in 1977 to the highest. Quoting the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, I see that unemployment in South Australia at present is 7·9 per cent, against the Australian average of 6·2 per cent. South Australia leads the field in unemployment.

Taking into account the $4 700 000 that the Dunstan Government is spending on unemployment relief schemes, the Government will have spent over the years $51 000 000 on such schemes. In spite of that, however, unemployment has increased. One could regard such unemployment relief schemes as merely band-aid treatment.

I do not now why the Government has not seen fit to encourage the private sector in creating long-term employment. The sum of $20 000 000 has now disappeared entirely from the scene, leaving the situation as it was previously. I suppose that the extra money saved will go to areas dearer to the heart of the Premier and of the Government.

In this Budget, we saw a repetition of what happened a couple of years ago, when it was announced in glaring headlines that the Budget would contain no new tax rises. That is a hardy annual. We are told that, but the increases take place before the Budget comes in.

Apart from the shocking unemployment situation, South Australia has the costliest water in Australia. It may not be the best, unless one has a good filter fitted to one's supply, but it is the dearest. The cost of water when the Government first came to office was 7·7c a kilolitre, and it has now risen to the record pace-setting figure for Australia of 22c a kilolitre, the dearest in the Commonwealth. The cost a kilolitre in Sydney is 17·15c; in Melbourne, 14·25c; in Brisbane, 14·25c; and in Hobart, 12c. This is one of the areas in which the Government is taxing all people, whatever section of the community they belong to.

There are many other areas of high taxation. We know that socialism means high taxation because, if a socialist Government provides all these facilities for people and tries to live up to the expectations of the welfare State, from the cradle to the grave, it must have money. The only people who can provide money to the Government are the taxpayers. No Government has money of its own; it plays around with other people's money, so it is the taxpayers' money that is spent. It is much easier for any Government, whether State, Federal, or local, to spend other people's money than it is to spend its own money. Really, it should bring more responsibility, because I believe that one should be more responsible when spending another person's money that when one is spending one's own money. If a person makes mistakes with his own money, that is his problem, and he must learn to solve it. If one makes a mistake with another person's money, one has to call on him to solve the problem. That is precisely the situation in South Australia at present.

There is no doubt that the methods of taxing are designed to help and supplement special schemes on which the Government has its eye. One is called industrial democracy—what might develop into what is termed worker control. I had the privilege some time ago of attending in Adelaide the world conference, organised by this Government, on industrial democracy. It was amazing to see that all the overseas countries invited to attend the conference were socialist countries. There was socialist representation from Great Britain and West Germany.

Mr. Groom: What is socialism?

Mr. MATHWIN: I spent 10 minutes telling the honourable member, who is definitely out of order in interjecting out of his place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order for interjecting out of his place.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member has been here long enough to know the rules of the House. I explained socialism to him some time ago. Obviously, he has not read it. I will post him a copy.

Mr. Groom: I read it, but I couldn't understand it.

Mr. MATHWIN: There is none so blind as he who cannot read, and no-one is as deaf as the person who does not wish to hear. Socialist countries were represented at the conference. The member for Morphett's colleagues from Great Britain were present. Big Jim and his colleagues are in charge of England and are doing a massive job to stagnate the whole country and to bring it to its knees with great notionalised organisations such as British Steel, which is losing more than £1 000 000 a week. British Leyland, another nationalised industry, is losing so much taxpayers' money that it is like an endless pit. Nationalisation just does not work.

Invitations to attend this conference went to the socialist countries of Europe. An invitation was not sent to the Americans, who have, I understand, a form of industrial democracy that has been working for many years.

Industry had proceeded and has extended the lot of the worker in far-reaching areas and far-reaching fields. That

could well be termed industrial democracy. The Premier had latched onto this new type of "in" thing, and he has taken it under his wing to look after it. Speakers at the conference came from West Germany, which, incidentally, does not have complete trade unionism. In fact, in that country few members of the work force are members of trade unions.

Another country to attend the conference was Yugoslavia, which is well to the left of the socialist countries in Europe. Mr. Ted Gnatenko was at the conference to give his advice on what happened when he went to work there. His trip was financed by this Government: it cost the taxpayers a large sum of money to send him there so that he could tell us how industrial democracy worked there. He explained that worker councils were in full command in Yugoslavia and had the right to hire and fire. In Germany, too, they have the same right, as has Sweden. The Premier regularly tells us that South Australia should be known as the Sweden of the Southern Hemisphere.

Sweden has so much legislation in relation to industry, workers, industrial democracy and the like that it cannot all be understood. I understand that about 21 Acts must be abided by in relation to worker relations. In Yugoslavia, worker councils have full control. If management wishes to fire a person for some reason, the worker appeals to the worker council, which must give its members 14 days notice of the meeting. After that time the worker council meets and discusses that worker's problems. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 21 September at 2 p.m.