

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 23 September 1981

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 32 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr Glazbrook.

Petition received.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PETROL SUPPLIES

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY** (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: I wish to report to the House on the latest developments in the petrol situation—a situation which is now grave. Honourable members will be aware that yesterday afternoon, after the union involved had rejected an Arbitration Commission order to return to work, the Government was forced to announce even stricter arrangements for the rationing of petrol in the designated metropolitan area.

These arrangements now have to be such that inevitably the wheels of industry will grind to a halt unless the Government receives an immediate guarantee of union action to alleviate our supply situation. Because of the gravity of this situation, I have again urged the Australian Institute of Marine and Power Engineers to take immediate action which will allow the Port Stanvac refinery to reopen. Such action will require the union to exempt from the strike, without limitation, the *Esso Gippsland*, now berthed at Whyalla, which is needed to remove fuel oil from storage at the refinery so that further refining can be undertaken. Early this morning, I sent an urgent telegram to the union seeking its immediate consideration of my request. So far, I have had no response. That has been the history of my daily repeated contacts with the union.

Mr Millhouse: They don't—

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: They don't even obey the orders of the Arbitration Commission. Consequently, this afternoon I have taken action to seek leave to intervene before the Arbitration Commission hearing of this matter in Sydney. It is the Government's intention that the Minister of Industrial Affairs and Government officers should fly to Sydney to brief counsel with a view to seeking, from the commission, an order for further exemptions of shipping to alleviate South Australia's supply situation.

Yesterday, the union exempted from the strike the *Cel-lana*, to sail from Geelong to South Australia, but this will give us only an additional three days fuel and, without a resumption of operations at Port Stanvac, and a guarantee of continuing supplies of petrol, the Government will be unable to relax the current rationing and restrictions on sales of petrol. To do otherwise would be to put at risk the maintenance of essential industries and services.

Mr Millhouse: Who are you briefing?

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: Not you.

Mr Millhouse: I just wondered—

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: As it is, I have been advised that there is now only three weeks supply of fuel

remaining to maintain these industries and services, and, in metropolitan service stations, present supplies are only sufficient to provide for four days supply at normal consumption levels.

All South Australians therefore are being held to ransom by a group of men who at present earn between \$24 000 and \$43 000 a year, who now want 10 per cent more than this and one day off duty on full pay for every day they have on duty, and who are prepared to seek to bring this State to its knees to achieve their ends.

An honourable member: Disgraceful!

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: It is absolutely disgraceful. Words are not strong enough to condemn this sort of piracy and anarchy. The consequences of the actions of these few men now pose for all South Australians the gravest threat to our petrol supplies in recent memory. Honourable members may recall—

The **Hon. J. D. Wright**: Why don't you fly across and see them, instead of carrying on like this?

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. J. D. Wright**: If I were the Minister—

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: I name the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Does he wish to be heard?

The **Hon. J. D. Wright**: Mr Speaker, I apologise for whatever I did. I am not quite sure what it was, to be completely honest with you, Sir. I take exception to the irrational way that the Minister is now carrying on about this matter. I was merely commenting that, if I was the Minister in charge (and, sure, I do not deny that South Australia is in a very precarious situation), I would not be inciting the dispute, as the Minister is. I would be flying to Sydney to see the organisers of this dispute.

Mr Mathwin: And give them their demands.

The **Hon. J. D. Wright**: Not giving their demands, but I would ask them to consider South Australia's position.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Deputy Leader has been given the opportunity to explain why he was named, not to enter into a debate relative to an issue which is the subject of a Ministerial statement now.

The **Hon. J. D. Wright**: Mr Speaker, I do not know why I was named. There was no attempt to reflect on you whatsoever. If I did, I apologise. I make that point very clear to you. I was going to leave this Chamber because the Deputy Premier was inflaming this situation, which I do not think can help the people of South Australia at this stage. I made no reflection on your decision. After you warned me, I was quite surprised. You did not, in any circumstances, as you have in the past, warn on more than one occasion, and the next moment you named me. I have no idea why I was named, but if I was wrong I apologise to you. If there was any reflection on you, I hope you will accept my apology.

The **SPEAKER**: The Deputy Leader seeks to suggest that he does not know why he was named. He immediately started to interject again, having been warned. It was for defiance of the Chair that he was named. On this occasion I accept his explanation, but I do not want any member on either side of the House to believe that acceptance on this occasion is a precedent, and that on future occasions a warning will necessarily bring relief, such as I am offering now.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: I would like to report that I contacted the union daily when it was contactable. I offered to fly to Sydney to talk to the union. That offer was not accepted. It seemed rather pointless to me to fly

to Sydney and bang on the door and not be admitted. I certainly offered to fly anywhere in Australia to talk to the union to see whether we could get any sense into this matter. That offer has been rejected. As I said, the Minister of Industrial Affairs will fly interstate with appropriate officers, and seek to intervene in the commission. The Government could not have done more to try to communicate on a reasonable basis with the union. At the weekend it was not contactable, so I worked through the A.C.T.U., which could not find the union either. It had gone walk-about, I was told.

Honourable members may recall that strict restrictions on petrol sales were imposed in 1972 and 1973 because of strikes by key workers at the Port Stanvac refinery. However, the present circumstances are far worse than those experienced on those two previous occasions. At the end of the 1972 strike, two tankers which had been standing offshore were immediately able to off-load product. In 1973, the refinery was not forced to close. In the present situation, the refinery is closed and we have no ships waiting offshore, nor do we have any guarantee when continuity of supply will be restored.

When, in 1972, the former Premier, Mr Dunstan, imposed strict rationing without notice, he said this, and I quote from the *Advertiser* of 29 July 1972:

We could not take the gamble of not restricting fuel supplies. It is not a matter of convenience. It could be a matter of life and death.

Due to circumstances even more serious than those applying in 1972, South Australia faces the same situation as that highlighted by Mr Dunstan. The former Premier was also reported as saying that 'he could not believe that workers would countenance the potentially dire results to people which would occur unless petrol were obtained'. I urge all honourable members to join the Government in putting that point of view to the members of the trade union movement involved in the present dispute.

## QUESTION TIME

### PETROL RATIONING

**Mr BANNON:** Will the Premier give an undertaking that his Government will commence an immediate and searching inquiry, following the conclusion of the present petrol emergency, into the way in which the emergency has been handled administratively by the Government with a view to compiling an efficient, workable, simple and equitable plan to deal with any recurrence of petrol shortage in South Australia?

Everyone concedes that the position of rationing is a difficult one and poses a number of administrative problems. My office has been inundated with calls from members of the public, petrol retailers, oil companies, trade unionists and others involved in and affected by the current situation—all of them with a range of complaints and problems concerning the administrative arrangements and the information communicated by the Government.

Petrol retailers have contacted my office to say, first, in their view the amount of fuel stocks held by them and generally in the State is apparently not fully known by the Government; secondly, the scheme has discriminated against certain retailers with no prospect of compensation in the present situation; thirdly, it has been reported to me that certain individuals are proposing schemes whereby they may get around the rationing and restriction situation in South Australia; and, fourthly, members of the public have complained that on the Sunday when rationing was first announced it was not made clear to them precisely under

what criteria and for what period coupons or emergency restrictions would be lifted and there were insufficient numbers of personnel, both on the telephone and in person, to handle their complaints.

Members of the public (and this has been reported in the media) have complained about the fact that there have been insufficient outlets whereby permits can be obtained. They have stated that the Government has given as a reason for this that to open too many outlets would mean that too many coupons would be issued and emergency stocks of fuel would be depleted. It has been put to me that surely in that case, it is suggested, the criteria under which fuel is to be issued for emergencies are too broad if all the available fuel will be used up and that, rather than create a situation of obtaining permits by exhaustion, a concept of permits by need and emergency should be developed. In light of all those points and all the confusion that has been raised by the Government's administration of the recurring problem, I ask the question.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I find the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition quite extraordinary. First, I will deal with the supplementary questions concerning matters he raised in his explanation. To say that the amount of fuel stocks in South Australia is not known is quite ridiculous: there is a daily tally, and indeed the Minister has been reporting on a daily basis to this House and to the public about how much fuel there is in South Australia. Those people who may have (and we have only the Leader's word for this) contacted him to say that the Government does not know what stocks there are, are talking nonsense. I doubt whether the Leader of the Opposition did anything to disabuse them of their misapprehension.

The second point was that the system has been discriminatory against certain petrol stations. For the life of me, I do not see how the matter can be discriminatory to any petrol station. All petrol outlets are in exactly the same boat; they supply petrol on a common basis. People with coupons can go and get their petrol from their normal dealers. If the Leader thinks there is something discriminatory about that, I do not understand how he can possibly justify that thought. Thirdly, the Leader says that there are schemes for getting around the petrol rationing system. One such instance has been brought to the attention of the Government. Action will be taken forthwith and that practice will cease; action will be taken at law to make sure that it ceases.

The Leader says that on Sunday members of the public were not given the full criteria. That is not true, either. They were given the full criteria, which were that they had to have their registration papers and some form of evidence to indicate that they needed petrol to be able to travel to work. The majority of people did this. In fact, I heard some quite interesting stories, particularly the one concerning the plumber who took the door off his car so that he could show the officers the registration disc to prove that in fact he was the driver of that registered vehicle, because he had left his registration papers at home.

The Leader also says that an insufficient number of public servants were in attendance. Let me say to the Leader that there were far more public servants involved in this exercise than there were when we last had petrol rationing in 1973. The Leader has already made a cowardly and vicious attack against the dedication of those public servants, who have been working so well on this matter, and it ill-behoves him to bring that up again. Then, it is said that insufficient permits were given out. Permits for about 2 200 000 litres were handed out on Monday, and are valid for the rest of this week. Those people have fuel to get to work, and we are very pleased that we have been able to keep those people at work as long as we have. For the

Leader to say that this is a recurring problem is again a totally inaccurate statement. Petrol shortages are certainly becoming far more common than we would like, but we have not got to the stage of rationing since 1973. Yet the Leader refers to 'this increasingly frequent occurrence'—really he does exaggerate enormously.

We have learned a great deal from this experience, and we drew on the experience of a former Government in office in 1973, but we are doing far more and I would like to say that I believe that the situation has been handled very well indeed, in extraordinarily difficult circumstances. We have kept people at work as long as we possibly can; we have made sure that as many people as possible have obtained petrol; and now that it is not possible, because of diminishing supplies, to continue petrol supplies to everyone in the community, we have instituted the fairest and best system of petrol coupons.

The Leader of the Opposition needs to examine his own attitude to this entire business, and examine it carefully indeed. It is an extraordinary attitude that he asks for an inquiry—not into the causes of the strike; not into the actions of the union, which is holding this State to ransom and which is threatening to bring South Australia to its knees; not into the action of the union in defying the order of the Industrial Commission—but an inquiry into how the Government is handling the rationing situation. Having criticised the handling of the crisis and having criticised the public servants who have done so much (and I may say that their job has not been made easy, because no-one in the community likes being deprived of petrol by the actions of a small group of unionists), he wants an inquiry into rationing.

I want to know, and the people of South Australia want to know, why we have not heard from the Leader any comment as to the real cause of the difficulties in which we now find ourselves. He is always very anxious to criticise. As usual, he has come up with no positive suggestions as to how things could have been handled otherwise, and he ignores the blunt cause of the strike—that a group of trade unionists in another State is defying the Industrial Commission and, I repeat, holding the community of Australia to ransom. Why is he not now condemning the action of that union? There would not be one person in South Australia, other than the Leader of the Opposition and maybe his supporters, who does not condemn the actions of that union—not one. Those people are getting not only at Australia, not at the—

**An honourable member:** They condemned you.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** So they should; you organised them.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Indeed they did. That was a most cowardly thing to do.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Those unionists are attacking the fabric of our society. They are attacking their fellow unionists, depriving them of jobs and of a livelihood. The long-term consequences of this strike will be felt for many years. South Australia's economy will suffer because of the damage to the tourist industry and manufacturing industry. There are very few expressions of sympathy coming from the public. Apparently, the only expression of sympathy for the trade union involved comes from the Leader of the Opposition and his supporters. Our reputation, as a nation, for the delivery of goods, and the satisfaction of contracts, will suffer very dearly indeed from the actions now being taken by this small group of bandits.

I know that the Leader of the Opposition has to make a stand of some sort to try to identify himself with the difficulties that are currently besetting this State. Regardless of his personal feelings, he is bound to support the

trade union movement come what may. I do not think it does him any credit to be quiet when everyone else in South Australia is full of resentment at what is being done to every single person in this State by the actions of trade union members in another State.

#### LAND EASEMENT

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy enumerate what formula or criterion is used by ETSA in assessing land required for easement, and can he say whether the trust considered land values on all route options of the proposed 275 kilovolt power line when assessing the original costings? Some constituents have suggested that ETSA has not undertaken sufficient planning and investigation into the effects of the proposed line, and have called on the Government to direct ETSA to undertake alternative route options.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The precise criteria for easement are not known to me, but I shall certainly ask the Electricity Trust for a report on the matter. This question has been aired over a good many months now, and a number of deputations have been introduced to me by members of Parliament in relation to the construction of this power line. I think it is true to say that, wherever the line goes, some people will be dissatisfied. That is the nature of the exercise. The only alternative is to locate all power lines around the borders of the State, and that would be quite impossible and quite ridiculous. I have had deputations from various groups. Several alternatives were investigated by the Electricity Trust, and only two emerged as real options. I had equal numbers of deputations from people who were discomforted and opposed to both options.

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** If the member for Stuart has any specific interest in this question, I would suggest that he see me later, but I ask whether he would be prepared to hear my answer. If he has any particular interest, I shall be only too happy to send to him the same material as I have sent to the others. I am perfectly happy to take up with the trust the question of the guidelines surrounding the obtaining of easements. I think the honourable member also alluded in his question to a request that I should direct the trust to a certain course of action. The trust is not under direct Ministerial control, although many statutory authorities are, but it is not in the power—

*The Hon. Peter Duncan interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not take much notice of interjections from the honourable member opposite. He owes me an apology, if nothing else, for certain insults, but he has not been man enough to do that yet.

**An honourable member:** Who are you talking about?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am sorry—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I just interjected, out of order, on the Minister, and he claimed that I owed him an apology. I do not understand—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There is no point of order.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am sorry. The voice came from that direction. I would not want to impute to the alternative Leader remarks which I thought were made by someone else. Unlike a number of statutory authorities, the Electricity Trust is not under the direct control of the Minister, so it would be inappropriate for me to direct the trust. However, I shall be only too happy to take up the

points raised by the honourable member and seek the views of the trust to see what we can do to answer the queries raised.

### PETROL RATIONING

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the Government is yet able to state its attitude to the rather ingenious plan of a Windsor Gardens service station proprietor who is preparing to import petrol direct from Victoria by road tanker to service people who have formed themselves into what he suggests is a co-operative, thus by-passing the official rationing system? Is this system discriminatory to local resellers with full tanks? The Labor Party has been besieged today—in fact, there have been 15 calls—by calls from angry petrol resellers, especially those in that part of the metropolitan area. They have complained that they are unable to sell petrol although they have full, or nearly full, fuel tanks. While they cannot capitalise on their stocks, they are still having to meet interest repayments on their overdrafts, and some are slowly going bankrupt. That is the information I have been given today. The co-operative idea might be making no inroads into South Australian petrol supplies, but it hardly appeals to operators who are caught in a serious financial bind. I am sure the Minister has looked at this matter.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I believe that the Opposition will support wholeheartedly the action that the Government is taking. We are getting legal advice at this moment. I have the latest report that the Premier has just handed to me. The Attorney-General has contacted us. He has discussed the legal position, which is contrary to the spirit of rationing operating in the State. The Crown Solicitor is at present attending a conference convened with the person involved, his legal adviser and Crown Law officers. We will get further advice. I agree with the Deputy Leader—this is one of the rare occasions on which I do agree with him—that this is putting enormous pressure on those people who are forced to sit on their petrol stocks, because they are in the main a large part of the petrol stocks remaining in South Australia. In many cases, money is owed on them. The Government is appreciative of the pressure which is on the whole of the community. There is certainly a degree of profiteering in what this gentleman is doing.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution will make it difficult for you.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We know the difficulties. We know that the gentleman concerned has had legal advice. Even if, as a last resort, we had to put something through this Parliament in a hurry we are gratified to know we will have the support of the Opposition. We are looking at this problem at this moment. It is only a drop in the bucket. What is happening is insignificant in relation to the total petrol problem, but it is the principle of the thing, as the Deputy Leader has mentioned. It is putting pressure on other people who are playing the game. We intend to do everything we can to cut it out this afternoon.

### INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on the member for Glenelg for his question, I advise that the member for Glenelg will occupy the seat of the Government Whip until the Government Whip returns from C.P.A. business.

**Mr MATHWIN:** My question is to the Minister of Transport.

**Mr Hamilton:** Is this on correctional services?

**Mr MATHWIN:** You do need it, I agree. Is the Minister of Transport aware of the comments of a Mr Scott, M.H.R. (a Labor M.P.), casting doubts on whether international flights will come to Adelaide soon? What arrangements has the State Government made with the Federal Government to ensure that there will be at least limited international access to Adelaide? Is it contemplated that any construction work is to take place at the Adelaide Airport to bring this plan to fruition?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I think, in view of the uninformed comments of Mr Scott (M.H.R. for Hindmarsh), I should put the record straight. I am glad to do so today, because yesterday I attended a meeting of the State Airfields Committee, and I will deal with that shortly. On coming into office, this Government realised that the acquisition of international flights to Adelaide was a matter of extremely high priority. It was quite obvious that South Australians were severely disadvantaged by the lack of international flights coming to this State. South Australians were disadvantaged when travelling overseas in relation to both cost and time. Some people leaving Adelaide for overseas had to pay up to an eight or 12-hour penalty in time on some flights, let alone the additional costs involved. Moreover, this Government gives an extremely high priority to tourism, and there is no doubt that this State is suffering because of the lack of international services to Adelaide.

To be quite frank, I believe that this attitude was held by the Opposition. I believe that it also held the view that international services should come to Adelaide, although we saw precious little action on its part to try to bring this about while it was in Government. We gave this matter an extremely high priority, so we had a series of meetings with the Commonwealth. We did not just set up a series of meetings between me and the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr Hunt), but we also attacked the problem from many fronts, the most important being, of course, at Premier to Prime Minister level.

Indeed, the Minister of Tourism also made great efforts on this State's behalf with her counterpart in Canberra to try to obtain international flights to this State. It was not an easy job; it took much time, effort and work, not only by Ministers concerned but also by public servants. When the Prime Minister was in Adelaide, it all came to fruition when he attended a State Cabinet meeting and it was put most forcibly to him Adelaide's desperate need to get limited international air services to this capital.

I am pleased to say, as has been said publicly before, that I firmly believe, as does the Government, that limited international services will fly into Adelaide Airport at the end of 1982. I am not prepared to give a specific date, but somewhere within the last three months of that year. Regarding Mr Scott's comments, I am pleased to say that, having attended the State Airfields Committee meeting yesterday in this State, a committee set up as a result of negotiation between the Federal Minister and myself and comprising Commonwealth and State public servants, I really believe that that will come to fruition.

These are the facts regarding upgrading of Adelaide Airport. In the last Federal Budget, \$40 000 000 was allocated by the Commonwealth for upgrading major R.P.T. airports in Australia to take wide-bodied aircraft. I am pleased to say that, of that \$40 000 000, \$8 000 000, more than twice South Australia's share on a population basis, will be provided for upgrading Adelaide Airport to take those wide-bodied aircraft. We are getting \$8 000 000, which is far more than our share for that upgrading, because modifications to Adelaide Airport to take the air-

bus and other wide-bodied aircraft will also provide for baggage handling facilities, not only for containerised baggage from an airbus, but also for a fully laden 747. That is important and should be recognised by the House.

Also, in the Federal Budget a further \$3 000 000 was allocated to be spent at Adelaide Airport, entirely for providing international facilities. That is \$11 000 000 to be spent in this financial year by the Commonwealth, of which \$3 000 000 is specifically earmarked to provide international facilities.

**Mr O'Neill:** Will a fully-laden 747 be able to take off?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** No, not with a full fuel load. I am happy to arrange for a briefing for the member for Florey on this matter, as I have done with other transport matters; time does not permit now to give the full facts. A fully laden 747, as far as fuel is concerned, will not be able to take off from Adelaide Airport, but a fully laden 747 S.P., special purpose jet, will be able to do so. As negotiations continue with the airlines to see which airlines will be interested in coming to Adelaide (and talks have already been held with three of them, particularly Qantas), we will be able to make an announcement about that later.

In conclusion, one of the most difficult questions we have had to face, and one of the most important matters that the State Government has considered in getting international facilities into Adelaide Airport, is protection for residents surrounding the airport. We have undertaken that we will not see a lifting of the curfew at Adelaide Airport, nor are we interested in seeing an extension of the main runway over Tapleys Hill Road.

We also understand, from information made available by our officers, that the introduction of the wide-bodied aircraft will mean fewer flights to Adelaide and, therefore, less noise nuisance. Bear in mind, also, that international aircraft of the 747 type are no noisier than the 727 we are used to now.

**An honourable member:** Are they the only aircraft that will be allowed? What about the Airbuses, the 737?

**Mr Trainer:** What about the 737?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I do not know whether the honourable member for Ascot Park wishes to answer this question himself, but he is making enough noise to do so. I reiterate that this Government has remained steadfast in its determination to see that the residents surrounding the airport are not disadvantaged by the introduction of limited international flights, and that is why we have always said that there should be only limited international flights. I believe (and am quite confident in saying this) that they will be with us in the latter part of 1982.

#### VICTOR HARBOR LINE

**Mr O'NEILL:** Will the Minister of Transport inquire of Australian National Railways whether it intends to dispose of 19 of the 25 passenger coaches used on the Victor Harbor line and, if it does, will the Minister take steps to prevent the sale of those coaches? It has been stated to me that Australian National has received a tender from a Victorian entrepreneur to purchase 19 of the 25 coaches which are being used to convey tourists to Victor Harbor. It has also been stated by persons committed to the expansion of the South Australian tourist industry that the sale of the coaches will have an extremely adverse effect on the preservation of the Victor Harbor train service, and on the ability to service conventions at Victor Harbor.

It has been further stated that the Victorian Government is assisting the entrepreneur in the interests of the Victorian tourist industry. Given the Minister's quite recently expressed concern about tourism in South Australia, I hope that he

will be able to assist in the retaining of these coaches in South Australia.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I do know that Australian National called for tenders for the disposal of 19 coaches. I was not aware that they were from the Victor Harbor line. I know of no proposal by Australian National to reduce services on the Victor Harbor line, or of any proposal by it to alter the agreement or understanding reached between it and me last year. I must say that this Government regards the Victor Harbor line as an extremely important one. I think I can say quite confidently that, if there is any proposal by Australian National to do away with that service to Victor Harbor, this Government would want to take the strongest action possible to prevent that happening.

**Mr Keneally:** Send it a nasty letter.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I will take what the honourable member has said as a Question on Notice and get him more detailed information about those coaches. I understand that there is no plan by Australian National, at this stage, to make any alteration to the Victor Harbor service. Indeed, I would be surprised if it did so without consulting me, because, as the honourable member for Stuart was implying in his interjection, I do have a ready means of communication with Australian National, which usually keeps me informed about what is happening in that type of matter.

#### TRANSMISSION LINE

**Mr GUNN:** My question, which is supplementary to that asked by the honourable member for Rocky River, is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy. It also concerns the proposed 275-KV transmission line from Port Augusta to Adelaide. In view of the concern that has been expressed by landholders through whose properties this line is going to pass, will the Minister approach senior management of the Electricity Trust and members of the board and request them to enter into meaningful negotiations with the landholders concerned as a matter of urgency?

As the Minister pointed out in reply to the member for Rocky River, he has been approached by a number of persons who would be concerned by either of the proposed routes. My question brings to the Minister's attention the problems that will be experienced by landholders whose properties this line will be passing through. Therefore, I believe it is in the interests of all concerned that the Electricity Trust, as the responsible organisation, immediately sends its officers there to talk to the people concerned.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The short answer to the question is 'Yes, I will approach the Electricity Trust for discussions.' There have been protracted discussions, but I will certainly ask that there be some more.

#### CHILD ASSAULT

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Will the Minister of Health undertake to have an independent inquiry carried out into the assault of a 14-month-old Aboriginal child at Maitland Hospital on Saturday 5 September? On Saturday 5 September between the hours of 9 p.m. and 9 a.m. Sunday 6 September, a 14-month-old Aboriginal girl, Tarlee Rosemary Sansbury, who was in Maitland Hospital suffering from bronchitis, was assaulted around the face and body. After being contacted by the police concerning the incident, the parents went to the hospital and were told by a Dr Talbot, who was medical officer on duty at the time, that the child had been assaulted with a sharp instrument around the face close to the eye, on the shoulder, back and arm. The doctor stated that the

injuries also could have been caused by bite marks or sharp finger nails. The mother took the child from Maitland Hospital to Minlaton Hospital, where she was placed in the care of Dr Kinnear. I understand from sources who have spoken to the mother that the hospital has carried out its own investigation and has said that the assault was possibly carried out by a four-year-old child in the same ward. The mother has said that the police had told her that an assault of that magnitude could not possibly have been the action of a four-year-old child. Tarlee has since been released from Minlaton Hospital but has continually suffered from bouts of hysteria, which Dr Kinnear has said are the result of the incident at Maitland Hospital. I understand that Tarlee's parents are not happy with the results of the hospital-based inquiry and will not be satisfied until an independent inquiry is undertaken as to the circumstances surrounding the assault.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, Mr Speaker.

#### NATIONAL PARK CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

**Mr LEWIS:** Does the Minister of Environment intend to increase the number of consultative committees associated with the National Parks and Wildlife Division beyond those of Fleurieu Peninsula, the Lower South-East, and Fort Glanville to serve other parts of the State in which parks are situated and also to serve specific interest users such as apiarists (beekeepers) who have had traditional access to areas now contained in more recently dedicated parks?

The success of the consultative committees I have already mentioned is becoming increasingly well known. I have had several representations from my constituents seeking formation of similar committees, especially for those other parks in other parts of the electorate of Mallee, not the least having come from graziers who suffer losses of live-stock as a result of dingo attacks in the vicinity of Ngarkat National Park, and from beekeepers throughout the entire State. Consequently, I seek clarification on their behalf and on behalf of other people concerning the possibility of forming more such committees.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Yes, the Government intends to increase the number of consultative committees relating to national parks. Only last Friday I was pleased to attend the launching of the fourth consultative committee, the Upper South-East consultative committee. It was a very worthwhile day, and it is the Government's intention that these committees will eventually be formed throughout the State.

The very close liaison being achieved through these committees between the national parks staff and the community is very worth while, and it is ensuring a rapid movement of information between the local communities and the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. This has naturally led to a better understanding and improved management of the reserves and wildlife protected by the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

The member for Mallee referred particularly to the apiarists. I am aware of his interest in this matter, because he has brought a deputation to me regarding this matter, and I am pleased to be able to inform him that we have now decided to set up a special committee as a consultative committee to bring about an on-going communication and liaison between those people and the officers of national parks as well. This has been needed for a long time. Many problems have been experienced by beekeepers in National Parks, and the setting up of this consultative committee will help to improve liaison.

#### ALLIED ENGINEERING

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Minister of Environment and Planning undertake to confer with the Minister of Industrial Affairs to ascertain what requests for financial assistance for relocation have been received from the firm of Allied Engineering at Royal Park, and what assistance is available or has been offered to that firm for relocation purposes? As the Minister would be aware, I have corresponded with him on numerous occasions since late 1979 on behalf of my constituents who have complained bitterly about noise and air pollution problems emanating from this firm's premises. The firm's management has informed me that they would like to expand their production and employment capacity should the firm be provided with funds to relocate.

On Kevin Crease's programme on 8 September the Premier was exhorting firms to expand in South Australia. The Minister would also be aware that such relocation would effectively eliminate the noise and air pollution problems complained of by my constituents who live adjacent to Allied Engineering. To give an example of a complaint I have received recently, I refer to a recent letter from one of my constituents to me, as follows:

Dear Mr Hamilton,

I send this letter to you, hoping it will be sent to the Minister concerned, as I have heard enough unnecessary sound and noise in my street caused by a factory.

I wish to place a personal invitation to the Minister of Environment to stay at my home for any length of time and to experience the unbearable noise my son (11 months) and myself have to endure. I have only lived in this street a short time yet I find I can no longer tolerate this never-ending noise.

Naturally, I realise there are many reasons why the Minister may not be able to accept my invitation. Yet I feel that if such an important matter as this is placed before him, as a gentleman and a member of Parliament, he should do all in his power to assist in any way possible.

If the Minister cannot accept this invitation to my home within six weeks, I will take it as his total disinterest of the effect this factory has on the environment of this suburb that he is there to protect.

The letter is signed 'Respectfully' by one of my constituents. Will the Minister undertake to take up this matter with his colleague, the Minister of Industrial Affairs? Would he also indicate whether he is prepared to accept the invitation offered by my constituent?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I have already had discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Those discussions will continue. As the member concerned would know, this matter has been going on for a very long period of time. The previous Government was not willing to provide any financial assistance to relocate this industry. We are looking into various matters of how the problem can be overcome. Those discussions have taken place and will continue.

Let me say that we will do everything we can to make sure that the industry is kept alive and well. I make the point again that it is all very well for the honourable member on the other side of the House to raise the matter now, but the previous Government could not find any solution to the problem.

#### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**Mr SCHMIDT:** Will the Minister of Transport inform the House how the State Transport Authority has responded to the present petrol shortages and the need to move more people on the public transport system? Many people in the past, for various reasons, have used their own transport to get to work. Due to the bloody-mindedness of the union strike which has caused the petrol shortage in this State, many people have been forced to use public transport and

are therefore grossly inconvenienced, because it means taking a number of transport systems to get to work, rather than the shorter system previously used by them. Due to all these people now having to use the public transport system, that system is being overloaded in some areas, to the extent that sometimes people waiting at a bus stop find the buses going past, chock-a-block full, and they are unable to get on board. These people are interested in the action taken by the State Transport Authority.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** This morning, as I waited at the bus stop, two buses went past without stopping; I am not sure whether that was because they were full or because the drivers recognised me! I thank the honourable member for his question, because this is an important matter. The authority, I believe, has responded extremely well to the demands placed upon it by the present crisis. As has been announced in the press, 50 extra peak services are being supplied night and morning, and extra consists are being placed on the trains. Because of the number of people who have had to use public transport (and I am very glad that that has happened, because in some cases we might capture some more passengers), I have to say that buses especially have been overcrowded.

I would like to take this opportunity to ask the public to consider the situation, especially as it seems from what the Deputy Premier has said that we have a while to go yet before the dispute is settled. When they are using public transport in the middle of this emergency, the public should allow plenty of time. They should not expect what is normally a 20-minute journey to town to take only 20 minutes under these conditions. They should allow a little time and change their travel habits so that, if a bus has to pass them because it is full and cannot pick them up, they will be able to catch a following bus and still arrive in town or at work on time. I ask the public for that co-operation. It has been my observation, especially from riding on the buses, that the public is accepting that there are difficulties. I want to pay a tribute to the State Transport Authority and its officers, and particularly the unionists operating the rolling stock, for the tolerance that they are showing in very difficult conditions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** I hope that I am getting support from members on the back bench opposite. This is an extremely trying time for everyone, and I think the authority has responded rather magnificently. I want very much to put that as a matter of public record.

### GYMNASIUM

**Mr SLATER:** My question is directed to the Minister of Education.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**Mr SLATER:** You have had your turn; hang off a minute. Is the Minister of Education in a position to provide me with a report on the future of the gymnasium at the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education? The Minister will recall that last week I asked whether he could provide some opportunity of retaining the gymnasium for multiple use.

The Minister answered by saying that he was having consultations with people involved at the Institute of Fitness Research and Training, and he is also speaking to people from the school council and the Principal of the college. I ask the Minister whether he is now in a position to give a more comprehensive report on the future of the gymnasium.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** We have made only a little progress, but it is quite true that I met with representatives of the institute only last week. We discussed two issues, one of which was whether the institute would be able to continue

its occupancy of the McKinnon Parade premises, which currently it has an arrangement to lease from the South Australian College of Advanced Education. The ownership of those premises is, I believe, in dispute, because I am told that in fact the Minister of Education is the rightful proprietor and therefore negotiations would have to be with the Ministry rather than with the college, which has been acting as the lessor for quite some time. That really does not represent a problem, and I believe the institute will remain in occupancy there.

The second issue is whether the institute can continue to use the gymnasium on Kintore Avenue. The institute sees this issue as being really not in dispute. It would like to continue using the gymnasium, but it made it quite clear that there was really no argument between the institute and the South Australian college in so far as it recognised the college's right to determine how best to utilise the gymnasium.

At present, it appears that the decision of the colleges to utilise the gymnasium in the main for future dance courses is an indisputable right. What we are still trying to negotiate is whether in fact there might be some appropriate times when the institute could utilise the gymnasium and those times being when the college was not requiring the gymnasium for dance purposes. We have not progressed very far along that track, and I will report back to the honourable member when I have something more positive with regard to the second point.

### TOURISM

**Mr RANDALL:** Will the Minister of Tourism explain the basis of her concern about damage being done to the South Australian tourist industry, as reported in the news media? Yesterday and several times recently articles have appeared in the news media about damage being done to the tourist industry. In making comments yesterday at the opening of a caravan park, the Minister referred to some of these comments in the news media but I am sure she has a much stronger base on which to make her comments.

Representations have been made to several back-benchers about concern in the tourist industry by operators who are running guest homes and other accommodation for interstate tourists because they are receiving cancellations. They have asked us to express to the House our concern about this.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, indeed, as each day passes I am receiving more and more reports from operators in the tourist industry of the adverse effect of the petrol shortage on their operations. As honourable members would know, the tourist industry in South Australia sustains employment for about 35 000 people. Much of that employment is through small businesses, and many of those small businesses are in country towns throughout South Australia. The effect of the petrol shortage was immediate, and it is becoming worse as each day passes.

One particular incident which is causing me grave concern is that in Adelaide tomorrow are due to arrive 50 travel agents and tour wholesalers who are currently attending the 'Destination Australia' market place in Perth. They are due in South Australia tomorrow so that the Department of Tourism can show them the tourist attractions of this State, in particular the Barossa Valley, Kangaroo Island and the Flinders Range. Most of these operators are from our principal markets, from the United Kingdom, New Zealand, North America and Europe. What is their impression going to be of Australia, and in particular South Australia, as a tourist destination when they arrive here and find that people cannot travel even from their own

homes to their work places, let alone to a holiday destination?

This puts in mind what happened last time there was a petrol strike and the time before when there was an air hostess strike. During the air hostess strike there was a visit to Adelaide from the personal ambassador to the President of the United States, Mr Joey Adams and his wife Cindy. They asked, 'Why do you have so many strikes in this country? Who would want to come here knowing that they might be stranded and might not be able to get from place to place and might not be able to get back home?'

It is not just the immediate effects of the strike but the long-term effects which create doubts and uncertainty in the minds of prospective tourists. It is absolutely heart-breaking to me that right at this moment the Government is spending considerable sums by way of investment in South Australia's tourist future to promote this State to South Australians and to people interstate.

In last night's *News* a full-page advertisement for the Hit the Trail campaign appeared, yet who can hit the trail in South Australia right now? We are all prisoners in our own homes because we have not enough petrol in our cars, and that is the responsibility of a small group of unionists in the Eastern States who are sitting on comfortable incomes of in excess of \$20 000 a year and in some cases more than \$30 000 a year.

**An honourable member:** What's your income?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** At least I work 365 days a year, which is more than can be said for the unionists interstate who have one day off work for each day they work. These are the people who are sending small South Australian operators to the wall—the wineries in the Southern Vales, the wineries in the Barossa Valley, the small businesses in towns like Hahndorf and through the Adelaide Hills, on Fleurieu Peninsula, at Victor Harbor, on Yorke Peninsula and Eyre Peninsula. They are the operators who run the risk of going to the wall because of this petrol shortage, which is caused by a strike by the marine engineers.

I think it is time that everyone in Australia realised the extent to which the States and this country depend on tourism. There is not one industry that does not benefit, other than the defence industry. I repeat: there is not one industry in this country other than the defence industry that does not benefit as a result of an expansion in tourist activities and, whatever the income of a potential tourist, surely that person is entitled to plan a holiday with confidence and to enjoy that holiday without having it destroyed by the inconsiderate actions of a few.

My principal concern is not only with the tourists but also with the operators who provide employment, and it is employment which should be a matter of deepest concern to everyone on both sides of the House.

I simply want to say that for every day that this petrol shortage continues there will be an adverse effect on tourism and there will be a consequential adverse effect on employment.

### FIRE PROTECTION

**Mr PETERSON:** Can the Chief Secretary state what fire protection services the Government intends to provide for LeFevre Peninsula? The situation of the South Australian Fire Brigade services in the area has been under discussion for some time. The existing fire station in Hall Street is a single-appliance station and the building is very old. In fact, it was built for a horse-drawn unit.

Late last year it was rumoured that a new station was to be built in Strathfield Terrace, Taperoo. This was confirmed

in correspondence dated 16 April this year and in a reply from the Chief Secretary wherein he stated that it was anticipated that construction would commence later this year, although I see no mention of it in the Budget.

Since then the Government has engaged a Mr R. G. Cox to report upon the amount and distribution of the fire-fighting resources in the metropolitan area. In that report it was clearly indicated that no appliances should be based upon LeFevre Peninsula. I have raised this matter on several occasions but have not been able to elicit a firm response on fire protection for my electorate. Will the Chief Secretary now give a firm answer?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** I wish that the member for Semaphore could have some faith.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Everybody wants to know what the faith is.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** If the member for Semaphore thinks back he will know that some very learned people on a Select Committee have wrestled with this matter for some 12 months. Presently, there is a Bill before this Parliament undergoing whatever it is undergoing in the other place. I am not going to give the member any undertaking at all, except that he should have enough faith to know that, when this Bill becomes law, as the Cox Report is couched in wide terms, common sense dictates that LeFevre Peninsula, with bridges and so on in that area, will be catered for. That is the only undertaking I give the member for LeFevre Peninsula. Fire, explosions or any other things that happen will be well catered for.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: WORKERS RALLY

**Mr O'NEILL (Florey):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr O'NEILL:** During Question Time the Minister of Education made a rather inane remark across the Chamber, accusing me of organising the rally yesterday in Adelaide when 15 000 South Australian workers gathered in Victoria Square and then came to the front of Parliament House. I was not involved in its organisation. Certainly, I was at the rally and was very impressed.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr O'NEILL:** Its organisation, as I understand from previous experience, was that the Trades and Labor Council would have called a meeting of unions likely to be involved. That meeting, I assume, made a decision which resulted in a notice being issued under the heading, 'United Trades and Labor Council', in the following terms:

Rally—Victoria Square. Tuesday 22 September 1981, 11.30 a.m.

The United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia has, after considering the effect of the Industries Assistance Commission report on jobs in South Australia, determined to hold a rally in Victoria Square on Tuesday 22 September 1981 at 11.30 a.m.

This report, if implemented, will eliminate 10 000-15 000 jobs in South Australia, thus creating an industrial wasteland in our State. It seems that Federal politicians of the Party which is considering the implementation of this report do not understand or do not care whether South Australians have a job or not, a future with a job, or on the dole.

All workers who work for the following employers:

General Motors-Holden's

Mitsubishi

Bridgestone Australia Pty Ltd

Bundy Tubing Company (Australia) Pty Ltd



Camelec Cables  
 Carr Fastener Pty Ltd  
 Castalloy Limited  
 Cheviot Australia Pty Limited  
 Clyde-Apac Limited  
 Globe Products Pty Ltd  
 Hills Industries Ltd  
 Automotive Components Division  
 Industrial Engineering & Springmakers (Sales) Pty Ltd  
 Irons Engineering Pty Ltd  
 Kelvinator Australia Limited  
 McLeod Engineering  
 Johns Perry—Perry Engineering Division  
 Q.H. Automotive Ltd  
 R.O.H. Auto Products Pty Ltd  
 Rainsfords Metal Products Pty Ltd  
 Rollform Pty Ltd  
 Rubery Owen & Kemsley Pty Ltd  
 Sampson Engineering Pty Ltd  
 Schrader-Scovill Co. Pty Ltd  
 Screw Machine Engineering Company  
 Tecalemit (Australasia) Pty Ltd  
 Tubemakers of Australia (BTM Division)  
 Wheel Weights Australia Pty Ltd  
 W. H. Wylie & Co. Pty Ltd

and are members of the following unions:  
 Vehicle Builders Employees Federation  
 Australasian Society of Engineers  
 Electrical Trades Union  
 Amalgamated Metal Workers & Shipwrights Union  
 Federated Enginedrivers and Firemens Association  
 Transport Workers Union  
 Federated Storemen and Packers Union  
 Federated Iron Workers Association  
 Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union

**An honourable member:** Is this a personal explanation?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! On more than one occasion an honourable member on my right has questioned whether this is a personal explanation. The Chair will make those decisions. The honourable member sought leave of the House to make a personal explanation because of an insinuation made against him. He has indicated that he is identifying the source of the call for the event, and that his name is not a signatory to that call. Honourable members will assist the conduct of the House if they approach the Chair privately if they have any question.

**Mr O'NEILL:** The document continues:

Association of Draughting Supervisory and Technical Employees  
 Federated Rubber and Allied Workers Union  
 are directed to cease work, so that they are able to attend the rally at 11.30 a.m.

The only way these politicians will understand is for the workers in these industries and members of these unions to attend this rally.

It is signed 'R. J. Gregory, Secretary'. Much as I would like to have the power to influence all those people, and many of those companies—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable gentleman not now to start debating the issue.

**Mr O'NEILL:** My phraseology may have been wrong. I have not the power to direct those people, nor those employers, many of whom I am informed from reliable sources supported the demonstration. So, I was at the meeting—

**Mr Oswald:** Who organised the professional hecklers?

**Mr O'NEILL:** —as was the Minister of Industrial Affairs. The Premier was not there, although the meeting called for him to appear.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable gentleman has asked leave to make a personal explanation. That leave does not extend to answering interjections which are, in themselves, out of order.

**Mr O'NEILL:** I reject the allegation, which is patently stupid. If the Minister had not resorted to such stupidity, I would not have had to take the House's time to clarify the matter.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The member for Florey seems to be far too sensitive regarding the interjection I made, which was by no means directed towards him. In fact, I had no idea that he had any connection with the rally yesterday. He has made his point quite clear. It was addressed collectively to the bland faces in Opposition. The reason I interjected—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister has asked for leave to make a personal explanation. I ask him to come to it.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The allegation that I accused the member for Florey of having organised the entire rally and being irresponsible by doing so is quite incorrect. My comment was merely addressed to the irresponsible group who attended the rally in a very small minority and who were the subject of an apology to the Minister who attended the rally yesterday, people who came up and said, 'We are not supporters of yours, but we do apologise for the small lunatic fringe of canine society who howled at the front in opposition.' They recognised that what the Minister was really trying to do yesterday was to say that the Government itself had led representatives to the Federal Government. Had the Minister been allowed to say that, as the vast majority—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr O'NEILL:** At least he had the courage to go out there.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I repeat that the Minister sought leave to make a personal explanation. I ask him to refrain from proceeding to defend another person in the House.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** In conclusion, I apologise to the honourable member for any inference at all that he personally was responsible for joining with the Minister of Labour and Industry in pressing the case of the South Australian automotive industry, a point which has been repeatedly made, in fact, by the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

#### OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Offenders Probation Act, 1913-1981. Read a first time.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I ask for the support of the House because this Bill provides advantages for the offender and the public alike. It is a short Bill, of two clauses, designed to enable the court to require, in some cases, as determined by a judge or magistrate, that the person being placed on probation be given the opportunity to contribute towards the cost of his or her probation or parole. This will, in effect, give the person concerned, I am sure, a greater feeling of responsibility, and certainly a feeling of satisfaction that, indeed, all the costs, not just part of them, of the assistance and protection given by the probation officers concerned, or any of the staff of the probation office, or that area of correctional services, will not be borne completely by the community. Therefore, it removes some onus from the community.

Rather, they will pay and play their part towards helping finance the high cost of this service provided so ably by our Department of Correctional Services, and particularly by our parole officers. In fact, when we talk about parole and probation we must realise that it is a service and, indeed, an alternative to being put into gaol. In fact, it is an alternative that will be made available to the courts under my Bill with a direct benefit, I suggest, to the offenders, whereby they are not detained in prison.

This, I think, is a good step because we have problems in the Department of Correctional Services in providing accommodation for the number of people who get into trouble with the law, the number of criminals. From experience generally throughout the world, one can realise that there will be no relief in this area and that the situation generally will become worse, as is the case in most countries of the world. We will find, I believe, that there is more need for this method of dealing with particular offenders. It will save them from being detained in prison, and is therefore an alternative so far as they are concerned.

This will help them in their rehabilitation, because they will remain within the community. It is far better to leave them in the community than to intern them in institutions. People who are in institutions regularly tend to become institutionalised. Unfortunately, offenders who offend in the early years of their lives tend to become institutionalised. We must try to avoid that at all costs. The fact that this Government has provided for community service orders for this type of person, or for some types of people who are in conflict with the law, is meritorious.

This system has been proved effective in other countries of the world that I have visited. In West Germany, for instance, community service orders have been working satisfactorily for four years and are most successful, because they keep people out of prison and are less costly, and cost is another matter we must not forget. Above all, it facilitates rehabilitation, as it gives the offender more opportunity to see the folly of his ways. It gives him an opportunity to toe the line and obey the law. It is of advantage, I suggest, not only to the offender but also to the Government. Generally speaking, it is of advantage to the community at large.

Even better effects, I believe, will be achieved from the restitution orders I hope will come into operation within our society in South Australia, working in conjunction with the community service orders which are now under way. People placed on restitution orders must work for a certain period to pay back part of the debt they owe to a particular person or, in some cases, to society generally when damage has been caused, say, in local government areas. They can be ordered to perform some work as restitution for the offence they have committed. This gives offenders, particularly juveniles, the advantage of realising that people have responsibilities and a commitment to work for a certain time, having time off during the normal break, and being relieved of that work when their day is finished. Those people also have a responsibility to continue with that work in the days following. I think this legislation will have a good effect on a number of our younger offenders, in particular. I believe that community service orders in the case of juveniles have been working successfully. They will prove to be a distinct advantage to all persons concerned, particularly to offenders.

This Bill helps to offset the cost of supervision, which is a huge bill that the taxpayers of this State, or of any country, have to pay. Taxpayers' money finances these areas at the moment. I draw the attention of members to the Auditor-General's Report of this year at page 56, where it shows that the annual net cost to house an adult prisoner is \$16 700 a year. Last year, according to the Auditor-General's Report, that amount was \$13 975, so it is getting more expensive each year.

With regard to the area about which this Bill is really concerned, that is, the area of parole and probation, page 57 of the Attorney-General's Report indicates that the cost of salaries and wages for the Probation and Parole Branch in the year 1978-79, when there were 80 staff, was \$983 231. In 1979-80, staff numbers were increased to 88, an extra eight people, and the cost of wages and salaries was \$1 205 577. For the last 1980-81 financial year, there

were still 88 people on the staff at a cost of \$1 439 115—a massive bill for only one branch of the Department of Correctional Services, a cost which I believe could be offset to greater advantage under my Bill.

As I said earlier, at present this is a cost to the taxpayers, who in general are responsible people and who obey and help to uphold the law, but they foot the bill for those who do not. I believe it is good arithmetic that some of the offenders should be obliged to pay something towards the cost of their supervision, towards the cost of their keeping out of gaol, and I think that is fair enough. Also, there are benefits to offenders: it provides offenders with the opportunity of developing responsibility, which some of them do not have. Some may, but a number have no responsibility at all. Such people would be given the opportunity to look at themselves and develop a responsibility to society. Offenders should derive some satisfaction from developing that responsibility. It is fair that the cost should be shared by some of these people on probation and parole.

I believe, too, that rehabilitation is a great benefit; I think all members would agree. It is an area that we should pursue to the best of our ability. All of us who are honest would agree that there are cases where the end of the tether is reached and where it is found that rehabilitation may have to be put into the background for the protection of people in society. The point of view of the community is very important indeed. People within the community may sometimes cringe from the financial responsibility, the financial burden that they are asked to take, particularly in the area of offenders, and I refer particularly to recidivist offenders, people who continue to defy the law and cause trouble within society. If this Bill is passed, and I hope that some of my colleagues from the other side of the House will look at the Bill closely and that they will—

**Mr Keneally:** If your colleagues support it you have the numbers.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I agree that it is a numbers business, but I would prefer that some members opposite support the Bill. I say this quite sincerely; it would give me a great deal of help and assistance and make me feel a lot better if I received some support from the other side of the House. I feel that the Bill would be a better Bill if that occurred. I look forward with great anticipation to support. My friend the member for Stuart is a reasonable gentleman and, although we do not always see eye to eye, there are times when we do. Being the reasonable gentleman that he is, I believe he will support this Bill.

The Bill relates to retribution, of course. The term 'retribution' in the correctional services area is a term which one hesitates to use, because it has been deemed over the years to be perhaps a naughty or nasty word, but I believe that, in some situations where a family, in particular, or a person has been wronged severely or badly, such a person has a right to feel that he has some recourse to retribution.

**Mr Keneally:** How does it help them?

**Mr MATHWIN:** In some cases (and I know, because the member for Stuart is such a reasonable man, that he would agree with me) it is certain that the victim comes off far worse than the offender, and the problems associated with that cause all of us who are sincere about this matter a great deal of concern. One could quote a number of cases, but I do not wish to do that on this Bill.

With regard to the cost or the amount laid down to be paid by the parolee or the person on probation, I have left that determination to the court. I have done this purposely as opposed to some legislation from some States of America, where there is a fixed amount. I have left that question for the courts to determine, because I believe there is a great advantage in doing that and it can be done according to the circumstances of the offender, according to how he is

situated, and if there is a case of hardship the case would not be fought in court. However, if a person involved could well afford to pay \$20, \$60 or \$100, I would expect that a court would order such amounts to be paid as a reasonable cost for a person's not going to gaol. Therefore, I am quite happy to leave the matter of fixing the amount of costs for the court's determination, which of course will mean that the court will consider each case on its merits. I refer to some of the legislation in two States of America. I received from the Board of Pardons and Paroles in Texas a letter which stated in part:

Enclosed are copies of pages 105 and 106 of the *Texas Code of Criminal Procedure*, Eighth Edition, Article 42.12. I hope this information will be of assistance to you.

Yours very truly, Ken Casner, Executive Director.

Section 6a of that State's legislation states:

(a) A court granting probation may fix a fee not exceeding \$15 per month to be paid to the court by the probationer during the probationary period. The court may make payment of the fee a condition of granting or continuing the probation.

(b) The court shall deposit the fees received under subsection (a) of this section in the special fund of the county treasury provided by section 4.05 (b), article 42.121 of this code, to be used for the same purposes for which state-aid may be used under that section.

Those sections define where the amount of money goes and also define the fixed amount of \$15 per month. I also received a letter from the Florida Department of Corrections, 1311 Winewood Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida. The letter I received from this department says:

In regard to your request of 25 September 1980 concerning our programme whereby probationers and parolees are required to pay a monthly supervision fee, please find enclosed a copy of our programme manual.

The next part would be interesting to any member who is keen to see what amounts of money we are talking about. It continues:

During fiscal year 1979-80 the Probation and Parole Offices in Florida collected \$3 900 000 through this programme which went into the State Treasury to help offset operating costs. The manual should provide you with details concerning the programme. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Florida has a saving that goes back into the Treasury. In South Australia the money could go into the parole and probation department to provide more assistance for these people. The figure of \$3 900 000 as far as we are concerned in the present situation would make one's mouth water. In explanation, the Costs in the Supervision Programme Manual says:

Payment for cost of supervision and rehabilitation. Any person under probation or parole supervision, except a person on probation or parole within or without the State under an interstate compact adopted pursuant to chapter 949, shall be required to contribute not less than ten dollars nor more than fifty dollars per month as decided by the sentencing court, to a court-approved public or private entity providing him with supervision and rehabilitation. Any failure to pay such contribution shall constitute grounds for the revocation of probation by the court or the revocation of parole by the Parole and Probation Commission. The Department of Offender Rehabilitation may exempt a person from the payment of all or any part of the foregoing contribution if it finds any of the following factors to exist:

We have here a situation of a change in the costs laid down. The areas of cost are between \$10 and \$50. I would prefer to leave this matter to the court to decide. The manual continues:

(1) The offender has diligently attempted but been unable to obtain employment which provides him sufficient income to make such payments.

(2) The offender is a student in a school, college, university, or a course of vocational or technical training designed to fit the student for gainful employment. Certification of such student status shall be supplied to the secretary of the department by the educational institution in which the offender is enrolled.

(3) The offender has an employment handicap, as determined by a physical, psychological, or psychiatric examination acceptable to, or ordered by, the secretary.

(4) The offender's age prevents him from obtaining employment.

(5) The offender is responsible for the support of dependants and the payment of such contribution constitutes an undue hardship on the offender.

(6) Other extenuating circumstances as determined by the secretary.

This manual explains their scheme and its operation. I repeat that I would prefer to leave the actual costs to the courts to decide. It is interesting to note that, under their system, the parole officers are required to involve themselves actively in motivating the offenders to remit the payments and any back-payments due by the first day of the month, according to rules laid down, must be payable by the fifth day of the month. If this does not happen, it is up to the parole officer or probation officer to contact the people and make sure that they shoulder their responsibilities and do as they were told by the court.

One must remember when dealing with matters like this that parole is a privilege and not a right. One seems to forget this in many cases. People forget this and think parole is a right; it is not. As the honourable member for Stuart should well know, we have situations where people are offered parole and do not want it, remain in gaol, do their term and come out free rather than have that supervision. This is their right; they can please themselves. People that take advantage of parole must realise it is a privilege to be released back into the community, instead of staying in the particular institution; it is not a right. The cost of the situation at the moment—

**Mr Keneally:** We don't legislate for privileges; we legislate for rights.

**Mr MATHWIN:** I am saying that parole generally is a privilege; it is not a right. The honourable gentleman would not argue with me on that. If people are offered parole they can take it; it is up to them, and it is their responsibility. If people take advantage of parole they must never believe that it is their right. It is a privilege grasped by many people.

I have mentioned the cost of keeping people in adult prisons. When one looks at the juvenile situation, one sees that the cost is between \$46 000 and \$47 000 a year to keep a young person in an institution. It does not end there. The Government has to provide accommodation, and this is very costly. The cost of a modern prison would be at least \$75 000 to \$79 000 per head. That is a lot of money for the taxpayer to pay.

The estimated number of probationers and parolees in South Australia to July last year was 3 047. We see that, if the courts charged \$20 a month for that supervision, that would represent a sum of \$731 280. A charge of a mere \$15 a month would represent \$548 460 in savings for the taxpayer, and the money, I hope, would be made available for use in the area of correctional services. I would expect the courts to deal with cases on their merits.

This is an important Bill, although it is a short Bill of only two clauses. The Act will be cited as the Offenders Probation Act Amendment Act, 1981. Clause 2, the main clause, amends section 5 of the principal Act by inserting after paragraph (b) of subsection (1) the following paragraph:

A condition requiring a probationer to pay the Minister monthly during the term of recognizance such a sum as the court thinks appropriate as a contribution towards the cost of his probation and specifies in the order.

Clearly, it is left to the court to deal with the matter according to its conscience and its rights. I ask members to support the Bill to enable this provision to become law in this State, thus providing greater opportunities for offenders, greater satisfaction for society generally, and indeed a sav-

ing in money which could be provided to help these unfortunate people.

Mr KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

### NATURAL DEATH BILL

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I move:

That the Natural Death Bill, 1980, be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1980.

Motion carried.

Mr KENEALLY: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

On 22 October 1980 the Hon. Mr Blevins introduced into the Legislative Council a private member's Bill entitled the Natural Death Bill. On 26 November 1981 the Bill was approved by that Chamber and referred to the House of Assembly. The legislation was received and read a first time in this place on 26 November 1980, but lapsed because insufficient private members' time was available during the completion of that session for debate. The House has voted today to restore the Natural Death Bill to the Notice Paper, and I thank members for their co-operation.

Before dealing with the Bill in detail it is important that the Assembly be given some background information. On 18 July 1978, in the Address in Reply debate (page 39 *Hansard*), the Hon. F. T. Blevins first raised the question of the possibility of having a Natural Death Act in South Australia and asked for comment from interested persons and organisations.

The response to that speech was such that on 5 March (page 1428 *Hansard*) he introduced the Natural Death Bill which, if it became an Act, would 'enable persons to make declarations of their desire not to be subjected to extraordinary measures designed artificially to prolong life in the event of a terminal illness'. During his second reading explanation when introducing that Bill, the Hon. Mr Blevins stated that he would be moving that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. On 2 April 1980 he so moved, and the Council concurred.

The Bill to which I am now speaking, although amended during the subsequent debate, was unanimously recommended to the Council by that Select Committee. The principal differences between the Bill referred to the Select Committee and this one are that the Bill was expanded to include a definition of death. Also, the main Part of the Bill, which allows a person to give certain directions against the artificial prolongation of the dying process, was altered to more clearly define that Part's limitation.

I will deal with Part II of the Bill first, that is, the Part of the Bill which defines death. It soon became clear to the Select Committee that the Bill before the Select Committee, if passed, could have an effect on other legislation—for example, the State's Transplantation of Human Tissue Act and the Anatomy Act.

It was not the intention in introducing the Natural Death Bill to do anything that might disturb adversely the availability of organs for transplant. If the Bill had passed in its original form, conflict could have arisen between a patient's ability to exercise his right to refuse medical treatment as outlined in that Bill, and the patient's close relatives' wishes that the patient's organs be used for transplantation purposes. In the absence of any adequate definition of death, it is possible for situations to arise where there could be doubt whether a person was actually 'dead' before parts of his body are removed. The problem with the present law is that the absence of heartbeat and blood circulation are taken as sure signs of death. The reality is that the best test of whether a person is dead or not is when there is

irreversible cessation of all functions of the person's brain. Once this criterion is adopted, then the dead person's heart can be kept functioning and blood circulating by sophisticated machinery until such time as preparations are made for organ transplantation.

According to the Australian Law Reform Commission, without the 'brain death' definition of death, the doctor who removes an organ while the heart is still functioning can face criminal charges of perhaps manslaughter, and at least assault. The Select Committee felt it worth while to clear up these points by adopting the Australian Law Reform Commission's definition of death, as have some States, and also by recommending that this State's Anatomy Act and Human Tissue Transplantation Act can be examined with a view to redrafting as soon as possible.

I will now deal with Part III of the Bill, which permits an adult person, if he wishes, to give directions against the artificial prolongation of his dying process. This proposition is a simple one. Adults have (with some minor exceptions) the absolute right to refuse medical treatment, and no doctor is permitted to treat a patient against the patient's known wishes. If the patient is conscious, aware of his rights, and able to signify consent or otherwise to treatment, then no problem should arise. However, once a patient is unconscious or is heavily sedated, and is therefore unable to exercise his right to refuse or consent to medical treatment, then the treatment at that stage of a terminal illness is entirely at the discretion of the doctor. It may be that the treatment the doctor gives would not be wanted by the patient, but the patient is unable to have any effective say. This Bill, if passed, would provide a framework that would ensure that any person who so desired would have his wishes respected in the circumstances I have outlined.

Besides this Part of the Bill's most important function of ensuring that the patient's wishes are respected, it would also have the effect of relieving the doctor and relatives of terminally ill patients of the responsibility of deciding what treatment should or should not be applied. On a topic as sensitive as this, it is also important that I spell out clearly what the Bill does not do. The Bill does not attempt to solve every problem involved in people dying due to a terminal illness. Some people might think it should; the fact is, it does not. For example, the Bill specifically restricts itself to adults, so the problems relating to terminally ill children do not come within the scope of the Bill.

A person whose condition is what is commonly referred to as a vegetable, again, may not come within the scope of the Bill. On reading the interpretations in Part I, it is immediately apparent that death has to be 'imminent' and treatment has to be 'useless'. Very many people in a vegetable state would not meet that criteria. The *status quo* would therefore be undisturbed.

The Bill also does not authorise any act that causes or accelerates death, as distinct from an act that permits the dying process to take its natural course. The Bill not only does not authorise such acts, it specifically states that it does not authorise those acts in clause 5 (2). I appreciate that it is not usual for a Bill to state what it does not permit. However, the Select Committee unanimously agreed that, to avoid any misunderstanding by lay people reading the Bill, such a clause should be inserted.

I suppose we should ask ourselves a couple of questions regarding the principle of this Bill. First, does a patient have an absolute right to control what happens to his own body regarding his own medical treatment? The answer to that question is indubitably 'Yes'. No-one, before the Select Committee or otherwise, has questioned that proposition.

We can therefore take it that on that question there can be no argument. The second question is: do we now need a framework to enable a patient to effectively exercise the

right we have agreed he has, when it has not appeared to be needed in the past? The answer to that is much more complex, but I would argue that it is just as firm a 'Yes', as was the answer to the previous question. The main reason why we need such legislation as this is, in a word, technology.

There is a vast difference between the way in which society treated terminally ill patients in the past and the way in which they are treated now. The variety of treatment now available to the medical profession constitutes, in my opinion, a qualitative change rather than just a quantitative change, and we need new legal forms to deal with this change. The pressures on the medical profession to use all procedures available (however complex and useless) to defeat the dying process must be almost irresistible. Doctors see their profession as a 'curing' profession, quite naturally, but, in the case of terminally ill patients, by definition cure is not possible. Care is what is required, and the level of care that the patient requires has to be paramount. If part of that caring process is to give the patient the peace of mind of knowing that he is guaranteed he will not be subjected to unwanted and useless medical treatment when he is dying, then I believe that as legislators we should give that peace of mind.

In the past, people with terminal illnesses had far less treatment administered to them, simply because it was not available. Dying generally took place in a far less clinical and technological atmosphere: some would say in a far more humane atmosphere, and I would like to dwell on that for a moment. It was only after thinking about this topic for some time that the Hon. Mr Blevins began to reflect on his own experience with the dying. The person closest to him who had died was a close friend and relative by marriage. This occurred about 20 years ago. I want to briefly relate what happened, because it shows the contrast between how we treated the dying 20 years ago and what appears to be increasingly the way in which we treat them today.

This person whose death I am describing was diagnosed as having a terminal illness some months before he died. He was diagnosed at home by his local G.P. He did not go to hospital, he did not want to, and it would have been useless, anyway. He was cared for at home by his wife, daughter and friends. During the whole of his dying process he was not alone unless he wanted to be, and his privacy was not invaded by anyone, medical or otherwise, however well meaning. He was three days in a partial coma before he died. During that time, he had the company of his wife, his daughter, his granddaughter and his friends. The doctor called occasionally.

Everyone involved helped that person to die with the dignity and respect to which he was entitled. When he finally died his body stayed at home for a few days with his family and friends before being cremated. At no time was he given up to strangers to look after, when it was well within the capabilities of his family and friends to assist him (and themselves) to come to terms with his dying. I am sure that the manner of his dying was a comfort to him, and I am told that it was a comfort and help to his family and friends. What would happen to such a person today? I suspect that the chances of his dying in that way today would be very much less. I suspect he would have died in hospital, being attended to by strangers in a completely alien atmosphere.

An example of just what medical procedures patients could be subjected to today was given by a doctor in an article in the *National Times* some time ago. I quote:

It is true that death is rarely dignified, but it is also undignified to die with a urethral Foley catheter connected to a drainage bag, a continuous i.v. running, a colostomy surrounded with dressings,

and irrigation tubes stuck in an abscess cavity line, a moisturised oral endotracheal tube attached to a Bennett respirator taped to the face, an oral airway, a feeding nasogastric tube also taped to the face, and all four extremities restrained.

This is the way a friend and colleague of mine died. When I went to greet him two days before he died, I could hardly get to the bed because of all the machinery around him. . . . The friend of course could not speak, and, when he lifted his hand, it was checked by a strap. Is it necessary to do this to a human being so his family will not feel guilty about wishing him to have peace at last?

That was from a doctor. Is it any wonder that many people fear the dying process rather than dying itself? I am not suggesting that we care less about people today than we used to, but we have been encouraged to believe that dying is an unnatural process and one that should take place out of the care and control of the people most intimately concerned, that is, the dying themselves and their families and friends. This Bill, if you like, is a reaction to a growing dehumanising of people by technology and so-called experts. I think it is very significant that some of the strongest support for this proposition has come from people with strong religious convictions who tend to see death as something perfectly natural, something which is not to be feared but with which to come to terms.

I see this Bill as a small but significant step in asserting the rights of patients to control their own lives. It also raises questions about the whole medical industry. Whose benefit is it for? I think the word 'industry' is the correct one. There may be a vested interest by some people involved in this industry in using whatever means are available to ensure that hospitals are filled, and that drugs and equipment are used to the maximum. I certainly exclude the Health Commission from that, because it has given strong support to this Bill. I am pleased that society is beginning to question the value of some of these procedures and treatments, because if we do not do so we will find ourselves totally controlled by alleged experts who claim exclusive rights to knowledge. If this happens, we will become more and more dependent, quite unnecessarily, on those so-called experts, and our freedom to assert our own individuality and to control our own lives will be considerably diminished.

I think it is of the utmost importance that Parliament does not shy away from assisting the growing move by people to reclaim some control over their lives. This particular area of the law (that is, the medical-legal area), is going to provide society with some enormous difficulties in the years ahead. The law already lags far behind the problems created by technology in the medical area. To illustrate this, I want to read to the Assembly part of the Malcolm Gillies oration given by Mr Justice Kirby, Chairman of the Australian Law Reform Commission, to the Royal North Shore Medical Association in Sydney.

At the end of the paper, which was entitled 'New Dilemmas for Law and Medicine', Justice Kirby said:

What I have said about transplants, the right to die and truth telling could be expanded into an essay of much greater length on the other medico-legal issues that confront us today. Developments in modern medicine stretch the boundaries of the law and of medical ethics. They also test our notions of morality. Issues involving test tube fertilisation, the conduct of clinical trials, genetic manipulation, the use of foetal material, the treatment of the intellectually handicapped, the whole issue of abortion, patenting medical techniques and biological developments, the problems of artificial insemination by donor, sterilisation, castration, psycho-surgery, the compulsory measures for health protection, human cloning, and so on, lie before us. Each of these developments poses issues for medical practitioners. But each also poses complex problems for the law and for society governed by the law. It is undesirable for the law to get too far ahead of community understanding and moral consensus in such things.

But there is an equal danger, it seems to me, in an ostrich-like refusal to face up to the legal consequences of medical therapy that is already occurring. According to Sir McFarlane Burnett, infanticide on compassionate grounds already occurs in monstrous cases: artificial insemination of children for adoption; *in vitro*

fertilisation recently proved successful in a Melbourne hospital. Various forms of experimentation in genetic engineering already take place in Australia. Hospital ventilators are turned off. Transplant surgery is a daily reality.

Moral, ethical and legal problems will not conveniently go away because the law is silent upon them. Unless the law can keep pace with these changes, there will be inadequate guidance for the medical profession when guidance is most needed. Laws of a general kind, developed in an earlier age to address different problems, will lie in wait for their chance, unexpected operation upon new unforeseen circumstances. I hope that our society will be courageous and open-minded enough to face up to these problems and not to sweep them under the medical and legal carpet. Truth-telling extends from our profession to society as a whole. What we need are doctors and lawyers (and I should say philosophers, churchmen, patients and clients) who will be prepared to debate publicly the dilemmas forced on us by the advances of science and technology. Procedures of law reform bodies can be adapted as a medium of this interchange between expert and citizen. What is needed is effective machinery to find Australian solutions for the guidance of conscientious doctors and distracted (and often timorous) lawmakers.

There are no easy solutions to any of the problems I have mentioned. But until we start to ask the questions, and face the dilemmas, our society will continue to shuffle along in directions in which we would not choose to travel and to destinations at which we would not choose to arrive.

I suggest, Mr Deputy Speaker, that for this Parliament to pass this Bill will start us moving, some would say belatedly, in the direction of personal choice and personal responsibility, and surely that is a direction, when dealing with our own health (or ill health), in which we have a duty to travel.

This Bill is the result of a unanimous decision of a Select Committee of the Legislative Council. It answers some important medical-legal questions. It does not disturb the present doctor-patient relationship unless the patient wants it disturbed. If it is disturbed, it is disturbed in favour of the patient, allowing him to assert his rights to make his own decisions regarding useless medical treatment in cases of terminal illness. This Bill does not disadvantage anyone. No-one's rights are adversely affected, only strengthened, and, owing to the safeguards written into the Bill, it cannot be misused.

The Bill allows people who are about to die a say in their own dying process, not only if they are going to die, not when they are going to die, but how. To me, that is a right we should acknowledge and I therefore strongly commend the Bill to the House. I urge on members who wish to participate in this debate to carefully consider the arguments put forward in the Legislative Council and the answers given thereto. The debate was extensive, and I am confident that any issue that would exercise the minds of members here would have been adequately dealt with in the Committee stage in the other place. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 states the title to the new Act. Clause 2 provides for a day to be fixed for the Act to come into effect and clause 3 contains a number of definitions required for the purposes of the new Act. 'Extraordinary measures' are defined as medical or surgical measures that prolong life by supplanting or maintaining the operation of bodily functions that are temporarily or permanently incapable of independent operation. A 'terminal illness' is defined as an illness, injury or degeneration of mental or physical faculties such that death would, if extraordinary measures were not undertaken, be imminent and from which there is no reasonable prospect of temporary or permanent recovery, even if extraordinary measures were undertaken.

Clause 4 deals with the definition of death. The definition follows the Australian Law Reform Commission's recommendation. The distinctive feature of the definition is that irreversible cessation of brain function becomes a criterion for establishing that a person has died. Subclause (2) is an evidentiary provision dealing with proof of death for the purposes of legal proceedings.

Clause 5 deals with a problem of causation that could be relevant in the context of criminal (and in some conceivable civil) proceedings. It provides that the non-application of extraordinary measures to, or the withdrawal of extraordinary measures from, a person suffering from a terminal illness does not constitute a cause of death. Subclause (2) makes it clear, however, that the new provision does not relieve a medical practitioner from the consequences of negligent mis-diagnosis of a terminal illness.

Clause 6 makes it possible for a person to give a formal direction that he is not to be subjected to extraordinary measures in the event of his suffering from a terminal illness. The direction is to be witnessed by two witnesses. Where a person has given such a direction and is subsequently found to be suffering from a terminal illness, it is the responsibility of a medical practitioner who is responsible for his treatment to act in accordance with the direction unless he has reasonable grounds to believe that the patient revoked or intended to revoke the direction, or was not, at the time of giving the direction, capable of understanding the nature and consequences of the direction. The new provisions do not, however, derogate from any duty of a medical practitioner to explain to a patient, who is still capable of exercising a rational judgment, the various therapeutic measures that may be available in his particular case, so that the patient can choose at that time what form of therapy should or should not be undertaken.

Clause 7 deals with the interaction between the Bill and certain pre-existing legal rights. Subclause (1) provides that the new Act does not affect a right to refuse medical treatment. Subclause (2) provides that the new Act does not affect the legal consequences (if any) of taking or refraining from taking therapeutic measures that do not amount to extraordinary measures, or of taking or refraining from taking extraordinary measures in the case of a patient who has not made a direction under the new Act. A medical practitioner is protected in respect of decisions made by him in good faith and without negligence in relation to various matters that he is called upon to decide under the provisions of the new Act.

Clause 8 is a saving clause. Subclause (1) makes it clear that the new Act does not prevent the artificial maintenance of the circulation or respiration of a deceased person for the purpose of maintaining organs in a condition suitable for transplantation or, where the deceased person was a pregnant woman, for the purpose of maintaining the life of the foetus. Subclause (2) provides that nothing in the new Act authorises an act that causes or accelerates death, as distinct from an act that permits the dying process to take its natural course. This latter provision is inserted out of an abundance of caution to guard against any possible misinterpretation of early provisions of the Bill.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr McRAE (Playford): It is with pleasure that I again move:

That, in the opinion of the House, victims of crime suffering personal injuries should be compensated by a publicly funded insurance scheme similar to the Workers Compensation Act and

should otherwise be assisted and rehabilitated, if necessary on the basis that public money expended be recovered where possible from those at fault; and further that a Select Committee be appointed to report on the most efficient manner of achieving that result and also to examine and report on property loss suffered by victims of crime.

This motion, as you will recall, has had a somewhat chequered and by no means successful career. It is the third successive session of this Parliament in which I have moved this. I trust on this occasion that we can, at long last, get the House's approval and a Select Committee off the ground. At least some positive steps have been taken since I first moved this motion. I would be so bold as to suggest that moving the motion and its discussion may have had something to do with some of the things that have taken place.

However, let me get this motion in its correct perspective. In the 1979 election campaign, there was a law and order issue beat up by the Liberal Party in this State and, particularly, in the outer metropolitan area. As member for Playford, and knowing the members for Newland, Todd and Napier, I was very well aware of the way in which this law and order campaign was used in those areas. Advertisements appeared in the paper at that time of a most extraordinary kind. I give one example, directed at of all people to the member for Hartley, the then Premier, which read in this fashion:

Why does Parliament provide sentences which are so lenient as, in some cases, to be laughable, and why are so many early paroles given to serious offenders? Some of your own justices of the peace have complained, so has your Police Force. Your Government sacked the former Police Commissioner, Mr Harold Salisbury, and you said, 'I would have resigned if he hadn't.' Are people who stand for family values and law and order expendable because of your Government's radical libertarian views?

There were other advertisements of a more disgraceful kind, but I do not intend to go into the detail of them.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** I think you covered them last year.

**Mr McRAE:** I covered them in quite some detail; I do not intend to cover them again. All members will recall the advertisements to which I referred. So, the background is that there was a law and order campaign, and if its intention was to focus lawmakers' attention on the rights of victims then I am all in favour of that aim. Unfortunately, I think the aim was blatantly political by those involved in it. I am not suggesting that all members of the Liberal Party in this place or elsewhere would have approved of that part of that campaign. However, I quite agree that the law has been defective in this State over a very long period indeed in the way in which it has looked at victims of crime.

A world-wide trend has been to look realistically at this very problem. If I wished, I could canvass various reports that have appeared in the United Kingdom, United States and in other countries. But, suffice it to say, I can deal with reports that have appeared in Australia, particularly in South Australia. Soon after I first moved this motion in 1979, the then newly elected Government of this State appointed a Committee of Inquiry into Victims of Crime in May 1980.

The membership of the committee was distinguished. It comprised: Ms J. Barbour, Child Protection Officer at the Adelaide Children's Hospital; Mr A. Barnes, a solicitor in private practice; Dr Aileen Connon, a very wellknown doctor, Health Services Co-ordinator with the South Australian Health Commission; Dr Peter Grabowsky, Director of the Office of Crime Statistics in the Law Department; Mr C. M. Harris, Assistant Director-General, Department of Community Welfare; Mr Brian Martin, Principal Assistant Crown Prosecutor; Mr J. Murray, Inspector, Policy Section of the Police Department; Mr A. Shields, retired insurance company director; Mr Ray Whitrod, Executive Officer,

Victims of Crimes Service; and Ms Rosemary Wighton, Women's Adviser, Premier's Department.

That committee discussed the matter extensively throughout 1980, and in due course reported to the Government, I understand in January of this year. That report, which has recently arrived in the Parliamentary Library, shows that the whole of this area has been very objectively canvassed. I must say, before continuing to refer to this report, that the Opposition still very much regrets the Government's decision not to allow it full participation in this inquiry—that is to say, it permitted the Opposition only to make a submission as distinct from participating in the inquiry. We regret that that occurred. I must also say that I am sorry that the Attorney-General was not courteous enough to send either the Opposition spokesman on justice matters or me a copy of this report. In fact, I had to ring Dr Grabosky in order to get a copy of it. I hope that the Minister's department will lift its game in future in supplying me and my colleagues with this information.

Nonetheless, I acknowledge the very valuable work that has been done by this eminent committee. I am surprised, in view of the number of recommendations made and the seriousness of those recommendations (and there are some 67 in all), that the report received little publicity. In fact, so far as I am aware, it received publicity in only one of the metropolitan dailies and at a fairly low-key level. I am interested to note some of the more important recommendations, and they certainly bear out the thrust of earlier speeches I have made in support of this motion.

Recommendation No. 2 states that further research should be undertaken in the field of criminal victimology. That is something that you, Sir, will recall that I stressed from the very beginning. Nobody disagrees with me that we must look after the victims, but in order to do our work properly we have to have proper research. Up until this point of time we have not had that. I am pleased to see that recommendation. Recommendation No. 3 is that increased resources should be provided for crime prevention and public information programmes by both Government and non-government agencies. I believe that I made that point on the last occasion on which I spoke. I will not deal with more than a dozen of the more important of these recommendations, but there are many important recommendations here. Recommendation No. 7 is that additional studies should be undertaken so that the public is better informed about the prosecution and sentencing process. How often have you, Sir, had constituents or families of your electors come to you, or other members, or to your office and ask questions about the criminal justice programme? How often have you found people confused about what is actually going on? They may not be saying anything is wrong, but they may be totally confused about the process through which a member of their family is going. I think that is an excellent recommendation and that something should be done about it.

Recommendation No. 9 is also important. It states that news coverage of crime and criminal justice should respect the dignity and protect the privacy of the victim and the victim's family. I point out that there is probably no more obvious case than the news coverage we have seen, particularly in the Murdoch press, over the last few days, over the case of Azaria Chamberlain. Again, when I look at today's *News* I find the most bizarre headline 'Human held bleeding Azaria'. Really, the most disgraceful innuendoes are being made in those reports without proper justification. If one looks at the so-called justification for that headline one finds that it is a secondhand guess at what some expert may have said 12 000 miles away.

I would like to continue to highlight some of the other important recommendations. There is a general recommen-

dition which forms part of a block, Nos. 18 to 25 inclusive, under the title 'Co-ordination of victim assistance initiatives'. That includes such things as provision of emergency numbers, seminars, various subsidies, and training and other measures which might be of assistance. There is then another block of recommendations which deal with service for crime victims. That covers a wide range of things such as police, medical practitioners, community counselling groups, and so on. In particular, attention is paid to cases of sexual assault (and so it should be) and to child sexual abuse within the family situation. Again, that is something I have raised in this House before—the critical situation we have in this State and throughout this country in that area. There is then another block of recommendations under the heading 'Court procedure'. Again, I find myself in agreement with most of the suggestions made there.

I now turn to the area which highlights my motion—that block of recommendations Nos. 55 to 67 and under the general heading 'Compensation'. Recommendation No. 55 is that the present limit of \$10 000 compensation for the victim should be increased and that a study should be undertaken to determine a fair and equitable limit. I think that the committee has vindicated my stand of the last two years, and I hope that the Minister will, in the light of that, be supporting my call now for a Select Committee of this House to determine what the limit, if any, should be and how we should approach an equitable and fair limit as these eminent people have said.

Recommendation No. 56 was that costs reasonably and directly incurred by a victim as a consequence of a crime should be reimbursed in the same manner as special damages in a civil court, and that provisions should be made for the recovery of compensation paid to victims where there are rights of recovery under alternative legislation. Recommendation No. 57 will not be pleasing to the member for Glenelg, I know, because it is that loss or damage to property occasioned by criminal acts should not be compensable by the State. I have often complained that the tendency of both our civil and criminal law is to treat human beings as subsidiary to property and animals. Members would be well aware that, if one's property or animals are damaged, one's rights to sue are preserved for six years by the law. However, if you, your son or wife are injured, the rights, except in exceptional cases, are preserved for only three years. That is one example I can give of how the law protects property and animals more than it does human beings. Therefore, I think that my motion is quite reasonable in that it at least asks that an investigation be made into recompensing people where their property has been damaged because of reckless criminal acts, sometimes committed by violent offenders, over which no person can have any control whatsoever. Let me give two examples of this. First, take the case of an armed offender who is making an escape and seizes a person's motor vehicle and in the escape smashes it.

That is something for which the victim should be compensated. There are simpler examples than that. It is the sort of situation where a larrikin passes one's car parked in the street and for the sheer fun of it (what fun there can be I know not), slashes the duco, breaks off the aerial, or does any number of things, and I do not know why we should not be able to investigate that matter. I indicate that this is what the recommendation is for. However, on this occasion I hope that the Minister will allow the Parliament to make a proper investigation of this.

I know that the member for Glenelg will be even less pleased with recommendation No. 58, and I am not very happy with it, either. This recommendation is by a majority. Where not otherwise indicated, all of these recommendations are unanimous. Where a recommendation is by a

majority I will say so; otherwise, the recommendation has been unanimous. Recommendation No. 58 is that loss or damage to property occasioned by escapees from State training centres should not be compensable by the State. Again, in line with my earlier remarks, I cannot really see why that matter should not at least be investigated. By all means let us place the emphasis on criminal injuries to persons, bodily injuries to persons, but having done that let us also examine, in all justice, damage to persons' property. I do not see why it should not be investigated. I am dubious about recommendation 60, which is that the trial judge should be empowered to make a compensation award immediately upon the conviction of the offender. If by that it is meant that the trial judge may do it upon request in appropriate circumstances, I do not really object to that, but if it is intended that this be a rush to justice, I am totally opposed to that, because quite obviously in many cases (and take the case of a rape victim) it would take a long time to assess what real damage had been done to that person. Depending on what the recommendation means, I may or may not favour that recommendation.

I favour recommendation No. 61, which states that criminal injuries compensation matters should otherwise be heard by one court, and that this court should develop efficient administrative and court hearing procedures. I think it is only fair.

**Mr Mathwin:** What report is that?

**Mr McRAE:** The report of the Committee of Inquiry on Victims of Crime, January 1981. As I have said, I am very sorry that the Attorney-General's Department appears to have completely overlooked the House of Assembly. I have not been given a copy, and it was not until I went into the library this morning that I found that it had a copy, the stamp on which is 3 September but the date of the report is January this year. I checked with my colleagues and I found that the Leader of the Opposition in the other place had a copy given to him in March this year, but certainly none of my colleagues in the Assembly has been given a copy. I have rung Dr Grabosky and asked for a copy, and he has kindly said that he would send me one. However, I am not very pleased about the attitude that the Attorney-General in another place has adopted towards members in this place.

**Mr Mathwin:** It is the cost.

**Mr McRAE:** It may be the cost factor, but it is small cost if we can help the victims. Recommendation No. 63 contains provisions for interim financial assistance, which I think is very necessary indeed where there is an emergency. Recommendation No. 65 I know will please the member for Glenelg: it is that courts should make greater use of restitution. I support that, too.

All in all, I must say that I consider this report has been very carefully researched and reflects credit on those who have done the work, and it is a pity that it has not been broadcast more widely throughout the community. Now that we do have it, I hope that the Chief Secretary will take steps, either via my motion or by some other procedural means, to set up forthwith a committee of this House to determine how we should go about this important work, because I stress that it is the members of the House of Assembly in our electorate offices who have to deal with these situations and it should be in this House that a committee should be dealing with the implementation of this report. The Opposition will guarantee the utmost assistance in an unbiased fashion in collating whatever evidence is required, and doing the best that we can to see that we get a proper system.

Having said all that, I want to stress this factor: in my own belief and in my own motion I believe I have struck what is a fair way of providing recompense. I chose a



system similar to that of workers compensation, because victims of crime are very often similar to victims of work injuries. It can be simply because a man is working in a factory and is unlucky enough to be standing under a crane when the crane topples that he is very seriously injured. It may be that there is no negligence on his part, the company's part, or anyone's part, but society as a whole recognises that such a person has been an unlucky victim of the system, and therefore he is recompensed.

In the same way, victims of crime are most often picked at random by their attacker. It seemed to me that one way of adjusting their compensation was to do it on a workers compensation basis. However, I must point out that there are others who would put the case more strongly than that. I have before me, from the University of Sydney, Faculty of Law, *Proceedings of the Institute of Criminology*. It is print No. 45 under the heading of 'Victims of Crime'. It was a recent seminar held on 17 September 1980. The institute comes under the very distinguished patronage of the Hon. Sir Laurence Street, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New South Wales. On the occasion in question, a report was given by Mr Ray Whitrod, who was one of the authors of the report to which I have just referred. He made reference to some of the problems which have occurred and gave us his various opinions. There was also an interesting address given on the question of compensation itself by Glen Barkley, a New South Wales criminal law barrister. I do not propose to read the whole of his address, but I will read his concluding summary, which is as follows:

It is submitted that any such tribunal [he is referring to the Criminal Injuries Tribunal] should have the following features:

- (a) the amounts of compensation obtainable by victims of crime should be equivalent to the amounts of damages which would be awarded at common law for equivalent injuries. Awards of damages at the common law level are what the community through the courts has developed as a fair measure of compensation. There should not be a reduced scale such as that provided for in section 16 of the Workers Compensation Act, 1926, whereunder amounts of compensation obtainable are generally substantially less than the amounts of common law damages which would have been awarded for equivalent injuries.

So, it can be seen that there is support from a reputable source for a far greater degree of compensation for the victim than my motion would seek to obtain. The author continues:

- (b) a victim should have a right of appeal to a court against an error of law or the inadequacy of an amount of compensation;
- (c) as proposed at the 1975 seminar, an applicant should have legal representation and legal aid;

I certainly support that. The report further states:

- (d) there should be provision for affidavit evidence with a right of cross-examination.

So, one finds everywhere one turns that there is now an ever-increasing realisation that something must be done to look after victims of crime. I am suggesting to the House that now we have obtained a report of the Committee of Inquiry on Victims of Crime, when members have had the opportunity of reading it, a Select Committee, for which my motion makes a proposal, would be an excellent vehicle by which this House can monitor and give its views on the way in which people can be helped.

We all have a responsibility to do something concrete about this. Political Parties in this State have been saying a lot but doing very little for a long time, and I hope that by supporting this motion something can now be done in a concrete way.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## INCOME TAX

**Mr McRAE (Playford):** I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, a Select Committee should be appointed to consider and report on the various methods, either in use or proposed for consideration, of apportioning income tax between the Commonwealth and the States, in particular this State, and to advise the Government on the various effects which may be induced by the 'New Federalism'.

Again, this is a motion I have put before the House before. As in the case of victims of crime, it is important, as has been underlined by subsequent events. In my address to the House last evening in the Budget debate, I drew attention to the problems that were being encountered by this State due to the so-called New Federalism proposed by the Fraser Government. I now draw attention particularly to two of the statements made by the Treasurer in his Financial Statement delivered on 15 September of this year in which, under the heading 'Commonwealth Funds', he says:

Funds provided by the Commonwealth Government, together with borrowings over which it has a large influence, finance around 70 per cent of the outlays of the South Australian public sector. It goes without saying that trends in funds provided by the Commonwealth Government are of crucial importance in determining the shape of the State's Budget.

I agree; it goes without saying that that is the case. I now turn to the portion of the Treasurer's statement where he deals with the general purpose grants provided by the Commonwealth, where under the heading 'General Purpose' he says:

The Commonwealth Government has discontinued the specific purpose grants it has made previously for community health projects and dental health services. In the main those grants were made available direct to the South Australian Health Commission. For 1981-82, the Commonwealth Government has provided a general purpose health grant of \$8.6 million.

As indicated elsewhere in this statement, new tax sharing and health grant arrangements have been introduced under the States (Tax Sharing and Health Grants) Act, 1981. After a transitional year in 1981-82, those arrangements will move towards a sharing by the States of a total tax base, rather than the former net personal income tax collections base.

For 1981-82, the arrangement provides for the States' tax sharing base in 1980-81 to be increased by 9 per cent. In addition, it provides for the absorption of certain specific purpose grants.

In the case of South Australia, the increase of 9 per cent in the 1980-81 base yields a grant of \$753.8 million. Absorption of specific purpose grants for urban public transport (\$5 million) and for soil conservation, rural extension services and the cost of operating the Commonwealth Government's pathology laboratory at Port Pirie (in all, \$2.2 million), bring the total grant for 1981-82 under the States (Tax Sharing and Health Grants) Act, 1981, to \$761 million. This figure has been included in the Estimates.

Under the heading 'Recurrent Payments', he says:

The Government's financial planning for 1981-82 and the years beyond has regard to two major factors. The first [and I stress this] is the uncertainty which exists in the area of Commonwealth-State financial arrangements with respect to the review of relativities between the States. The report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission has serious implications for South Australia. We are presently taking advantage of the one year deferment in the application of new relativities to develop a case designed to protect our position. The matter is as yet unresolved.

This is quite right; all of these matters are unresolved and it is time that we paid attention as a House to what is going on. There is no better way of doing this than by a committee of the House itself. On coming into office, this Government stressed that it would be a Government of open Administration and would make use of Select Committees. In fact, it has been a closed Government and has made very little use of Select Committees. On this occasion I hope I will be listened to.

**Mr GLAZBROOK** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## FIREARMS

**Mr McRAE (Playford):** I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, a Select Committee should be appointed to investigate the increase of firearms in crimes of violence, advise on the suitability of the regulations on obtaining and keeping guns, and advise generally on what steps should be taken to control this problem.

This is the third time that I have moved this motion. Events have somewhat conspired to assist me, because a great deal of work has been done on this matter in recent years. Before putting before the House a few important statements of recent times, I would like to adopt the philosophy of the consultative document presented to the United Kingdom Parliament in 1973 under the heading 'The Control of Firearms in Great Britain'. By reading paragraphs 23, 24 and 25 and adopting their philosophy, I can show the House the position I take in relation to firearms generally. Under the heading 'The case for stricter controls', it states:

23. The extent to which the rising trend in the use of firearms in crime can be checked or even reversed by stricter controls must be seen in proportion. No system of legal controls, however stringent, is likely to be wholly successful in preventing criminals from obtaining firearms; there will always be some who are bent on acquiring them and have the resourcefulness or the connections to do so. Society should make this as difficult for criminals as reasonably possible. Legal controls are aimed at cutting down, so far as practicable, the ready availability of the more dangerous firearms to the criminal, and to the irresponsible. This is a useful aim, which is not invalidated by the difficulty of achieving more.

24. It may be suggested that the existing controls have failed because, despite being strengthened in a number of respects in recent years, they have not prevented a steady rise in the use of firearms in crime. But the question we must ask ourselves is what the situation would have been with no controls, or weaker controls. If dangerous firearms and their ammunition had been easier to obtain within the law, if the requirements on legal holders to keep their firearms in safe custody had been less strict, is it plausible to suggest that the extent of criminal and irresponsible use of firearms would actually have been less?

25. It can also be argued that the legal controls are not necessary in relation to responsible persons who have legitimate uses for firearms, and that the object of the law should be to deter and to punish unlawful uses. There are, however, serious weaknesses in sole reliance on this approach. Without some machinery, such as the present law provides, for distinguishing the responsible from the irresponsible person, and the legitimate from the illegitimate use, the law would have to allow everyone to buy dangerous firearms—even, for instance, known criminals and the mentally ill—without inquiry into their reasons for wanting such weapons. Experience demonstrates that some people are not in practice deterred by the prospect of heavy penalties, and these include some of the most dangerous and determined criminals. Two kinds of measure are required for the prevention of crime—measures to reduce the opportunities open to the criminal, as well as those which provide for his punishment. One essential aim of any serious attempt to contain the growth of violent crime should therefore be to eliminate avoidable opportunities to acquire firearms for criminal purposes.

I think that is a very neat statement of philosophy, and I simply adopt it as the basis on which I put this motion before the House.

I would next like to refer the House to a volume entitled *Firearms Control*, a study of armed crime and firearms control in England and Wales by Colin Ringwood who, if I recall correctly, was a former chief inspector in Yorkshire. The portion of his work to which I refer deals with the emphasis which he places on the need for research and, as in other areas of the criminal justice system, I again stress the lack of research information that we have available to us, because wild statements are made by the gun lobby, and sometimes by others, which are often plain guesswork. I shall not read this in great detail, but I shall read the headings. He has made recommendations. The first is that there should be a sensible and acceptable definition of the criminal use of firearms in this context. He seeks to differentiate the various kinds of use of firearms. Secondly, he refers to the general incidence of violence in connection

with the types of crime considered above. His third recommendation relates to the use in connection with crime of all types of weapon, while the fourth recommendation deals with a detailed breakdown of types of firearm used, and the fifth recommendation is for as much information as possible about the source of firearms used.

I have, first, adopted the philosophy of the United Kingdom green paper and, secondly, I have stressed the need for research, and I am now pleased to refer to a very recent work by Richard Harding, of the University of Western Australia. It was in fact published only this year and, under the heading 'Firearms and Violence in Australian Life', he deals with the South Australian legislation and regulations in a very flattering way. I hope the Chief Secretary will take the opportunity of looking at this volume. Of course, he does make some recommendations which are in line with comments I have made in the past, and I take this opportunity of adopting his remarks. This is what he sees as a strategy for the future.

His first point is that all jurisdictions should have efficient registration systems for hand guns, shotguns and rifles. I agree that at the moment we have made a very good start in this State, and the writer applauds that. On the other hand, the Minister will know that a huge number of weapons has been registered when one considers the population of the State. I think the figures given to me showed something like 150 000 registrations in a population of 1 300 000.

The second point is that all jurisdictions should have a licensing system for persons wishing to own registrable firearms. The next point is that it is essential that all jurisdictions co-ordinate their legislation and licensing systems—and I think that is a fair comment. I believe that special attention should be given to problems created by the use of firearms in crime, particularly robbery. Next, police practices with regard to the carrying and use of firearms should be re-examined. The author believes that issues relating to gun control must be dealt with for the public benefit, and not to serve sectional interests, such as those of the gun lobby or the police. I believe that has been done in South Australia.

I am most interested in the summary of the entire book by Mr Harding. He states:

The impact of firearms ownership and use on Australian society is well short of a crisis. But there are tangible grounds for concern. We are on the same road as the United States, though nowhere near as far along it. Accordingly, the strategy for the future should be considered now, formulated in detail soon, and implemented reasonably quickly. The various issues which have been identified in this book should not simply be allowed to drift. If that were to happen, after a decade they would have consolidated into one large problem, and by the end of the century that problem could have become unmanageable. Firearms violence would by then be a part of everyday life, and the quality of everyday life would be poisoned by anxiety and fear.

I want to stress very strongly to the House that it is my belief that, while we do not yet have a crisis situation in this State, we are well along the American path, and it would border on the criminally negligent for this House to do nothing about it. It was only because of the work which I did and which the former Chief Secretary (Mr Simmons) did that we got the legislation that we did in 1977; otherwise, the matter would have been allowed to drift at that time.

I see, in the continual crimes of violence involving firearms which are reported day in and day out, a drift along the American path, and it would be criminal negligence on the part of this House to allow that to go on. What we have to do, and we have the facilities to do it, is to identify from the police and other sources the various areas of concern and the rational and logical ways in which we can, by legislative and other means, seek to eliminate the dangers. If we do not take that step soon, I here and now prophesy

that within 10 years we will be in a crisis situation. I am glad to find that I am now fortified by a writer of the status of Richard Hardings, and I commend the motion to the House.

Mr MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr McRAE (Playford) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1978. Read a first time.

Mr McRAE: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It is a simple Bill which will facilitate reference to Acts of the Parliament. At the moment Acts of this Parliament are for various purposes in the administration of the law referred to in different sorts of ways. It may be noted that I have referred to the Act which I seek to amend by this short title and have then denoted the year in which it was passed and the year in which it was last amended. That is a common method of referring to legislation, but for other purposes an Act may be referred to by the year of its passing together with its number assigned by the Clerk of the Parliament.

Since no two Acts of Parliament have the same short title for the above reasons, it seems to me that all that is necessary to identify an Act is to cite the short title. However, various persons may wish for different reasons either to add the year of its passing or to add the year of its passing and the year of its last amendment. Others may simply wish to refer to its year of passing together with its number. This Bill provides that any of these methods of reference may for all purposes be used. I believe that I have considerable support in the legal profession and elsewhere for this measure and I commend it to the House.

I hope that on this occasion there can be a speedy passage of this measure. It is something that is wanted by the legal profession, the police, and various Government agencies. A number of people were quite disappointed on the last occasion when I put in this simple measure and, simply for reasons which I know not, the Government chose not to do anything about it. There should be no reason why this Bill could not have passed all stages today, and I appeal to the Minister on the front bench today to speak to his colleague in another place to see whether we can arrange that on the next appropriate day this Bill should pass through all stages. Every section of the community is in favour of it, and it makes a lot of good sound common sense.

Mr MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr McRAE (Playford) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Wrongs Act, 1936-1975. Read a first time.

Mr McRAE: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The law relating to liability for animals is in a confused and undesirable state. As long ago as 1969 the Law Reform Commission of South Australia in its seventh report to the then Attorney-General (Mr Millhouse) recommended various amendments. I commend this report to honourable members, and I also, with respect, commend an article which I recently prepared for the *Australian Law News*.

Honourable members will be aware that in the famous case of *Donoghue v. Stevenson* (1932) A.C. 562 the modern

law of negligence was clarified. The classical pronouncement is to be found in Lord Atkins speech in that case, as follows:

There must be, and is, some general conception of relations giving rise to a duty of care, of which the particular cases found in the books are but instances . . . The rule that you are to love your neighbour becomes in law you must not injure your neighbour; and the lawyers question, 'Who is my neighbour?' receives a restricted reply. You must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions which you can reasonably foresee would be likely to injure your neighbour. Who, then, in law, is my neighbour? The answer seems to be—persons who are so closely and directly affected by my act that I ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected when I am directing my mind to the acts or omissions which are called in question.

In my respectful submission, there is no reason why this basic principle should not apply to persons in custody of animals in the same way as it applies in the general law of negligence, yet for various reasons strange and peculiar distinctions have been drawn. In particular, in the notorious case of *Searle v. Wallbank* (1947) A.C. 341, it was held by the House of Lords that the landowner was not liable for damage caused by animals straying on to the roads from his land, even though he may have known that his fences were in a bad state of repair. This foolish and unjust rule has now been abolished in England, Scotland, Canada, New South Wales, and Western Australia. It still remains law in South Australia today.

Furthermore, there are ancient distinctions which allegedly delineate between animals said to be naturally in a wild state and domesticated animals. As the Law Commission report mentioned, this peculiar distinction caused one famous writer to ask whether or not a snail was a wild animal.

I have, therefore, put before the House a Bill which provides that the keeper of an animal who negligently fails to exercise a proper standard of care to prevent the animal from causing loss or injury shall be liable, in damages, in accordance with the principles of the law of negligence to a person suffering loss or injury in consequence of his neglect. I have provided a standard of care in accordance with the facts of the particular case. I have provided a presumption in the absence of proof in relation to vicious or dangerous animals.

I have abolished the rule in *Searle v. Wallbank*. I have provided for employees of such owners. I have defined owner in a reasonable fashion. I have dealt with the question of trespass and incitement. I have excluded other ancient principles of law which are no longer relevant. I have provided that action in nuisance can in certain circumstances still be maintained and that no Statute remedies are affected. I have made it quite clear that this Act will not be retrospective.

I feel confident that I can assure the House that the proposals I have put to honourable members are in accordance with the great weight of opinion in the legal profession and, furthermore, are in accordance with the numerous reports of the Law Reform Commissions throughout the British Commonwealth and in many of the Australian States. Finally, I believe that the Bill is in accordance with common sense and justice and does equity to all concerned. I commend the measure to the House.

I again ask of the Minister that on this occasion there will at least be an attempt to debate this issue because I want to explain to him one of the circumstances which led me to introduce this Bill. It will take only a moment to explain what happened.

A young lady was driving her motor vehicle from Lyndoch in the direction of Gawler and seated next to her was a young female friend. As they were passing a farm, sheep strayed from the farm. The farmer had been warned on two occasions by the local policeman that his fences were in a

state of disrepair. The end result was horrific. The young lady struck the sheep, and the car went out of control. It smashed headlong into a car conveying a man, his wife and three children coming from Gawler to Lyndoch. The toll of that accident was absolutely horrifying. The young lady was dead, her female passenger was a paraplegic, and in the other car the husband and wife suffered horrific injuries and all the other passengers were injured.

The matter went to the High Court. Only as a matter of luck and because the young lady who was the driver was dead and not there to defend herself, it was held that all the survivors could sue her insurance company, but the High Court held that, notwithstanding what I would say was a virtual criminal act by that landowner, nonetheless under this ridiculous *Searle v. Wallbank* rule he would not be liable.

Even if it is the intention of the Government not to support this measure, I hope that, on this occasion, to do justice to the people who are at risk in our community because of this foolish and ancient law which has been abolished in so many common law jurisdictions now, at least I will be given the credit of a properly informed debate. I again appeal to the Minister on the front bench to speak to his colleague in another place to ensure that we at least get a debate.

Mr MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

### CASINO BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 16 September. Page 941.)

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I state quite categorically that, if this measure depends on my support for the introduction and establishment of a casino in South Australia, then there will never be a casino in this State.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Does that mean you are opposed to it?

Mr LEWIS: I am flatly opposed to the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I see no reason whatever why South Australia should follow the lead, if that is what it can be called, down whatever road it is that other people and other places are going in the construction of this kind of facility and its licensing.

Mr Max Brown: Joh Bjelke-Petersen does not think the way you are thinking.

Mr LEWIS: Whatever he may think, and whatever else anybody else may think, I see no logic in that argument. Although there may have been some increased revenue derived by the Tasmanian Government as a result of a casino's establishment by Federal Hotels in the Wrest Point complex, I do not agree that that same amount of revenue would accrue to this State. For that reason, I cannot support the measure. Let me expand on that. If Queensland establishes one or two casinos, if Victoria, New South Wales, and Western Australia establish a casino, and the Northern Territory's casinos continue, clearly there will not be the remaining market from which to obtain that revenue. All States will merely have casinos to cater for those people who have a propensity to gamble within the States in which they happen to be at the time they decide to do it.

Until recently, Wrest Point was the only casino operating in Australia. For those who thought there was some novelty in gambling and who otherwise might have had reason to take a junket somewhere away from where they lived, whether that was, Brisbane, Perth, Adelaide, Darwin or Melbourne, and who may have chosen the destination of Wrest Point for the simple novelty, perhaps at taxpayers'

expense, because they could say they went there for a convention of two, five or 10 days—

Mr Slater: You were there; I was with you.

Mr LEWIS: I had no option; if the Parliamentary bowling tournament is held in Tasmania and if my accommodation for that is in that complex, what hope have I got if I want to attend that function? I derived a great deal of benefit from the opportunity for political debate at a social level, and therefore some intellectual interaction on a number of issues quite unrelated to gambling, by participating in that activity. That was why I went to Hobart. I enjoyed bowling with the member for Gilles, along with you, Mr Speaker. I quite happily acknowledge that the accommodation provided there is very satisfactory, although that is not what this Bill is about.

The Bill is about the principle of gambling in a casino and the necessity or otherwise to have such a facility in this State. I have pointed out that I believe that once all States have casinos the total number of dollars invested nationally in casinos each year will not increase substantially. Having made the point that the total market for gambling in such facilities is fairly limited and will not increase by any more than a marginal amount, certainly not by a factor of one, two or many times, even though there may be a greater number of casinos in this country, I cannot see justification for providing one in this State. Who will pay for it? This is the nub of the moral argument.

If plumbers, bricklayers, builders of different kinds, carpet weavers, painters, and other tradesmen involved dedicate all their resources and efforts for the time necessary to construct such a facility as Wrest Point, certainly they are earning an income and paying income tax on it for the public purse, but in the meantime how many houses will not be built for those people desperately in need of welfare housing? How many kinds of essential services, including schools and hospitals, could have been built in the same year by using those resources by reallocating them through the taxation mechanism or whatever other mechanism members might like to use in the public or private sector? Those resources would then be put to better use than if used for casino construction.

As I see it, this State is in enough difficulty without having the burden of an additional reallocation of resources away from areas of great social need, for what I regard as a legitimate moral commitment of resources. In this place we should heed the needs of people in less fortunate circumstances.

Mr Mathwin: We should be alert.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, indeed.

Mr Slater: Wowsers incorporated!

Mr LEWIS: Quite apart from the fact that I may be legitimately or otherwise termed a wowser (and I am not quite sure what that means), I do not believe that people need greater opportunities to gamble. I will oppose any such measure before this House if it alienates such resources.

Mr Slater: You supported Soccer Pools.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gilles will have an opportunity in due course.

Mr LEWIS: I cannot answer that interjection. I did not hear it.

Mr Mathwin: It would be out of order if you did.

Mr LEWIS: I understand that. I echo sentiments contained in an article attributed to comments made by our Minister of Tourism, Mrs Adamson, an outstanding Minister indeed. The article by Julian Stuart, headed 'Casino is not the answer', states:

Convention centre better for South Australia, says Adamson. Don't put your money on a casino to sure South Australia's tourism problems!

I am sure that should have read 'to cure South Australia's tourism problems'. The article continues:

Instead, put it on a convention centre on an international stage ... and watch the tourist dollars roll in. That was the message from South Australian Tourism Minister Mrs Adamson yesterday after attending the opening of the new Federal Hotel casino complex at Alice Springs.

She said: 'I think in general Australians tend to be slightly unrealistic in their belief that casinos *per se* are the answer to tourism development. My personal view is strongly against any expansion of gambling facilities.'

Indeed, they are my sentiments. She continues:

I find it hard to believe that something I feel is inherently wrong can be good for South Australia.

They are my sentiments, too. She continues:

However, I recognise that the realities of tourism today require examination of what the tourist wants. Now I believe there is a limit to the number of gambling facilities that can be sustained in any State and the Commonwealth, and we already in Australia are more than well catered for in terms of gambling facilities.

That is especially so when we consider the proposals before other Parliaments in this country to establish gambling casinos in their States or areas of social jurisdiction (and in the latter case I refer to the Federal Government). The article continues:

Mrs Adamson said the benefits of such a project would be spread over the transport, retail, accommodation and related industries, unlike a casino, where the main beneficiaries were the investors.

The Northern Territory Tourism Minister, Mr Steele, believes the Alice casino complex will boost dramatically the top end's impressive 12 per cent annual growth rate in tourist traffic—and he has told Mrs Adamson so.

He is entitled to his opinion, and he is also entitled to his problems, because associated with that casino, or any casino, there will always be elements of organised crime, crime related not only to blackmail but also, more importantly, to drug trafficking.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** Do you reckon that they launder black money through them?

**Mr LEWIS:** Do they ever!

**Mr Slater:** You've never been there, have you?

**Mr LEWIS:** Just because I am opposed to a casino does not mean that I have never been in a casino or that the only one I have been in is at Wrest Point. Let me reassure that honourable member that, of the casinos to which I have been, and because of the characters I have seen at them, I would be surprised if there was any one of those casinos in which a significant organised operation laundering crooked dollars was not well in hand and well established. I think that there is no more effective way of laundering dirty money.

**Mr Max Brown:** They might have been thinking that about you.

**Mr LEWIS:** They are entitled to think what they like about me, but my manner and disposition, I believe, as non-verbal indicators of my attitude to life, would clearly demonstrate that I am not that kind of person.

*Mr Max Brown interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Max, I would not want to reflect on anything that might be indicated by your own appearance. The honourable member might, therefore, desist from the line of interjecting he is following. After all, it is not only on appearance, but also in reports.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** So you had no trouble getting in and out?

**Mr LEWIS:** No, in and out. I must say to the member for Hartley that on that occasion I was approached. I was propositioned on more than one matter, which I would regard as not only an activity entailing what I consider to be immoral and undesirable behaviour but also a proposition which in this State would be illegal. Certainly, to have taken up any of those propositions, if they were not in any

or all of the circumstances illegal, would have led me into difficulties that would have proved more awkward for me to get out of than my simply refusing to participate. All very attractive.

Some of the problems with which people who go into casinos became involved are reflected by a newspaper article which quotes a group called Gamblers Anonymous. That group is referred to in an article which appeared in the *Hobart Examiner* on 9 May 1978. Goodness knows, they have probably been referred to again subsequently, and there may well be records not available to me, but confidentially held records in the Tasmanian Government's welfare agencies, indicating the kind of difficulties into which people have got themselves when they have become involved in gambling on a regular basis at Wrest Point. The article, which is titled '500 Hooked on Lure of the Casino', states:

There is evidence that 500 chronic, compulsive gamblers have been or are addicted to the various games offered at the Wrest Point casino. There could be more, but it would be irresponsible to estimate how many.

A 'picture' of the 500 would be as follows:

A large majority have switched to Wrest Point from another form of compulsive gambling. In nearly all cases this previous addiction was horse-racing—

where the extent to which they can bet is limited by the bookmakers with whom they place their bets—

Only a small number have come from non-chronic gambling habits ... Most would be males—

the member for Whyalla might take heed or solace, I am not sure which, from that point—

although from an originally small percentage, the number of women is steadily increasing.

For those of the 500 who are salaried, their weekly income is insufficient for their habit.

**Mr Slater:** They could become hooked on soccer pools.

**Mr LEWIS:** Indeed they could; that is why I do not support gambling in any of its forms. However, wherever it is lawful I will do whatever I can to regulate it in a way that ensures that the welfare problem, created by people who became addicted, is addressed by the revenue collected by Governments and allocated to that purpose.

**Mr Max Brown:** More so in soccer pools than in the casino.

**Mr LEWIS:** You just never know. What about the dogs? The article continues, later:

They—along with their wealthier colleagues—are using bank loans and finance companies as a source of revenue for gambling.

When any of the 500 go bankrupt, it is nearly always 'quietly'. The reason for their problems—gambling—and in particular the casino—will be entered on few official documents—

most of which will be confidential—

This picture—the clearest so far—comes from Gamblers Anonymous, a small Hobart-based organisation which attempts to turn all those who come to it away from compulsive gambling habits.

That article would not have been written simply to fill up space, nor would it have been written simply to air a view. It was, in fact, part of a series of articles called 'The Casino: An Inquiry, Part I'. The important point that comes out of this is that it is easier for people to become hooked on gambling in casinos and extend their betting far beyond their means than it is in other forms of gambling. When the race card has been completed people go home; there are no more horses to bet on. However, if one starts betting in a casino one can lay a bet, as sure as eggs, at least 60 times an hour, as fast as one can get one's money down, in a good many of the games.

The rate at which people hooked on gambling can go through the dollars in their pockets is far greater than their capacity to comprehend the peril in which they place themselves and the families that are otherwise dependent on the dollars they are using. The personal tragedy that results is

enormous, and wherever we can save one family I think it is worth our time and trouble to do so. Not one member opposite, nor one member on this side of the Chamber, if confronted with a situation in which it were possible to intervene and save a family from break up and social and financial disaster, would hesitate to do so.

**Mr O'Neill:** Why do you hesitate in the unemployment situation? Why don't you do something about getting jobs for people?

**Mr LEWIS:** Indeed we are. Although I would like to address that question in realistic and fair terms, the ambit of this debate relating to this Bill does not allow me to do that. If the member for Florey wishes, he can see the comments I have made about that subject from time to time.

**Mr Max Brown:** You are talking about an employment project.

**Mr LEWIS:** I would consider it to be less than appropriate, depending on one's morals (and if you have not got any, the honourable member from Whyalla might just as easily argue that prostitution is an employment project).

**Mr Max Brown:** It is.

**Mr LEWIS:** If the honourable member thinks that is desirable, stand up and say so and let the people of South Australia and his constituents know.

*Members interjecting.*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mallee has the floor.

**The Hon. D. J. Hoggood:** The times they are a changin', you once told us.

**Mr LEWIS:** I did.

**The Hon. D. J. Hoggood:** And then you got talked out of it by your colleagues.

**Mr LEWIS:** I did not. I know exactly what I believe in relation to that matter, and what I would seek to do, given the opportunity to do it, and it is not what the member for Baudin has implied by his interjection. I would say to any member opposite who may want to claim that that was an instance when I was guilty of duplicity, that of the amendments that I would have attempted to move I would have made it impossible, where it is now possible and lawful, to recruit minors or juveniles to prostitution.

This matter of a casino for South Australia needs to be carefully and thoroughly considered by all members before they decide to vote in favour of it, if that is their inclination, but I urge them to do otherwise, as a casino will not significantly increase total revenue accruing from taxation, but it will only increase the burden of responsibility that the welfare agencies, both public and private, will have to meet. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## CASINO

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Slater:

That, pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, a Joint Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the implications of the establishment of a casino in South Australia and what effect and potential a casino may have on the tourist industry in this State.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 949.)

**Mr KENEALLY (Stuart):** I support the motion moved by the member for Gilles. It is true to say, and it has been proven here today as well, that the whole question of the establishment of a casino in South Australia is one of considerable interest, and it has been for some years. I can recall when we debated this measure in the House eight

years ago that I supported it then, and I support it now—not because I personally have any great interest in being a customer or a client of the casino, because that is not in my nature. In fact, I have visited casinos in Hobart and Darwin, and I went there with the very best intentions of making a substantial contribution towards the cost of running those facilities, but I left after spending a few dollars on keno, and I was not able to bring myself to contribute to blackjack and two-up and a lot of other games that are played there for the benefit of the proprietors (very rarely for the clients).

Nevertheless, I am as aware as most other people that there is a considerable body of feeling in South Australia that a casino ought to be established here. There is also a considerable body of opinion that a casino ought not be established in South Australia. The best way that we as legislators can resolve that obvious difference of opinion that exists in the community is to give the community the opportunity to express a view, and I think the best way that the Parliament can do this is through the avenue of a Select Committee.

I should have mentioned while I was telling the House about my visits to legal casinos that, strangely enough, I have also found myself at odd times in illegal casinos, which would come as a great surprise to members here who know of my very law-abiding ways. However, strange as it is to relate, I have been in such places—the authorities turn a blind eye to them. I might add though that they are not in South Australia, but are interstate. They are well patronised and do very well. The tables have a lot of chips going over them, and a lot of money was disappearing into the little notches they have in the tables for money for the purchase of chips.

It is quite clear that there is considerable support for casinos. Also in my travels (not very extensive within Australia) I have been made aware that some States seem to benefit much more than others through legal gambling. The legislators of South Australia have traditionally been of the view, although it has not often been put to the test, that we do not want casinos in South Australia or, in fact, the one-arm bandits, as they are fondly known by those who sometimes win but mostly lose, the slot machines which are very common in New South Wales. If one drives up to the Murray River one can see the clubs on the Victorian side of the river, where most of the big towns are, and if one drives across the Murray River bridges one finds that the very small towns on the New South Wales side of the Murray have absolutely magnificent club facilities.

**Mr Whitten:** Good cheap meals.

**Mr KENEALLY:** Yes, and great facilities for the public, and there is no doubt where the money comes from. Of course, Sir, as you would rightly point out to me, we are not discussing here whether or not we ought to have poker machines, but we are debating whether or not we should have a casino. As I have every intention of giving a very well informed contribution to this debate, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 September. Page 1062.)

**Mr ABBOTT (Spence):** I support the remarks already made in this debate by my colleagues on this side of the House. The effects of this Budget will be most severe on the little people, the workers, and the ordinary families of South Australia. The dismal economic performance of the

Government will increase the number of people living in poverty and place more stress on the ordinary people already struggling to survive. The community welfare budget has for the second successive year suffered major cuts in real terms. In the 1980-81 Budget it suffered cuts to the extent of almost 6 per cent, and in this Budget the Department for Community Welfare suffered a massive 7.4 per cent cut in real terms.

With inflation running at about 12 per cent, that is a very drastic cut in the area of welfare services for South Australia. This will result in more stress, suffering and hardship and there is no doubt that the department will have grave difficulty in maintaining all of its existing services. There will be no expansion of welfare services and no expansion of welfare facilities, and in times of growing demands the future can only be described as extremely bleak.

It is obvious that the razor gang—that very courageous group of Ministers—looked after their own departments and willy-nilly took the razor to work on the all important areas of health, education and community welfare. It is certain that not one Ministerial member of the razor gang bothered to read the Mann Committee Report that was set up by their colleague, the Minister of Community Welfare, to report on the delivery of community welfare services in South Australia. As members will know, that report contained 90 important recommendations. I do not intend to deal with them in this debate, as I have spoken on some of those recommendations previously. Under this Government, that report and others might just as well be torn up. They are a waste of time.

The Aboriginal community in South Australia is also being treated badly by this Government. I will say more about this later. It is obvious the Government believes that this is an area in which cuts in expenditure can be made, and it adopts the attitude, 'Well, so what; it's only the poor old Aborigines and we can get away with that.' In his second reading explanation, the Premier stated:

For the first time in some years there has been a perceptible improvement in the unemployment situation, as employment opportunities have grown faster than the work force. At the end of June 1981, Australia's unemployment rate had fallen to 5.2 per cent, the lowest since 1976.

In South Australia the disastrous loss of some 20 000 jobs during the period 1977 to 1979 has been halted. However, while the number employed since then has increased significantly, unemployment still remains at an unacceptably high level.

How can the Premier say that the loss of jobs has been halted when South Australia now has the highest level of unemployment in Australia, a fact to which he fails to refer and a situation that his Government's policies have created. It is also strange that, two days after introducing the Budget, the figure of 20 000 job losses during the period 1977-79 had grown by 1 000, to 21 000. It was reported in the *Advertiser* of 19 September, when the Premier was urging private enterprise to get off their tails and do more to help develop South Australia, that a total of 21 000 jobs were lost to South Australia between August 1977 and August 1979. One minute it is 20 000 jobs, and the next it is 21 000 jobs, for the same period. It is no wonder that the Premier referred to them as job creation statistics; he should have called them figure fiddling statistics. This Government has no job creation programmes, and they have very bad statistics.

The Premier also told the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry that his Government could take the credit for creating the right climate. Everybody knows that all the Premier has created is the right climate and the right policies for the present massive unemployment. This major speech marked two years of Liberal economic mismanagement. The Premier says he has reversed the

trend after two years in Government, but we now have more people living in poverty, more homelessness, record unemployment, and reduced and falling family living standards. This is a fine record indeed for a man who said he would create 10 000 jobs. It is an absolute disgrace, and it is irresponsible government. It will certainly take years to tidy up this mess when the Opposition becomes the Government, after the next State election.

In nearly all of his statements, speeches and answers to questions, the Premier enjoys issuing warnings to the work force that excessive wage demands will cost more jobs. He stated this to the Chamber of Commerce, and we hear it continuously from his Government colleagues, and it is given great prominence in his Budget Speech. The Premier, when commenting on the economy in his second reading explanation on the Budget said:

Any comment on the economy would be incomplete without reference to three important factors which, if not managed properly, could erode seriously the progress which has been made.

We are not aware of any progress. Continuing, the Premier said:

The first is the emerging resurgence of excessive wage demands. While growth in prices moderated in 1980-81, the prospect of accelerating wage and price inflation in 1981-82 is of great concern. This Parliament is well aware of my Government's strongly held belief that the wage and salary earner should not have to bear the full brunt of the fight against inflation. However, members are aware also of the Government's determination to do all it can responsibly to encourage moderation in wage and salary demands. It is a determination which stems from an equally strongly held belief that excessive wage demands will jeopardise potential major developments in the State with consequent adverse affects for employment and for the general well-being of all South Australians.

The Premier may care to define for us what he considers are excessive wage demands. The United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia has sought an increase of 2.4 per cent for its affiliated unions in the South Australian Industrial Commission based on the cost-of-living increase in Adelaide for the June quarter. Is that an excessive demand? The Premier will also be aware that, before the wage indexation system collapsed, the Commonwealth Government appeared before all Arbitration Commission hearings and in most of the cases it said that the full c.p.i. increase was not justified, and on many occasions it said that no increase at all was warranted, even though the cost of living continued to spiral, and so workers everywhere did not receive full indexation. As a consequence their living standards dropped and weekly wages fell further and further behind.

The trade union movement in South Australia has simply determined to seek to maintain in this State a system based of full quarterly automatic cost-of-living adjustments. It will be interesting to watch the Government's reaction to this claim, particularly following those controversial amendments to the Arbitration Act requiring the commission to take into account the effects of any decisions on the State's economy in regard to employment and inflation. It was interesting to read that one trade union, which made an application to the South Australian Industrial Commission for wage increases, subpoenaed the Premier. The Premier is in charge of this State's economy and should be in the best position to inform that commission of the state of the economy in South Australia, and as to what effect those wage applications might have upon economy and employment. It was also interesting to hear him answer a question in this House yesterday, when he made the weak excuse that the summons had not been delivered properly, so it appears to me that the Premier is too scared to appear in that court.

I hope that the Premier and his Minister of Industrial Affairs will take note of what the Federal Treasurer was quoted as saying at the twenty-fifth annual industrial rela-

tions conference of the New South Wales Employers Federation on Friday 18 September. In case they were too busy to read it, or were away on holiday over the weekend, let me read it again. It was reported in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 19 September, as follows:

The Government should 'stand back a bit' and allow wage and industrial relations matters to be settled by the parties more directly involved, the Treasurer, Mr Howard, said yesterday. Mr Howard was speaking at the twenty-fifth annual industrial relations conference of the New South Wales Employers' Federation at Bankstown, in Sydney's south-western suburbs.

Mr Howard said he was often told that what was needed was a 'new Government wages policy'. 'It is nonsense to speak of a Government wages policy as though it was something independent from the stance of fiscal, money and other policies,' he said. Governments should avoid rhetoric such as 'wages policy', which encouraged the belief that they had direct and effective powers to set wages when 'clearly they don't have such powers'.

'What I am saying is that we need to recognise that the Government has neither the responsibility nor the wherewithal to involve itself in every pay claim. The best contribution the Government can make to wage determination and to the settlement of industrial disputes is to take one step back and encourage those whose interests are directly at stake to accept direct responsibility for their actions.'

There is a lesson for this State Government in that message.

I was interested to read the comments made by the retiring head of the South Australian Industrial Affairs Department, Mr Lindsay Bowes. After 21 years as head of the department, Mr Bowes could undoubtedly speak with authority and from a great deal of experience. He believes that the pessimism felt for our industrial present and future is highly over-rated, 'blown out of all proportion'. He also said that four times as many hours are lost in industry by accident as by industrial action, and that there has been concentration on the sensational industrial issues and neglect of the positive things. I think that the Government has a lot to learn in its attitude and relationship with the trade unions and the whole work force of South Australia, and the more quickly it comes to grip with this the better.

Another factor that the Government fails to understand is the effect of the massive increases in nearly 70 State Government charges. The Premier makes the feeble excuse in this Budget that we would all prefer that these increases were not necessary but that, while costs, and particularly wages, continue to rise, fees and charges will need to be reviewed regularly. The alternative is higher taxation and/or lower standards of service, he claims.

The Premier knows darn well that his Government was perfectly willing to forgo large amounts of tax revenue by willy-nilly abolishing succession duties and land tax. I believe that he is sorry now that he did this and his backbenchers, particularly those in marginal electorates, are extremely worried by the strong electoral backlash from that massive number of State Government charges.

It is quite understandable, therefore, when the Premier admits that South Australia is a 'pretty sick' place and that people are leaving the State for greener pastures. Week by week, the Government has raised various charges to help itself out of its own financial problems. Almost every possible licence, permit, registration fee and fare has become dearer, as well as water rates and electricity, Housing Trust rentals, motor vehicle registration, public transport, petrol (specifically due to Government bungling), burials, liquor permits—the list is endless. Unfortunately, the Government still has not managed to balance its Budget, so all South Australians can expect more savage increases during this current financial year.

The Government has presented to this House a very negative Budget. It has failed to respond adequately to record unemployment, the high and worsening level of inflation, the high burden of Government charges and fees, and the falling family living standards. This Budget will do

nothing to solve the problem of unemployment or of the severe hardship being suffered by many people in the community.

An increasing number of families are living with stress owing to financial problems created by recent decisions made by both the Federal and State Governments. The latest increase in home loan interest rates, for example, will make it virtually impossible for many South Australians to keep their homes. There are families who have already put their homes on the market simply because they can no longer absorb the increased costs. There are approximately 160 000 South Australian households currently paying off mortgages. Interest rates have risen so sharply during the past 12 months that many families can no longer cope. Many have stopped buying basic necessities in an attempt to meet their mortgage payments, and young couples are putting off having families because they just cannot afford to have them.

Present forecasts suggest more interest rate increases are highly likely, and this means more families will be unable to meet their mortgage commitments and more would-be home-buyers will be prevented from buying homes. It also means a deeper recession in South Australia's building industry, more bankruptcies and more unemployment. In addition to this increased financial burden, the State Government has added pressure during the past 12 months by increasing Government charges. These back-door taxes are hitting the ordinary families hardest.

This form of taxation has become so oppressive that the Leader of the Opposition has been forced to call on the Government to implement a 12-month freeze on all State charges. If the plight of those ordinary families was not already serious enough, the Federal Government's recent Budget has added insult to injury. Sales tax on a wide range of goods, including furniture, floor coverings, bedding and white goods will double, and even shoes and clothing will be subject to a 2½ per cent tax. This will mean that many families who have struggled to hold on to their homes will find it impossible to buy furniture or to make a comfortable environment for their children.

The 17½ per cent sales tax on pet food is a major blow to the community, especially for aged and single pensioners who keep companion pets, and the straw to break the camel's back with many families will be the added costs of the new health insurance scheme. Many families cannot afford an extra \$10 a week to obtain adequate medical and hospital cover. Their budgets are already stretched to the limit. As a result, many will decide to gamble on their health and this, of course, will be disastrous in the event of any medical emergency.

I read with much interest the opinion expressed by the *Advertiser* Economics Editor, Edward Nash, which was published in last Saturday's *Advertiser*. The article was entitled 'Pity the new poor', and I think its contents reflect many of the points I have been talking about.

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

**Mr ABBOTT:** Before the dinner adjournment I was referring to the article in the *Advertiser* of 19 September regarding the opinion by Economics Editor Edward Nash on 'Pity the new poor'. I quote from that opinion, as follows:

Persistent inflation, higher public sector charges, rising direct and indirect taxes and the vagaries of investment returns are combining to create another class in Australia—the new poor.

Their numbers are not known but run into tens and possibly hundreds of thousands. And every day their ranks swell. No-one is more surprised at their new-found relative poverty than they are.

Usually they feel that they have been betrayed by a system which encouraged them to forgo immediate spending so that they could provide in their retirement a lifestyle not too different from when they were working.



Typically, these are the breadwinners who retired a few years ago after spending most of their working lives in middle to upper-middle positions with a private sector company.

Along with the gold watch went a lump sum superannuation cheque—almost certainly the largest amount they had ever commanded at one time in their lives.

Even after paying off the mortgage on the family home—usually only a pittance in today's dollars—and perhaps taking a trip abroad, there seemed more than enough left to provide adequate income for a pleasant and untroubled retirement.

Mr Nash then went on to point out the difference between the returns that are available from investments at today's interest rates as against returns from investments by those who retired several years ago and how the relentless progress of prices and the total inability of these people to protect themselves against the ravages of inflation are taking a very heavy toll. There are no incomes indexed for inflation available to them. Their income is too large to entitle them to pension benefits, but too small to ensure a worry-free style of living. With the new health scheme charges, more and more people will be joining this category of Australia's new poor.

A good deal has been said in relation to the abolition of the CYSS and the effect the abolition of those schemes will have on the unemployed youth of this particular State. If the Federal Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs continues to mislead the unfortunate victims of the Community Youth Support Scheme, that is going to have adverse consequences for South Australia. It is true that the Minister of Industrial Affairs has made a number of approaches to the Federal Government, but no assurances have yet been forthcoming and I would like to see this State Government come out and say—if its Federal counterpart fails to reverse its Budget decision to shut down the system—that it will continue to finance the scheme in some way, as has been stated by the Victorian State Government.

The Federal Minister who was in charge of disbanding 270 CYSS projects has suggested that CYSS workers whom his department is refusing to fund should instead apply for funds to the Minister for Social Security. However, the Minister for Social Security has told the Federal Parliament that there are no programmes under which this can be done and by implication, therefore, there are no funds. It was invention and expediency on the part of the Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs when he announced that CYSS was to be wound up. He gave the reason, but the situation changed since CYSS was introduced. The only thing that has changed is that there are now 65 000 more young people on unemployment benefits than there were when CYSS was introduced.

Promises were made earlier this year that CYSS would be retained, but that promise was broken in the Federal Budget and the Federal Minister's most recent pledge to provide new forms of assistance to the young unemployed is almost certainly as worthless as every other assurance he has given. I have attended several meetings in Adelaide over the past few weeks that have been arranged by youth support committees to look at alternative means of finance and assistance in order to keep them operating. Last Monday night I attended one arranged by the Port Adelaide-Woodville Youth Support Committee Incorporated held at the Woodville town hall. The Liberal members of Parliament were most conspicuous by their absence.

The Port Adelaide-Woodville Youth Support Committee is responsible for the conduct of two community youth support scheme projects, the outstandingly successful COMSKILL and garage programmes. Both are directing highly professional expertise towards the development of commercial or motor industry skills for unemployed in the region to enhance their opportunities for employment, to improve their confidence and broaden their experience and

maturity whilst they are unemployed. The garage and COMSKILL have been developed as job training programmes and, as such, are highly cost efficient. Both are fully equipped and could now operate on an annual cost of less than \$40 000 each.

South Australia has the highest unemployment of all States, with 20.5 per cent of youths between the ages of 15 and 19 years unemployed compared to the Australian average of 14.8 per cent in the same age bracket. If we look at the statistics of the COMSKILL and garage projects in the western region of Adelaide, they show quite clearly that these schemes are very helpful and successful for the young unemployed within that area. For example, in the COMSKILL project, participants leaving during 1981—February to September—have done so for the following reasons: for full-time employment there were 53, and for temporary employment, part-time employment and other training courses there were 50. The total number of participants in 1980 to 1981 was 280. The total number of participants this year is 135-plus and the average daily attendance is 12. In the garage project, the total number of participants for 1979 to 1981 was 590-plus, the total participants for July to September 1981 was 130-plus, and the average daily attendance was 20.

This clearly shows the success and value of these two CYSS projects. One very interesting speaker at this meeting was Superintendent Sykes, of the Port Adelaide Police Division. He was most concerned at the possible closure of these schemes. He was also very worried by the increase in vandalism, drug abuse, and violence, and the increasing crime rate which breeds from unemployment. Superintendent Sykes said that the more he is required to allocate his men to watching and looking after the young people who become unemployed, the less he can protect our homes and families and other areas.

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

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I get a little annoyed when I read and hear statements made by the Opposition when dealing with the State Budget. I refer particularly to the remarks made by the Leader when speaking on behalf of his Party. One would have thought that he would have given valued reasons for discussing the State Budget, but instead he made the following statement:

When the Labor Government left office with the combined accounts in surplus and with reserves in good shape, so much so in fact that the Liberal Government was able to claim a \$37 400 000 surplus in the first year . . .

Before making that statement, and about half-way through his speech, the Leader denigrated the Budget by saying the following:

What it really will be remembered for, I believe, is that it is a gross and cynically dishonest document and nowhere is this more apparent than in the area of taxation.

He continued later, as follows:

The Government claims a commitment to a policy of lower taxation.

Let me return to the statement the Leader made about my Government's inheriting a healthy Treasury. For the financial year ended June 1979 the actual balance on the Revenue Account was nil; on the Loan Account there was a surplus of \$622 105. In actual fact, the Government inherited from the Opposition a surplus of \$622 105.

In our first financial year, 1979-80, we again balanced the Revenue Account and there was a surplus in the Loan Account of \$1 476 683. What the Leader did not give credit for was that the Government did have a surplus of \$37 400 000 during that period and that the Government put that money in trust funds for the State Transport

Authority and for housing. We did not have to do that, but we did it so that housing opportunities would not be denied and so that the State Transport Authority would be placed in a strong financial position.

We were determined that housing would continue as demand required. We were also determined that the State Transport Authority, which had been allowed to run down in a higgledy-piggledy financial mismanagement under the previous Administration would be restored to a strong position so that it could meet future projects and keep continuously updating the bus fleet and the railway system. Nowhere have we heard or read what the Opposition would do, or any of its alternative suggestions.

We have heard that there would be pay-roll tax concessions and that there would be some job creation schemes, but we have not been told what kind of job creation schemes they would be. We certainly have not been told who will pay. We have not heard anywhere in this debate that the Labor Party is committed to increasing taxes. It is in the Labor Party's policy not to reduce expenditure but to increase taxes to meet those increased costs of operating a Labor Government in this State.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Do you think, if they ever get back into Government, that they will reinstitute succession and stamp duties?

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Olsen):** Order! The honourable member for Hanson has the floor.

**Mr BECKER:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture quite rightly asks what taxes would be increased and would succession duties be reintroduced. No, they will not be. The Labor Government will bring in a wealth tax. A wealth tax, of course, will hit every small business person, and any person who has a reasonable amount of assets, whether they be in land holdings, assets used for stock, or in liquid assets to operate a small business. That is where a Labor Government will get its money. That will, in turn, affect the cost to the consumer. As I have said, it is clearly in their policy to increase taxation rather than reduce costs of administration. When we hear members of the Opposition criticising current Budget proposals and the performance of my Government—

**Mr Hemmings:** It's 'his' Government.

**Mr BECKER:** let me go back in history to remind the honourable member who has just interjected that all we got from his Party when we came to office was \$622 105 and a tremendous amount of outstanding debts that we have had to pay off. In 1969-70, which was the last year of the Liberal Government led by Steele Hall, there was a surplus in the Revenue Account of \$2 920 425 and a surplus in the Loan Account of \$13 031 492, an all-up benefit to the incoming Labor Government of \$15 951 917.

**Mr Mathwin:** And that was 1970 dollars, too.

**Mr BECKER:** That was in 1969-70. It was in May 1970 that they had the election, so the Labor Government had little opportunity in the last month of that financial year to do anything to the finances of the State. It did not take the Labor Government long to get its hands on to Treasury, because that \$3 000 000 disappeared within a couple of months. When the 1970-71 financial year ended on 30 June 1971 there was a deficit in the Revenue Account of \$21 057. The Loan Account continued with a surplus of \$14 811 367. Do not let me hear members opposite criticise the performance of my Government for having surpluses or for using surpluses in the Loan Fund.

Let us now go through the process of the glorious years, those long weary years of the Labor Administration in South Australia. In the 1971-72 financial year it created a deficit in the Revenue Account of \$5 624 003. There was still a surplus in the Loan Account of \$10 382 362. For 1972-73 the deficit at the end of the financial year in the

Revenue Account was \$2 034 570. The Loan Account still carried \$8 522 946.

In 1973-74 there was still a deficit in the Revenue Account of \$535 844. The Loan Account had a surplus again of \$4 496 605, so that Government was gradually whittling it away, but the deficit in the Revenue Account was still there until 1974-75, when we had the huge surpluses created in the Revenue Account because of the disposal of the railways. That year the Government finished with a surplus in Revenue Account of \$22 782 009 and in the Loan Account a surplus of \$1 900 000. In 1975-76 there was still a surplus in the Revenue Account of \$27 500 000 and a deficit in the Loan Account of \$8 855. In 1976-77 there was a surplus of \$18 414 000 in the Revenue Account and they balanced the Loan Account. In 1977-78 the reversal came and there was a deficit in the Revenue Account of \$6 452 951. As I have said, in 1978-79 we balanced the Revenue Account. We also balanced it in 1979-80. Last year we had a deficit of \$6 585 290 in the Revenue Account.

**Mr Hemmings:** By manipulation.

**Mr BECKER:** Not by manipulation at all, because through those glorious years of the previous Government's Administration funds had been transferred from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account.

So, while we have certainly experienced a downturn in the economy throughout the whole of this country, our deficit for the financial year ended 30 June 1981 at \$6 600 000 compares more than favourably with the deficit of \$6 400 000 in 1977-78 under the previous Government.

We have heard during this debate what the Labor Party would do if it came into office, about how it would rearrange the finances for the benefit of all. However, let me remind members, going back further in history to 1964-65, when we had a change from a Liberal Government to a Labor Government—it was the last Government under Sir Thomas Playford. There was a surplus in 1963-64 of \$3 200 000. In 1964-65 the Labor Party had turned that surplus into a deficit of \$2 600 000, and then in the glorious part of its term in 1965-66 the Labor Party created a record deficit on the Revenue Account of \$6 834 000. So, it can be imagined what that Party did during those first two years of Government, how it was going to right all the wrongs of the State, as we were told back in those days. However, that Government created the largest deficit ever on the Revenue Account, namely, \$6 834 000.

In 1965-66 the dollar was certainly worth a lot more, and possibly if we convert it into today's values we would probably be looking at a deficit of \$30 000 000 to \$32 000 000—a record not to be proud of at all, and the people of South Australia must bear in mind that, if by some fluke there was to be a change of Government at the next State election, it would take many years to pay off the huge deficits that will be created by a Labor Administration within its first two years of office.

I have claimed time and time again that we have been paying for those golden years of the Whitlam era, the 1972-75 period, and this country will continue to pay for that for many years to come. It certainly has damaged the economy of this country and created a situation which meant that wise men now have to make strong and unpopular decisions to put this country on the right course.

It is an incredible situation when there is that type of Administration coming into the Treasury benches of the State, because they spend money recklessly, under any guise of a benefit to the community, but the real people that they claim they want to help are the ones they hurt, because the real people have to pay for it. When Dunstan was the Premier and he said he was going to tax the tall poppies, I said, 'Forget it; it will not work. You cannot tax

the tall poppies; you will not get that 5 per cent from whom you want to rip off all the money, because they just pass it on.' That is exactly what occurred. It failed, and he admitted that it did, so it was the people who had to pay for his follies in these years, and it is the people of this State who are still paying for some of the follies of the previous Labor Administration.

I know members of this House are not too keen on reading the Auditor-General's Report, but let us look at some of the follies created under the previous Labor Government. I refer to the Theatre Company of South Australia—we find at page 402 that the result for the financial year ended 30 June 1981 was a net deficit of \$107 000. When one looks at the balance sheet one finds that there is a net asset deficiency of \$68 000. The State Theatre Company, one of Don Dunstan's great dreams, is insolvent.

The former Government certainly poured in a lot of money to get the State Theatre Company going, and it is a project of which I have been personally critical for many years. While it is very nice to have these facilities, we cannot afford them.

**Mr Mathwin:** The taxpayer has to pay.

**Mr BECKER:** That is right. The huge amounts of Loan moneys that have gone into the operations are what is crippling them. With regard to the State Opera of South Australia, which was one of the former Premier's last dreams, again there was a net deficit for the financial year ended 30 June 1981 (at page 395 of the Auditor-General's report) of \$17 000, which was certainly an improvement on the previous year, when there was a deficit of \$291 000. This is another statutory authority which is insolvent. On the balance sheet, the net asset deficiency is \$147 000.

I refer to the South Australian Film Corporation, referred to at page 327 of the Auditor-General's Report. I think it is about time that we had a very close look at this statutory authority. There was a deficit on commercial activities of \$408 000 for the year ended 30 June 1981. The corporation was very strongly supported by the various Government departments in the making of films, and nobody would be more annoyed than I am that a television commercial for which \$10 000 was allocated was banned the other day. There is a total net asset deficiency for the South Australian Film Corporation of \$2 982 000—almost \$3 000 000. This is another statutory authority that is insolvent, yet the corporation has been a participant in producing what we are told are excellent films, which certainly have been breaking box office records around the place, winning awards at Cannes, and so forth. However, this is not reflected in the balance sheet at all. There is no great benefit to the State.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** So you are suggesting that we should abolish it?

**Mr BECKER:** I cannot see why private enterprise could not operate it. Certainly, the State would not face an insolvent corporation to the extent of \$3 000 000. That money must come from somewhere; one day somebody must arrange a settlement.

**Mr Hemmings:** You are a Philistine.

**Mr BECKER:** I think the honourable member has proved himself to be a fool on more than one occasion. He does not understand finance. We cannot continue to have statutory authorities such as these continually running up huge deficits and continually being in an insolvent situation, authorities which must be propped up by taxpayers' valuable money. The quick answer, of course, would be to hand them over to private enterprise and let them trade out of it, which I am quite sure they would do. Even if we had to give some subsidy, we would not have to pour in the subsidies that we are having to provide at the moment. Such money must be found and provided by the Treasury

to keep these statutory authorities going. I will not discuss the Jam Factory and a few of my other favourite statutory authorities such as the Monarto Commission, and so forth.

**Mr Mathwin interjecting:**

**Mr BECKER:** As the member for Glenelg knows, we must clean up all the outstanding and bad debts created by the last Administration. It would make available money and resources that we could use for the benefit of the taxpayers in this State. No-one knows better than do honourable members that, if the working man is allowed to have more money in his pocket, he will spend his money in the community, and that is what creates employment and consumer demand, giving benefits to the State and the community in general. So, give the worker his money, give him opportunities—that is why the Government believes in the policy of keeping our taxes as low as humanly possible. We get this mythical theory from the Opposition that the Government is increasing taxes when it said it would not. The Government is not increasing taxes; we are increasing charges. It is an entirely different situation between charges and taxation.

**Mr Hemmings:** It puts inflation up.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Olsen):** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**Mr BECKER:** The honourable member knows very well that, if you want something, you pay for it; it is as simple as that. There are 600 areas from which the Government receives revenue: out of that 600, the Government has increased charges in 60 of them—60 out of 600!

We have not even touched the tip of the iceberg that was used by the previous Government in this State. The member for Ascot Park can laugh. His mob was ruthless when in Government. They taxed everyone, because Dunstan believed in this great mythical dream of taxing the tall poppies. That did not work. The people he hurt were those whom he claimed he was trying to help: he did not help them at all.

**Mr Hemmings:** Why don't you give up your car, then? Be a bit fair dinkum.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**Mr BECKER:** It was allocated to the committee, not to me. I challenge the honourable member to take a reduction in his salary, if that is what he wants. We have disproved the intelligence of the Opposition in its handling of the affairs of the State. Members opposite could never again be trusted on the Treasury benches. If they get back into Government, all of the good and hard work that is being done by my Government will be destroyed within two years: they will spend money as though it is going out of fashion. That is the warning and the bleak future to which the people of this State must look forward. It will not resolve the situation one iota.

I am interested in the Government allocation to tourism. I was very interested to hear this afternoon that, apart from an increased allocation for tourism, my Government is doing all it can to attract visitors to South Australia. It is also trying to keep people within the State to see the unique tourist spots. I do not know how long it would take people to see those unique spots, but we will leave it at that.

It annoys me that there is a continual drive by Opposition members and some of my colleagues in relation to Adelaide Airport. The member for Napier, who makes inane interjections in this House from time to time, mentioned unemployment. He knows as well as I do that, if we want to create employment in the tourist industry, we must get rid of penalty rates. Unless the unions wake up to that, there will never be any worthwhile benefits from tourism for South Australia.

I received a letter from some friends in the Thebarton area who are involved in the Anti-Airport Noise Committee. I have been involved with this organisation for many years. The organisation set up an office to consider the problems in relation to Adelaide Airport. I have a list of complaints from various people who live under the flight path of the Adelaide Airport. One woman has written to the effect that she and her daughter have suffered significant hearing loss. The family doctor who treated them attributes this to airport noise, but he told them that nothing can be done. He said that many of his patients who live near the flight path experience hearing problems. That woman is a pensioner and there has been considerable damage to her property because of the planes, but there is no way that she can receive compensation. Her property has been inspected and documented, but no-one will accept responsibility. There are further—

**Mr Plunkett:** She would be happy about the announcement today.

**Mr BECKER:** If the honourable member listens, he will find out why I am making this point. I do not subscribe to that view one little bit. I do not even believe it. I cannot visualise international flights coming to Adelaide Airport, and I will state reasons later. The honourable member would be aware that people have complained, because his district adjoins mine. At last, accurate statistical information about complaints is being compiled.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, you should concentrate on the Auditor-General's Report.

**Mr BECKER:** I have dealt with the Auditor-General's Report: I am dealing now with the airport, because it is closer to home. It is quite significant that, when the Royal Flying Doctor charity appeal conducted a special Qantas 747 flight around Australia, complaints poured in from the West Richmond area and other parts of my district in regard to the noise. We all know that Qantas 747s cannot land at Adelaide Airport fully loaded with cargo and fuel. The complaint was that little children screamed in terror and would not sleep well for weeks after the sight of the huge monster that flew over their properties. I can well believe that. There is nothing more eerie than seeing a huge Jumbo jet bearing down on one, if one lives under the flight path, as people do in the district of the member for Peake.

**Mr Plunkett:** My office is right under the flight path.

**Mr BECKER:** I do not telephone the member for Peake during certain times. It is a waste of time, because one cannot hear. No-one can ring the poor man. That is how bad the problem is in his district. Over 2 000 complaints have been received in the past few months. Increasing problems of noise are being experienced in the Richmond and Netley areas. Ansett has now introduced 737s, and let me tell the House that Mr Pascoe, the General Manager of Ansett Airlines, informed me in 1977 what kind of aircraft the company intended to buy. This nonsense about the money that would be spent to upgrade the Adelaide Airport was known then. It was known that money would have to be spent on improvements to runways and terminal facilities. The noise from a 737 is as loud as that from a 727. I took particular note last Sunday morning when such a plane landed and took off again. I have no joy in this.

The introduction of the 737 will not benefit the people in my district. It will be 18 months or more before the Airbus arrives. Let us consider the promotion of the overseas airlines that will operate in South Australia. The *Bulletin* of 8 September 1981 (page 106), under the headline 'World Airlines in a Spin', states that the Inter Continental Hotels chain has been sold by Pan American World Airways. It was further stated:

Pan American World Airways sold ... its last big asset for \$500 000 000 ... Pan American World Airways and Continental Airlines are at the centre of the American airline drama.

Other struggling airlines in America include American Eastern, which was the American airline company that the former Premier wanted to bring here. Others are T.W.A., Northwest Transworld and United. It was freely tipped. It is further stated:

Elliot Fried, airlines analyst at Shearson Loeb Rhodes, a leading broking company, believes the chances of a Pan Am bankruptcy are quite high. 'It is in very serious shape,' he says.

Let us consider the other great wonder that was going to come here and provide cheap air flights to England. British Airways lost \$225 000 000 last year, and Qantas lost \$46 000 000. Sir Freddie Laker is running into trouble with his finances and is trying to restructure the Laker group's bank lending. Sir Freddie has his back to the wall or, more precisely, his bankers' walls. He feels concerned and he is shouting out and searching for an escape route. His immediate problem is that, because of the strength of the dollar, he could incur losses this year of about \$6 000 000 on the servicing of loans he has arranged to finance the expansion of his fleet.

All of the major airline companies in the world are in severe financial difficulty. As I said, Qantas is down by \$46 000 000. How much longer will the Australian taxpayer keep on propping up Qantas Airlines? How much will that cost? Some people want Qantas to operate in Adelaide.

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

**Mr CRAFTER (Norwood):** I am pleased to join in this debate on the Budget. It is an important measure in the life of the Parliament and the community of this State, and I congratulate the analysis of the Budget that was delivered to this House by the Leader of the Opposition earlier in this debate. The points he raised were not canvassed earlier in the press or by the analysis that we have seen in the media of this Budget. It is disconcerting to see so little press coverage given to such an important aspect of the life of the community. It is only in statements emanating from the Opposition that we are seeing the true effects of the Budget, those that will occur in the short term and the long term, and the effects that the decisions embodied in that document will have on the life of people in this State, particularly those who are most in need.

I was interested to hear the member for Hanson say several things on behalf of the Government. Towards the end of his speech, he saw fit to strongly attack statements made by one of his Ministers in the House earlier today. He is no doubt speaking on behalf of many of his constituents in attacking the Minister for the comments he made about the type of aircraft that will be allowed to fly in and out of the West Beach airport. He saw fit not to raise some of the important economic implications of the flexibility for aircraft to come in and out of this State, whether it be at West Beach or some other airport. Two aspects in particular are of widespread concern in the community. The first is the effect this suggestion will have on tourism in this State, which has increasingly become one of the brightest aspects of our economy and one to which we must pay a great deal more attention.

The other aspect is the transport of freight in and out of this State. There is a body of thought that argues very cogently that we should be using air freight more widely than we do at present to assist in the manufacturing and service industries of this State. It is therefore necessary to have the 747 aircraft to bring about such large quantities of freight inflow into the State by aircraft.

No doubt it is part of the thinking of the Minister and the Government that not only would passenger services be

improved but also the other aspects of the economic life in this State would be improved. It is a vexed question. I am surprised to see such deep divisions on the Government benches, on such a fundamental issue to the economy of this State as have been expressed this evening, particularly when the honourable member claimed to speak on behalf of the Government on a number of occasions.

We can tell from the rhetoric we have heard from the other side of this House this evening some of the shallow assessment that is emanating from the policies of this Government and the effects it is having on the community. We can see no clearer rejection of this show of economic philosophy, or monetarism as it is known, than in the victory of the Wran Labor Government in the New South Wales elections on the weekend. This was a resounding rejection of the simplistic monetarist economics that we see embodied in this Government in South Australia and in the Federal Government, and those espoused by the Liberal Opposition in New South Wales during that election campaign.

I want to comment on two repercussions of this State Budget, first, on some sectors of the business community and, secondly, on the family. Before doing that, I will comment briefly on some of the more interesting aspects of the Queensland Budget handed down last week. I saw as part of that Budget an attempt to give some impetus to the community, some life to the community, and some expression of hope to those sections of the community that the Government is trying to lead. Queensland is a State where at the moment there is an estimated increase in population of some 4 000 persons per month. As a result, there are great strains on the infrastructure, the service structure, of that State Government.

We find that the priorities of the Queensland Government are quite interesting. There is a record expenditure on education this financial year, and about 756 new teachers alone will be employed in the State education service. Pay-roll tax deductions will be refunded to employers and back-dated to July this year, if they sign on apprentices in certain circumstances. The Government has given the lead to employers. Not only will it take on its normal quota of new employees, in particular apprentices, but that Government proposes to employ in this financial year some 200 additional apprentices more than are required for absorption into its normal works programme. The apprentices will be trained over the years in respective trades that are needed by the private sector. The private sector is not either able to afford to train those apprentices or does not have the skilled staff to train them, and there will be arrangements made so that these apprentices can be absorbed into the private sector upon completion of their indentures.

This is what I consider to be an imaginative programme by that Government to give assistance and incentive monetarily, and by example, to the business community to employ more apprentices. If ever there was a need to provide skilled workers to the work force, there is at present. There is another example by the Queensland Government to other States which are, as the member for Hanson explained this evening, continually criticising the employment of public servants to deliver essential services to the community. The Queensland Government admitted that it had, as a result of Commonwealth decisions to remove itself from various areas of delivery of services to the community, to accept responsibility for those services, which must be provided in a reasonable and acceptable way to the community. The Queensland Government thus proposes to increase its State Public Service ceilings by some 280 employees in the current financial year. That sort of action has been strongly criticised in this State by the Government. In a few moments I will speak about the attitude of this Government to State public servants.

In the broader sphere, the Queensland Government is continuing a major capital works programme. That programme has been given sufficient funds to continue and to expand. No doubt this will have a flow on by providing not only employment to many workers in Queensland but by giving an impetus to the whole building industry, particularly the construction industry, in that State. There are concessions for home owners. This is one of the most concerning and pressing problems in the community, as every member realises from representations that we receive every day. In Queensland, the Government has attempted, albeit in a small way, to provide some economic relief to persons who are paying off high mortgages on their home. It has also provided additional finance through its Housing Commission to people purchasing their first home. In a humanitarian area of government, the Government in that State has increased compensation to the victims of violent crime by some 300 per cent, to a maximum of \$20 000. We can see a completely different set of priorities being displayed by that very conservative Government, from those adopted by the Government of this State.

This Government came into office telling the people of South Australia as loudly as it possibly could that its policies would revolve around getting out of the way of business in this State, together with the policy of being opposed to higher taxes. It has been my experience, in moving around the community, that two of the great criticisms of this Government's policies have been its interference in the business community, the frustrations that it has given the business community, and its imposition of higher taxes, indeed much higher than anyone would have expected it to impose. This Budget is no exception. There are further heavy imposts right across the spectrum of taxpayers of this State.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** There have been no increases in taxation at all.

**Mr CRAFTER:** In fact, there are eight separate taxation increases in this Budget that are intended to raise an additional \$15 100 000.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** We have done more to alleviate the burden on the taxpayers of this State than any Government has done.

**Mr CRAFTER:** The Opposition has added them up in recent months.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** We've given the equivalent of \$30 000 000 a year back.

**Mr CRAFTER:** There are 60 increases in taxation and charges that have been imposed by the Government in this State in the past year, and the people are well aware of it. Some of these increases are in excess of 1 000 per cent. Although the Minister no doubt talks about the areas of succession duties, gift duty and land tax that relieve the taxation burden on a small, wealthy section of the community, it then passes on that loss of revenue to the whole community. It falls, as the Minister well knows and as the community is feeling, right across the community and, more importantly, on those who can least afford it. It also falls on those in the business sector, particularly the small business sector. Those people must pay State charges, the same as anyone else, and they must then pass those charges on to consumers or meet the losses out of reduced profits, which, consequently, affects living standards and, unfortunately, the ability to further employ.

One area to which the Leader of the Opposition referred and which concerned me in last year's Budget (I referred to it in my Budget speech) was the Government's unwillingness to bring about parity between pay-roll tax exemptions in this State and, of course, New South Wales, but, more importantly, Victoria. We are moving rapidly at present away from that parity. As the Government of this State

is a Liberal Government and that in Victoria is a Liberal Government, I should have thought that there would be some consultation on matters of such importance to the business community.

We see now that the sum of money on which pay-roll tax is payable in this State remains at \$84 000, whereas in Victoria it begins to be payable at \$125 000 and in New South Wales at \$120 000. There is indeed a great incentive to locate at least part of the business in that State in order to avoid the payment of that impost, which is increasingly becoming a barrier to further employment not only in this State but right across Australia. It is a tax on employment, and that is where its effect lies.

South Australia has the highest rate of unemployment, particularly amongst young people, and we must look for ways in which we can encourage employment, particularly in the small business sector. It has been estimated that 2 400 small businesses in this State pay more pay-roll tax here than they would pay in either Victoria or New South Wales. Those businesses are estimated to employ 36 000 persons in South Australia. This matter is in urgent need of consideration, and it is not too late—

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** In calculating those figures, did you allow for the decentralisation rebate for pay-roll tax and land tax, and the initiatives which our Government took up and which the Leader of the Opposition criticised two weeks ago?

**Mr CRAFTER:** There was always, under Labor Governments, an intention to bring about some parity between Victoria and South Australia in relation to the payment of pay-roll tax.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** Your Government did absolutely nothing to help those people in decentralised areas in relation to pay-roll tax rebates.

**Mr CRAFTER:** The Liberal Government is planning, by means of inflation and wage increases in the coming year, to make a windfall out of pay-roll tax. That will fall, as the year goes on, more heavily on those who are running small businesses. Often, very marginal profits are being recouped in those businesses. This area is in urgent need of attention by the Government.

The other area of assistance that the Government provides to the small business sector is via the direct advisory assistance given through the Small Business Advisory Unit. We have seen under this Government a steady decline in support to one area of small business, namely, in the reimbursements of payments to consultants. I have had some experience in my electorate in assisting small businessmen who are experiencing difficulties, in conducting their businesses, in relation to specialised areas of accounting, the legal problems associated with the structure of their companies, the employment of specialist staff, management, staff training, and so on. Those people need expert assistance.

One sees that in the 1979-80 financial year the sum of \$118 000 was voted by Parliament for this purpose, yet the Government spent only \$19 706. I presume that the Government would say that \$99 000 was saved on this line. If it was possible to do some assessment of those small businesses that went to the wall, of the staff that lost their jobs, of the creditors who were left at a loss in the community, and of those people who had ordered various services and goods but could not have them provided, the cost to the State would indeed be very great. Yet in the 1980-81 financial year \$50 000 was voted for this line, although only \$22 261 was spent thereon.

One sees that this year the proposed vote is \$70 000 for consultancies for small businesses. One can only conclude that, if there is a geometric progression of the amounts spent in the two past financial years, only \$25 000 of the

\$70 000 voted will be spent on consultancies. I cannot see the Government's logic in providing that sum of money. Presumably, some calculations have been done within the Minister's department regarding the need and how the money will be spent. However, it is then simply not spent. There is an undeniable need for this sort of assistance in the community, and the fact that it is not getting out to assist those who need it is indeed an indictment on the Government.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** Did you have a look at the total assistance given to industry under our Budget compared to the last amount given by the Labor Government in this State?

**Mr CRAFTER:** I did.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** I think you will find that our Government has given five or six times more than the previous Labor Government gave.

**Mr CRAFTER:** There is still no answer forthcoming about why this amount should not be spent on consultancies to small businesses.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** Are you giving us credit for having increased assistance to industry by 500 per cent compared to—

**Mr CRAFTER:** This is one of the great difficulties that the community perceives with this Government: it continually provides assistance to the big businessman or corporations that trade in other States or around the world, yet it often forgets about those, to whom you, Mr Acting Speaker, have referred as being the backbone of this community.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** But we are substantially increasing the staff of the Small Business Advisory Unit.

**Mr CRAFTER:** I read some comments by the Minister in the press and those made before the Budget Estimates Committee last year. The Minister said that he was increasing the sum of money involved. I read with interest that a specialist person was to be employed (I presume that he or she has now been employed) in the Small Business Advisory Unit. We see that \$50 108 was spent on staff and salaries in that unit in the past financial year and that this year \$84 400 has been provided. That is hardly a dramatic increase in the expression of the Government's concern and support for the small business sector. Indeed, when one considers the salary of the person to whom I have referred, one realises that it would not even keep in touch with inflation.

Certainly, I do not regard that as any great expression of concern for the small business man in our community. I wonder that it is not more common to express what was said on an A.B.C. programme some months ago; commenting on the performance of the current Government, a leading Adelaide business man said that he was spending some \$3 000 000 on a tourist complex in this State, and no-one in the Government was very interested in assisting his project. He said that, if he had been a Japanese or an American or European business man flying into the State to spend \$3 000 000, he would have been feted all over town and would have received great press coverage and accolades from the Government for his expression of confidence in the economy of this State, and so on, but no such support was shown to him. He said that that is the contrast of this Government and where its priorities lie.

Another area that I wanted to raise briefly this evening is the effect on the family of this Budget. We can see, from the calculations I have done, that there are substantial reductions in proposed expenditure in the present financial year in the vital human service areas of health, education and welfare, in particular job creation schemes. In the health area the change in expenditure in real terms is an amount of some 8.4 per cent less money to be spent in the

current financial year. In education the reduction in expenditure is 3.7 per cent, and in welfare services provided by the Department for Community Welfare the reduction in expenditure is 7.4 per cent.

We see that there is to be a substantial reduction in the number of jobs to be provided by the State this year. For example, in the Water Resources Department some 704 fewer positions will be available for workers, in the Public Buildings Department 323 fewer, and I have not yet seen the exact numbers of teachers and ancillary and other staff in the Education Department who will no longer be employed.

One cannot pass by the comments of such strong supporters of the Government, indeed a member of the Liberal Party and a perennial candidate of the Liberal Party, Mr Alan Hickinbotham, one of our largest builders. He was very critical of the Budget and in particular of the reduction in capital works expenditure. He said 'the situation appeared grim, with little prospect of improvement in the short term, and it was likely that contractors would have difficulty in maintaining employment levels.' So, we see that the reduction in the public works programme of the Government, and in particular its own employment policies, will mean a spin-off for industry, especially the building industry, with a resultant loss of jobs in that industry—and so the procession goes on. As I said earlier, there is a great contrast with the Queensland Budget in the priorities that we see in the Budget before us.

One area affecting family life a great deal is the provision of financial assistance to local government. We have seen in the last 12 months—and this Budget embodies this policy—a great transfer of authority, but no financial assistance to carry out these extra responsibilities, to the local government sector. I refer briefly to the additional responsibilities for substandard housing, formerly carried out by the Housing Trust and the Housing Improvement Section. Some 5 000 substandard houses in the metropolitan area are subject to housing improvement orders, and those orders need to be supervised and checks need to be done of the properties from time to time. Those further properties that come into this category need to be assessed and processed, and that is a costly responsibility that has been transferred to local government without financial assistance. A similar situation exists in relation to the control of wet areas of buildings. It is important for the health of the community that these areas of dwellings in particular are properly erected and maintained. Once again, this is a transfer to the local government sector. I understand that some calculations done by the Local Government Association suggest that some \$50 000 in additional revenue a year is needed by an average suburban council to provide adequate services to police the work that was formerly done by the State Government.

I turn now to the home handyman scheme. I have had representations from every council in my district about the need to retain that scheme so that old people particularly can continue to live in their own homes with some degree of dignity. It involves a small amount of money, but I suggest it means a lot to persons who, in the main, are house bound. Some \$350 000 was provided last year for this purpose, it was much appreciated by the community and well received, and it provided additional work for tradesmen. This year the paltry amount of \$15 000 is provided, and I presume that is only to pay off existing commitments.

The Burnside council has agreed to take on this responsibility and fund it from its own resources. Some 300 persons have been helped by the Burnside council in that way since the scheme commenced. This is another financial burden passed on to local government. The whole concept

of community development, a most important area, the community now has to withstand the great pressures placed on it from so many areas that have been abandoned by the State Government and passed on to local government without very much financial assistance, apart from the Local Government Assistance Fund. There is no other assistance. Now most councils are considering the employment of or have already employed community development officers, community recreation officers, community arts officers, and the like, to pick up this vital need in the community.

I refer to one area that I have raised previously in this House, and that is the unwillingness of the Government to index the maximum amounts payable by way of rebate by the State Government to local authorities for pensioners and other persons in the community who qualify for rebates on council rates and taxes. This is often a relief that is required so that people can remain in their own homes in the communities where they have lived for many years. It is of substantial assistance to those persons who, with inflation in recent years and the unwillingness of the Government to increase this maximum amount payable by way of rebate, are once again are falling into the position of being forced to sell their home and move out of the district. That is a tragedy.

Another area may be involved (although hopefully it will not) in the coming year if the planning legislation is amended to provide additional responsibility to local government. So, we find that indeed all of these areas bring down new difficulties, especially for families living in the suburbs, wishing to live in the standard and to receive the services provided by the Government to which they have become accustomed and which they have enjoyed over recent years. This is how the community judges a Government, especially at Budget time, to see how it has determined the allocation of the resources given to it by the taxpayers. There is a most inequitable and unjust distribution of the taxpayers' money, and it falls very heavily indeed as a burden on the small business sector and the wage earner, the head of the family. Yet we see that they are the very groups being deprived of that assistance so that they can play the vital role that they do in the strengthening of our community.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to rise in support of the Budget. Contrary to what has been said by a number of members, including the Leader of the Opposition, I find the Budget to be a responsible document, when one considers the financial constraints with which the Government has to contend, the availability of funds, and the effects that generally would be inflicted on the community at large if the Commonwealth Government were to accept the advice of the Leader of the Opposition in this State and the Federal Leader of the Opposition. I for one make it quite clear that I support the Budget strategy of the Premier and of the Prime Minister, and I make no apology for saying that.

The only area of criticism that I have with either of those two gentlemen in their approach is that they were not tough enough at the beginning of their terms of office. Mrs Thatcher made that same mistake in the United Kingdom: she was not tough enough at the beginning of her term of office, either. The facts must be faced. Unfortunately, many people are not prepared to face the financial facts and instead want to run away from the situation. The tragedy in the United Kingdom was that for 25 years it had Governments that attempted to play Father Christmas with someone else's money. The hard decisions were not made 10 or 12 years ago when they should have been made. We want to avoid that situation in this State. Like all members

I have dozens and dozens of projects in my electorate which could justify the expenditure of very large sums of money.

I am pleased to see that the Government has allocated funds for a number of those projects in this Budget. However, I believe that if we followed the strategy of the Leader of the Opposition we would see the reimposition of death duties, land tax and new forms of taxation which have not yet been announced. Members opposite who have spoken in this debate have had a lot to say about where more money should be spent. However, they have not had the courage or thought it appropriate to tell the House where those funds will come from. The first matter that I would like to raise in response to the Leader and those members opposite who will speak, is to ask them what areas of taxation and what charges they would increase to get the extra money that they are demanding should be spent.

**Mr Hemmings:** Is that the line you're being directed to put forward?

**Mr GUNN:** No, it is not the line that I have been directed to put: it is a question that requires only a very simple answer from members opposite. For days we have listened to the huffing and puffing from members opposite. The Leader is always talking about the appropriation of more and more revenue but he has not yet had the courage to stand up in this House and tell the people where it will come from. The member for Elizabeth was at least honest enough to go to the leader and ask him for an unqualified assurance that he as Treasurer would not agree to an increase in transport costs. The Leader was not prepared to give that assurance. The hollowness of the Leader's statements was clearly borne out by the member for Elizabeth.

**Mr Hemmings:** That's the same line you conservatives have been putting forward for years, that is, 'where will the money come from?'

**Mr Trainer:** You're trying to blame the Opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Eyre does not require assistance.

**Mr GUNN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am pleased that members opposite are taking some interest in what I am saying. No matter what they say, the revenue must be raised from somewhere. No matter what complexion the Government may be, the great difference is the forms of taxation that the Opposition will impose. Whatever taxes the Opposition applies will have some effect on the economy. If the opposition imposes more capital charges, raises income tax or imposes surcharges, it will have a detrimental effect, and everyone knows that. Therefore, it is a matter of assessing where the least harm will be done in the imposition of those taxes.

It is all very well to say that for years conservative Governments have been asking where the money will come from. We saw an example of the Opposition's solution in this country when a Federal Labor Government set up the printing presses and Dr Cairns said openly, in reply to Mr Kelly, that he would probably print some more money. We all know the result of that particular course of action and what it did to this country's economy. We certainly do not want any Mr Khemlani's to raise funds for us—and members opposite would know something about that little exercise.

I pose the question as one who wants to be in a position to make a constructive assessment about what honourable members opposite have to say. Where would they raise the money? Can the member for Napier, who I understand is acting for the Leader on this occasion, or his colleague sitting alongside him, give us an assurance in their contributions to this debate that they will not increase water rates, will not bring back land tax, will not increase electricity charges or the levies imposed on the Electricity Trust or the Gas Company? There are a huge number of charges

which can be raised by the State Government. In relation to particular forms of taxation, I noticed in the schedule attached to the Premier's statement that there are a number of charges and taxes levied by the Government. Some of them return only very limited amounts of revenue, and I believe that it is about time we disposed of some of them, because the cost of administering some of those taxes would be far greater than the revenue collected.

Last year the bank note tax brought in \$130. I do not know whether that tax has any benefit, but I think it should be abolished. Another is the return for affidavits or declarations, which only brought in \$574. That should also be abolished. There is also a tax on agreements which brought in \$2 206. Bills of lading, and I have never heard of that one, brought in \$30. Another brought in by Mr Dunstan is a tax on the discharge of mortgages which I protested about at the time of its introduction. That tax brought in \$1 975. I believe that should also be abolished, because it is a penalty on people who discharge their mortgages. I believe that this whole area should be looked at by the Government. It would be a positive step in abolishing another form of red tape or licensing which is quite unnecessary. I also firmly believe that the Government should proceed with great haste in its programme of deregulation to abolish unnecessary boards, committees and statutory bodies. I believe that the Government should give that top priority.

**Mr Hemmings:** It was there when you came into office and you have done nothing since.

**Mr GUNN:** That is not correct. The Minister of Agriculture has already disposed of 60 in his department, and he should be commended. I hope he continues in that vein. That is an area where hundreds of thousands of dollars can be saved. I hope the Premier will inject some resources and manpower into following that particular course of action.

We have listened to the litany of comments that have been made by the Leader in relation to what ought to be done in South Australia. He fails to recognise that his Party left behind a financial mess when this Government assumed office. The member for Hanson has rightly pointed out some of the problems. Having been a member of the Public Accounts Committee for the last two years, I, like the member for Hanson, am fully aware of what happened at the frozen food factory. I hope that the Premier will soon be in a position to sell that factory and recoup some of the losses. I think the Government should dispose of all such enterprises unless there are compelling reasons to remain in a particular area of industry. I consider that the activities of the Land Commission need considerable investigation. The other day a copy of the annual report of the Land Commission was placed on my desk and I thought that on this occasion it would be a good idea if I took some time to consider it.

I was horrified to find that this grandiose scheme contrived by Mr Whitlam, aided and abetted by Mr Dunstan, currently has outstanding interest deferred on Commonwealth and State loans this year of \$7 500 000.

**Mr Hemmings:** We agree with you on that one. You have won us on that.

**Mr GUNN:** I am pleased.

**Mr Hemmings:** When we get back in 1983—

**Mr Trainer:** We'll do away with bills of lading.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Napier is being tolerated in speaking out of his place by virtue of the role he is playing tonight. That does not follow through to the honourable member for Ascot Park, and in any event interjections are out of order for both members.

**Mr GUNN:** It appears from reading the financial statements of the Land Commission that they have deferred interest owing of \$7 500 000. This was going to be the glorious scheme that would be the saviour of the people



who needed cheap land in this State. All we are doing is putting off the evil day. If one goes through this report, I believe, one sees that the time is long overdue when the organisation should be wound up completely and the losses cut, because it appears to me it has served little or no purpose but has incurred on the taxpayer considerable debts that are now going to have to be met by this Government.

In my district, I have many areas that have interesting mining prospects and it was interesting to note in the Premier's speech that he referred to the Roxby Downs and Olympic dam area and the benefit which will accrue to the people of this State in that particular exercise in relation to both employment and future royalties.

It is a pity that the Labor Party in this State, the official Opposition, has so far expressed only opposition to that particular project. The member for Napier, the only representative of the Labor Party in the House at this stage, has recently been overseas and no doubt would have had an opportunity in his country of birth to investigate what that country was doing in relation to the supplying of electricity.

**Mr Hemmings:** I did not go there to look at that.

**Mr GUNN:** That is a rather interesting comment because, knowing full well that this matter was going to be before the House in the very near future, a subject which has attracted attention throughout Australia, and with the U.K. being in the forefront of the development of that industry, it is a wonder that the member did not take the time to bring himself up to date on what is taking place, because there is no doubt that this particular project is required, it will be developed, the United Kingdom are crying out to enter—

**Mr Hemmings:** It is crying out; singular, not plural.

**Mr GUNN:** The United Kingdom is very keen, as is the European Economic Community, to sign long-term agreements with Australia for uranium. They all know about the great possibilities of the Olympic Dam site and are keen to be involved in it. It was interesting that B.P. was so successful in raising large quantities of money only a few weeks ago and lots of that money is destined to be invested in South Australia if a contract is approved by this Parliament. It would be a sad day indeed for the people of this State if that contract was denied to them.

We have had some interesting speeches by members opposite. The member for Playford made a speech 12 months ago in the Address in Reply debate, when he made what I think was a speech in which he must have been appealing to the conservative elements within the Labor Party, because I thought it was a reasonable contribution, and I agreed wholeheartedly with many of the views put forward. However, in his contribution on this Budget, obviously he is appealing to the more radical elements in the Labor Party. He scattered his shot in a fairly wide arc and launched an attack on people who are trying to bring back rational Government spending programmes. It appears that he has fallen for the trap of all the well meaning but misguided public spenders who believe you can just go on spending and spending.

**Mr McRae:** I never said that. Fair go!

**Mr GUNN:** That was the indication the member gave the House. The member for Playford, in the course of his remarks, was talking about the policies advocated by Milton Friedman. He worked himself into a considerable lather discussing Mr Friedman and got quite excited about the policies of the Prime Minister, President Reagan and Mrs Thatcher, and he was advocating, I thought, policies similar to those that Mr Whitlam and Dr Cairns were implementing some years ago.

**Mr McRae:** I didn't say that.

**Mr GUNN:** Well, that was the tenor of the honourable gentleman's remarks. I find it amazing that he now attempts to dissociate himself from Mr Whitlam and Mr Cairns, because I understand that he was one of their strongest supporters during their reign.

**Mr McRae:** I was supporting my own economics, Graham.

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable gentleman talks his own economics. As I said earlier, he has appealed to both branches of the Labor Party. It will be interesting to hear what he says in the next Address in Reply debate. Perhaps he will have had more time to think about this matter and to note what I have said on this occasion. I want to turn to one or two matters in my own district and how this Budget will affect them.

**Mr McRae:** Not too well.

**Mr GUNN:** For the edification of the member, I should tell him what this Budget will do for my district. As he is well aware, I have the honour to represent a district that encompasses more than 80 per cent of the land mass of South Australia, an area that has great possibilities to assist orderly development and the welfare of the people of this State. These are some of the works for which funding is going into my district: the Leigh Creek school; a new hospital being built at Leigh Creek; a new hospital being built at Coober Pedy; and a new hospital being built at Streaky Bay. About \$12 500 000 has been spent on the Stuart Highway. Expenditure on that has been substantially increased in the past two years by this Government.

The Labor Party used the Stuart Highway as a weapon with which to try to whip the Commonwealth Government, but unfortunately provided little money. Mr Wallace used to be critical of the Federal Government's attitude, but he did not say anything when it was spending highways funds around Port Augusta. He was quite happy about that. In my district there are areas that need close attention. I am pleased to see that there will be money provided to allow for extra police, some of whom I hope will be placed in my district, because for a long time I have been making representations on behalf of people in the Northern Flinders Ranges, particularly people at Quorn, Hawker and Blinman in the Flinders Ranges. I received this letter from the Flinders Ranges Regional Tourist Association this week dated 16 September:

Dear Sir—I write on behalf of the Flinders Ranges Regional Tourist Association. We are a Government subsidised organisation, newly formed to promote a general awareness of the area and increase tourism. My committee have expressed concern at the small contingent of police officers stationed at both Hawker and Quorn. There is a vast area beyond Hawker that is remote with very little police presence during peak tourist periods. We express concern at the additional work load caused to the two local police offices during these periods. We feel there is a present need for additional police in the area.

In the near future a large campaign will be initiated Australia wide to promote and increase tourism in the region. Further, there are a number of projects planned for the future that will increase facilities, mainly at Hawker, to cope with the expected increase in demand. We feel this campaign alone will result in a further demand on our local police officers. Protection of the environment and the public are of utmost importance to our cause. The sighting of police patrols, especially during peak periods, is, we feel, warranted at present and in the future. We trust you will consider our problem with a favourable reply.

I hope that the Government will put at least two more police officers in the Flinders Ranges. There is a need for at least one more officer at Hawker or Quorn, and I believe the police station at Blinman should be reopened. What these people seek is a most reasonable request, and I hope the Chief Secretary will be in a position to do something about it.

There are many areas of Government involvement where I believe tightening could take place. In relation to money

spent by the Highways Department, I am fully aware of the difficulties faced by that organisation, and I think it is not overstating the case to say that I could easily justify the expenditure of an extra \$30 000 000 on roads in my electorate. I shall name some of the projects, not particularly in order of importance. It is obvious that the sealing of the Stuart Highway must have a very high priority and should be speeded up. Great progress has been made on the road between Lyndhurst and Hawker, but that must be proceeded with at all costs. It is fairly obvious, as the activities in the Cooper Basin are developed, which we hope will be developed very greatly as more gas and oil is found, that there will be an urgent need to upgrade the roads in that area. Currently, for weeks at a time it is impossible for traffic to get through. One could also look slightly to the future and say that it will not be very long before it is necessary to have a sealed road connecting the Stuart Highway and the Eyre Highway. With regard to other projects in my electorate, a great deal of discussion and concern has been expressed at the very low rate of sealing of the Spalding-Burra-Morgan Road, which my constituents in the Burra area believe will greatly assist the tourist industry. Of other roads, there are many on Eyre Peninsula and in the Flinders Ranges where millions of dollars could be spent to great advantage, not only to the locals but also to the community at large.

With regard to education, a matter which always attracts a great deal of attention, in my electorate, which is so scattered and which has such large numbers of schools varying in size from very large to very small, there is always a need to upgrade and to build more schools. I understand that the proposed new school at Miltaburra is going to proceed in the relatively near future. However, what concerns me is that, in all the discussions which have taken place in relation to education, often little thought is given to the problems associated with parents in just getting their children to school. Like the member for Mallee, my electorate would probably have some of the largest school bus runs in this State, and I find it very difficult when discussing the matter with the Education Department to get any changes in those bus routes. When making representations to those people, I realise that it must be a very difficult job, for them, when looking at a map of South Australia, just to work out where the school buses are to go. I believe there is a need for the Government to look at the type of buses that it purchases. It always amazes me that it does not buy more diesel buses, because I understand from discussions with people who must service those buses that diesel buses are far more fuel efficient.

In conclusion, I want to make one or two other brief comments. The first is in relation to environmental issues and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The other night we listened to the member for Playford speak about the need to spend more money on national parks. I have received a letter from a Dr Black, who indicates similar sentiments. I believe that he wants more national parks.

My view is that South Australia has sufficient national parks at present. Conservationists and environmentalists have their eye on many areas that, in my view, are better suited to agricultural development. I find it very difficult to understand why the land in the Hundred of Gosse has not been let out for agriculture. Certain parts of it could remain as Crown land, but I would think that about three-quarters or two-thirds of the land, which is some of the best land in South Australia, with the highest rainfall, could be let out. It is absolute nonsense to talk about the great harm that may be caused to the environment by farming it. If the land was let out, we would be playing an important role in helping to develop South Australia and in creating jobs.

I am concerned that the National Parks and Wildlife Division is still attached to the Department of Environment and Planning. I believe that many of the problems that have occurred in relation to national parks have occurred because people in charge of the Department of Environment and Planning, particularly over the past few years, have had little or no experience in land management. The problems in regard to national parks have occurred because the land management of the areas concerned has left a lot to be desired. I was told recently (and I have had a look) that in some of the national parks kangaroos are in plague proportions and should be thinned out. However, nothing has been done, because the people involved have had no experience in dealing with these problems. I sincerely hope the Government can address itself to this matter in the very near future.

I believe that the Premier has taken difficult decisions that are in the best interests of the people of this State. Some of those decisions have not gained for him popularity in the community, but I believe that the right decisions should always be made. Those people who are prepared to criticise the Premier strongly (and the member for Norwood mentioned the name of one business man), particularly in the business community, should say what alternatives they consider would be appropriate. It is all right for the Leader of the Opposition to launch daily into a torrid criticism of the Government without giving an alternative. The Leader normally leads with his feet. It is another matter to put forward constructive, well thought out policies. I am pleased that the member for Elizabeth is in the House tonight, and I hope in the course of the Budget debate he will explain where he believes the extra revenue should come from. I hope he will tell us his attitude.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Out of your pocket.

**Mr GUNN:** If the honourable member wants the extra revenue to come from my pocket, he will also be attacking his own pocket. Labor politicians talk about increasing taxes, but I have yet to hear of a Government drastically increasing tax levels on politicians. The policies put forward sound very good, but I have yet to hear of any Treasurer introducing a level of taxation that will drastically affect politicians' salaries. Treasurers normally bring in taxing charges that are just above what politicians are paid. That is always very interesting.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** I bet that line goes over well in Leigh Creek.

**Mr GUNN:** It always amazes me that these people get up but do not advocate taxes and charges that will hit politicians.

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

**Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park):** I wish to address my remarks to the problems in the transport area in relation to the driving test that people who reach the age of 70 have to undergo. This matter came to my attention originally in regard to delays for appointments for such tests.

**Mr Randall:** 'What's this got to do with the Budget?'

**Mr TRAINER:** For the benefit of the member for Henley Beach, I point out that there has been an increase in the allocation for the Motor Registration Division from \$4 862 360 to \$5 566 774, and I hope that that allocation takes into account additional staff to overcome the problem to which I refer.

There appears to be a 7 to 8 week waiting list for appointments for tests for the over-70-year-old drivers. A pensioner in my electorate contacted the Marion branch of the Motor Vehicles Registration Division to arrange for a driving test before his licence expired. He made that application on 4 March for a test, 6 weeks before his licence

was due to expire. He thought that he had applied in plenty of time, but was surprised to be given an appointment for 23 April, 9 days after his licence was due to run out on 14 April. Fortunately, he was able to get a temporary extension of his licence.

The Minister and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles came forth with plausible explanations for these delays. They mentioned that some of the contributing factors were the P plate retesting; the fact that more old-age drivers were being tested; that some of the testers were on leave or away ill; and that the fact that appointments were not being kept was throwing schedules into chaos. Those explanations suggest to me that an increase in staff is needed, and I will be closely examining the details associated with that Budget line, as I mentioned earlier, in response to an interjection by the member for Henley Beach.

**Mr Randall:** Or a decrease in tests, maybe.

**Mr TRAINER:** That is another possibility; I will be dealing with that also. I will be checking the breakdown of that line closely in order to see that the number of examiners is adequate to cover the new requirements with respect to people who hold P plates, having regard to the fact that there is also an increase in the population of the number of aged people. Finally, it would be appropriate to have a few women examiners amongst those who test the old-age drivers to make them feel a little more relaxed. I hope to have time to mention this aspect later on.

Following an article on driving tests for the elderly published on 27 April in the *News*, in response to a statement I had made, I was contacted by quite a few people of over 70 years of age regarding this issue. Around that same time, I also noticed, dealing with the same subject, a letter to the Editor on 11 May in the *News* and a letter in the May edition of the R.A.A. publication. Both these letters seemed to share the same particular points of view. They complained about the lengthy delays in getting appointments, and, they commented on what they felt was the strictness of the test, the fact, as they believed, that elderly drivers had low accident rates and that many elderly drivers accordingly felt the testing was unnecessary, and lastly, that, except for Tasmania, other States either do not test drivers over 70 or do so at only higher ages. I understand the age is 75 years in Western Australia and 85 years in New South Wales.

After some further investigation, I issued a press release suggesting that a relaxation of the test might be worth considering, particularly when there were far more hazardous drivers on the road of a younger age who had never been tested. Subsequently, I wrote to the Minister on 28 May, as follows:

Dear Mr Wilson,—

I did not make it 'Dear Michael'; that is a little too familiar a term when approaching a Minister, particularly one who is not a Party colleague. The letter continued:

The matter of the tests given to elderly drivers for their licence renewals has been brought to my attention. Originally, the issue revolved around the lengthy delays encountered in making appointments, but it is now clear that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction among elderly drivers regarding the pressure allegedly involved in some tests, and at the principle of having these annual tests imposed at all.

Has your department given any consideration to a relaxation of the compulsory annual tests for drivers over 70 years of age, to bring them in line with the conditions existing in other states? I notice that Mr E. W. Hender, Chairman of the Road Safety Council, commented on this in his 31 March 1981 quarterly report to you as Minister of Transport.

I will be quoting from that particular report afterwards. My letter to the Minister continues:

I have suggested in the media that staff released by any such relaxation for the over 70s could be usefully employed in testing some of the drivers aged over 40, who gained their licences in the

1950s, or earlier, when no practical test was required. I recall, at the age of 16, paying one pound for a licence, and, after a brief written examination, I was licensed to drive cars, motor cycles, buses, trucks—in fact, just about anything on wheels. I understand in earlier times, just a few shillings were needed and there wasn't even any requirement to do a written test regarding the rules of the road.

I realise it is not practical to test everyone over the age of 40. However, I was interested in the hostile reaction by some people to my suggestion that it would be just as fair (or unfair) to impose a test on everyone at 40 as it is to impose annual tests on the over-70's. The community is willing to inflict annual tests on timid elderly pensioners because they don't complain. But there was quite a reaction from some people at my tongue-in-cheek suggestion that they have a once-only test at 40 or thereabouts.

Although my suggestion regarding 40-year-olds was only half serious, it is nevertheless true that some drivers have never had a driving test in their life. New drivers and the elderly, and people seeking special classes of licences, do have tests of one kind or another. Perhaps drivers who lose substantial demerit points, or are involved in an accident in which they are at fault, could be helped by a test. Certainly anyone who had their licence suspended could merit a driving test at the end of their suspension, rather than just getting their licence posted back to them.

Could you, accordingly, advise me on the practicability of both propositions: firstly, the relaxation of the test conditions imposed on drivers over 70, and, secondly, the testing of some drivers who have had a serious accident or who have accumulated substantial demerit points or have lost their licence altogether—particularly drivers in those categories who probably, like many in my age group and yours, have never undergone a practical test?

The report from the Chairman of the Road Safety Council, Mr Hender, to which I referred in that letter, is dated 6 April. It is the quarterly report to the Minister of Transport for the period 1 January 1981 to 31 March 1981. In that report, Mr Hender refers to a meeting in Canberra of PACERS, which is another one of those acronyms that seem to crop up. This one stands for the Publicity Advisory Committee on Education in Road Safety. In that report, Mr Hender states:

During the course of the meeting I raised the matter of the problem being experienced in the increasing numbers of elderly people finding problems in passing their age test in respect to retaining their driving licence.

On being failed by licence examiners, a large number of these elderly people are referred to us in the hope that we may be able to improve their performance, thereby making them eligible to continue as licensed drivers. The fact is that many elderly people who are caring for themselves find it virtually impossible to do their shopping without the use of a motor vehicle. Many cannot afford to use taxis, and public transport is not always available. Many are virtually housebound once they are unable to drive a motor vehicle. While we are pleased to help these people, the operation is time consuming as the assessment and instruction is labour intensive.

It has been past practice to apply a different standard to aged drivers as against that applied to persons gaining their first licence. I agree in that respect. At the same time I feel that some further consideration can be given in this regard, as elderly people are involved in very few accidents. It may also be possible to issue more restricted licences, thereby allowing these people to retain their independence. Following discussions on aged drivers, it was agreed that this matter should be referred to the Advisory Committee on Road User Performance and Traffic Codes, ACRUPT [another acronym] for consideration.

So, it is obvious that others have encountered the same problems as have a couple of my constituents. Indeed, following media coverage, I was approached by quite a large number of people in that age group. In response to that letter, the Minister wrote on 18 June, as follows:

Thank you for your letter dated 28 May 1981 referring to the testing of drivers. I am well aware that there is a feeling that it is somewhat discriminatory to be requiring drivers of 70 years of age and over to be tested annually. It is a matter on which there is considerable difference of opinion. However, there is evidence to suggest that in the interests of road safety a regular review of the driving ability of persons in this age group is warranted.

In view of the present road toll and accident rate, I do not believe it appropriate to take any action which could be interpreted as a lessening of the emphasis on road safety. Whilst the effects on road safety of the annual retesting of these drivers is difficult to gauge it cannot be disputed that a percentage of those whose driving abilities have deteriorated to a stage where they may no

longer be safe drivers are detected by this procedure. Many others voluntarily forfeit their licences or fail to renew their licences in preference to undergoing a practical driving test.

The procedure of testing aged drivers was introduced in 1935 and it is difficult to argue that there is a lesser need for such testing in 1981.

The test conducted is not considered to be unnecessarily severe and indeed about 90 per cent of the drivers tested are successful in passing although not all at the first attempt. Those that fail appear to lack a knowledge of current road rules and commit obvious breaches.

That figure seemed rather high, so I checked it out in the 1979-80 report of the Motor Registration Division, and on page 24 it seems that that figure is quite correct and that a high proportion of them do pass. The figure quoted there is 87.8 per cent, but it would appear that many of those take several tries to do it, because of the nervousness with which they approach the first test, and it is also a fact that many who, on ability, could well pass the test, because of that nervousness do not even sit for it, and they would not show up in those figures. The Minister's letter continues:

Whether the test should be conducted annually or less regularly and at what age testing should commence are matters on which there is differing opinion and the matter is being kept under review.

The retesting of aberrant drivers is in line with the department's planning, but the practicability of implementing this in view of current staffing and financial restrictions is doubtful. A similar procedure has been introduced through the probationary licence system in that probationary licence holders who acquire three or more demerit points and incur a cancellation of licence are required to pass a practical driving test before their licence is returned. This additional testing which is steadily increasing now that the system has been operating for about 12 months is partly the reason why delays are occurring in obtaining practical driving test appointments.

However, I am at present reviewing the procedure and I am grateful that you have written to me expressing your views.

As the Minister said, 87.8 per cent do pass; in other words, however, 12.2 per cent fail outright. As I pointed out, others are frightened off altogether from tackling the test, not so much because of its strictness, because the test, as I understand it, does not include parking and is probably not as hard as the test that beginner drivers do; nevertheless, nerves could cause more people to fail than otherwise would be the case.

I must point out, in relation to this aspect of nerves, that the police, when they conduct these tests, apparently do not seem to frighten so many of the elderly people. The Motor Registration Division now performs most of the licence testing, both written and practical, within the State. The police now are performing that only in outlying areas. Quite a large proportion of the people who have approached me on this topic have fewer complaints against the police.

I do not wish to be seen to be casting any sort of slur on the public servants in the Motor Registration Division, but there must be some reason why there is such a large number of complaints concerning the licence examiners in the Motor Registration Division and so few concerning the police. Elderly people say they did not have this sort of trouble when the police were conducting the tests. It is possible that this reaction on their part is simply the reaction of the elderly to a new way of going about things. They happen to prefer the system with which they felt more comfortable, because they were used to it, and they find it difficult to adapt to having tests conducted by the examiners of the Motor Registration Division, or it could be that the police are a little more lenient in their approach, or perhaps are better trained in handling the public.

Elderly people may find the more clinical approach of an examiner from the Motor Registration Division a little bit more awe inspiring than a policeman who might crack a joke to put them at ease or it could well be that the simple strain of having to handle examinations one after another for a continuous day is a little harder on the public

servant involved, so that his approach is therefore a little different from that of a policeman who may have to do only one or two in the course of an afternoon. It may be that there are perhaps one or two individual examiners located at centres who are building up a bad reputation for the whole division amongst some of the elderly people. I will refer to some of the correspondence that I have received on this matter that points in that direction. I again responded to the Minister's reply after having given the subject further consideration, and I wrote to him again on 23 June, as follows:

Thank you for your reply of 18 June to my inquiries regarding the testing of drivers over 70. Few would deny that 'in the interests of road safety, a regular review of the driving ability of persons in this age group is warranted'. However, is it necessary to 'use a sledgehammer to crack a nut' by imposing a blanket requirement on all over 70s for annual testing? Could not some of the resources directed to this goal be more fruitfully redirected to the 'retesting of aberrant drivers', so that the latter could be undertaken more intensively in spite of 'current staffing and financial restrictions'? The 1979-80 annual report of the Motor Registration Division points out that less than one in eight of the over 70s fail the test. However, two other matters must be considered in analysing that figure.

First, many elderly people, especially women, find the testing procedure so awe-inspiring that they fail purely through test nerves. This is not to imply that the test is physically difficult, merely that the presence of the tester intimidates elderly ladies into errors they would not otherwise make, that is, the test is an artificial situation which may not genuinely reflect their normal driving capacity. Such people would be among those who, as you say, 'fail to renew their licences in preference to undergoing a practical driving test', and who do not therefore show up among the 12.2 per cent who fail the test outright. (I might add that the correspondence I have received on this subject suggests that particular individuals who conduct the tests at two or three of the centres in Adelaide have an especially intimidating effect on some elderly drivers. In addition, the comment is frequently made that the tests were much less unpleasant in past years when they were conducted by members of the S.A. Police Force rather than by the Motor Registration Division. Both suggestions are, I realise, somewhat less than objective, but it is nevertheless interesting that they should be made so frequently.)

Secondly, the impact on the life of an elderly person deprived of their licence can be disproportionately severe in view of their low accident record. Most elderly drivers are only out on the road between about 10 a.m. and 4 p.m., rarely travel more than a mile or two from home, prefer to avoid rush-hour traffic or night driving, and use their car mainly for shopping or going to church. Their accident records are quite low. Yet, deprived of a licence, a frail elderly person can become house bound for the rest of their life (particularly in an isolated rural area).

No-one wants dangerously decrepit drivers on the road, but surely medical screening procedures can adequately eliminate those who have failing eyesight or reflexes? Could consideration be given to some of the following steps:

- (a) Devise operating procedures to make testing a less traumatic process for the timid who cannot drive up to their usual standard when accompanied by a potentially hostile critic with the power to remove their licence;
- (b) a more widespread use of restricted licences for the elderly;
- (c) Triennial practical tests at 70, 73, 76 and 79 years of age, becoming annual at 80 or 82, but with annual certification on eyesight and reflexes during that period?

I am pleased to hear that you are reviewing procedures, and trust that that review will give adequate consideration to my suggestions and inquiries on this matter.

The reply I received from the Minister seemed to suggest that he was a little tired of my correspondence on this matter because he was a little more terse than in his previous responses. He said that the suggestion made in my letter would be given due consideration and he said that there was little more that he could add to his previous letter. He then went on to say:

However, if you have particular information relating to complaints against particular licence examiners, I am sure the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, Mr D. N. Thurlow, would like to be notified so that he can make appropriate investigations.

I would hesitate to meet that request, inasmuch as I would hate to be seen to be providing evidence against a public

servant because, after all, public servants are already sufficiently under attack from this particular Government. So I did not pursue that matter directly. After further representations from a large number of elderly people and following some other items which appeared in the media, I continued to receive even more correspondence. In my briefcase I have at least 40 letters or notes of telephone conversations on this particular topic.

For example, I have a constituent in Marion who telephoned regarding what he felt was the psychological impact of testing on elderly people. He was aged 78, had had tests previously with the police at Plympton and Glenelg police stations, and never had any problems. He said that the people at the Marion centre were—I think it would be best if I did not use the particular words he used to describe those people as he was perhaps just a little rash, and it was rather intemperate language. He mentioned how a friend at Clarence Gardens, not a well man, could not eat for days because it worried him after the test. Another friend at Marlestone had to go to a doctor for treatment for nerves because the worry had made his so bad. Another constituent at South Plympton wrote to me saying the first time at 70 he had passed the test reasonably easily and passed the second time similarly. In relation to the third test in October last year, he stated:

The first time they told me I made a lot of mistakes. After driving 50 years without accident I could not understand it. The second time the other examiner told me to go to the driving school on the road off Morphett Road.

I assume he is referring to the road safety centre at Oaklands Park. The letter continues:

I did, and he could not understand why I did not get my licence, so I went back the third time about two weeks later and had another examiner and passed it o.k. It is very degrading having to go home and tell the family and friends that you had to keep going back all the time after driving for so many years and it is very upsetting to the nerves having these chaps sitting there taking down this report without a word being spoken, making you feel like a real nit. I am wondering whether I can stand it again this year. I am just dreading the time to come and am thinking of selling my car so that I won't have to go through it all again. I must say that they are not a very sociable lot of chaps at Morphett Road.

A lady from the other side of town at Paradise also wrote to me, and I quote from a section of that letter, as follows:

I have been driving for 60 years and have never had one accident nor have I been involved in one. Unfortunately, I am deaf and unless I can watch the speaker I cannot make out what he is saying. The appointment for the test was made for Tea Tree Gully. As the tester took particular points to speak to the windows, I did not pass. He advised me against trying again, but I told him I intended to, but of course with the same result. I have heard since that a monster is planted in all the testing centres and it was my misfortune to strike the worst one and, on going back again, another one almost as bad. Needless to say, by the time I had been screamed at and humiliated, I was a nervous wreck.

The particular comments she made about a monster being planted in each of the testing centres is purely a subjective interpretation but I think it is significant that so many of the elderly people have come to that particular impression. Whether the facts of the matter are such as to justify that interpretation, it is certainly strange that so many of them seem to have that particular impression. A lady from St. Georges wrote as follows:

When the Government stopped the police and made us to go to the driving centre nearest you, I had to go out to Tranmere and it has been hell ever since. I will be 75 in October, so then it will be on again. The men are so rude, and pick you up on the silliest things. My car is a Mini and I failed because I took my hand off the wheel to wind up my window, yet I have gears.

The particular lady means that she had to take one of her hands off the steering wheel anyway to change gears, but not of course at the same time to take both her hands off the steering wheel to wind the window up. Her letter continued as follows, with the lady quoting the examiner:

"You aren't looking at your outside mirror enough." I said I always watch in the one in front of my eyes and have had five cars and this is the first one that has the outside as well: all silly cruel things thrown at you, which makes you feel a no hoper.

I have seen elderly men come out crying and they have said to me, "I have driven all around Australia". The only thing I want my car for now is to go to church, and do my little bit of shopping because I am living on my own. My friend's husband had driven almost his life time and when his wife came home she had to ring the doctor because he had a heart attack, getting so worked up with these awful testers.

Another person from Beverley wrote as follows:

I found that the instructor was young, important, and contemptuous of anyone old. Of course, I did little things, that under ordinary circumstances, I would not have done and never have done. It seems like a conspiracy to push the old folk out of their cars, and into a house-bound condition.

Another letter was from a constituent, Len Golding, a former speed car champion who is described in an old edition of *Speedway News* that he showed me as someone who 'has probably won more races, held more records and driven on more tracks than most other Australian drivers.' Even he ran into strife with his particular test. Of all the 35 or 40 elderly drivers who approached me he was probably the most irate. He was upset, as a former speed-car champion, to be told he did not know how to change gears properly.

What upset him even more was being reprimanded during his test one year because the instructor, his passenger, had not put his seat belt on. Not wanting to be caught out again, the next year he made sure he said to the examiner, 'Would you please do up your seat belt before we move off?' only to be told by the same examiner, 'Who the hell do you think you are, telling me what to do?' In those circumstances, a lesser person than Len Golding probably would have packed it in.

Another part of the problem that deserves special consideration is the fact that some women tend to be more easily intimidated than men. I do not wish to be looked on as having a sexist approach, but few people would deny that elderly women, by and large, are more shy, more nervous, and more easily intimidated and distracted than are men of the same age. Most elderly people would be affected by the pressure of the test, which contrasts so much with their leisurely normal driving: the pressure of sitting there and having someone with a check list alongside them ticking off errors made.

For many people born in an era of less relaxed relationships between men and women, it could be off-putting. It can be off-putting for an elderly lady to have a strange man sitting alongside her taking these notes. It means extra pressure. Several ladies have commented to me about this, including one woman in the Minister's own district, in Gilberton, who referred to the particular pressure and contrasted it with the pressure faced by young people in their tests. She stated:

If young people are tested they have youth in their favour and they don't get nervous like older people, so I think it would be great if they left us alone to continue with our good careful driving and no tests at all. I think the testing should have been done by women testing women and men testing men; that would lower the rate of nervousness in women.

That may be taking it a little too far, but there should perhaps be a few women examiners who could be available on request if there was someone in that situation who preferred someone of the same gender to give the test. I asked a Question on Notice about this on 14 August, when I asked the Minister how many examiners were female. I received a reply on 25 August, which I thought was quite good, but then the Minister of Transport seems to be, on most occasions, far more helpful than other Ministers. He pointed out that there were 'no females currently employed as licensed examiners and that only two applications have

been received from women since the division took over the responsibility for driver testing. Of those two applicants one was unsuitable and the other one was nominated for a position but subsequently declined the appointment, which confirmed my suspicion that there were no women acting as testers. That is something I believe would most help.

I noticed in the last edition of the R.A.A. Journal, *S.A. Motor*, that the R.A.A. also has taken up this particular issue. I was a little surprised that there was no mention made of several members of Parliament, including myself, who have acted on this particular issue. I know that the member for Brighton has expressed interest in it, as also has the member for Mitcham. The R.A.A., for some reason or other, saw fit not to mention that. The R.A.A. has, however, also expressed an interest now. I think it is something that should be taken seriously, because elderly people are very much concerned about this particular aspect of their lives once they have passed the age of 70 years.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Olsen):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth):** I want only to say a couple of words tonight. In particular, I want to make some comments relating to the housing situation in this State. I believe, from my experience as member for an outer suburban district, that there is a serious situation developing in this State in relation to housing.

As has already been said, this Budget represents an incredible assault or attack on the building and construction industry in this State. That is looking on one side of the ledger; on the other side of the ledger, of course, it is an incredible attack on those people in South Australia who are in the position of either not being able to afford any housing at all without Government assistance, or alternatively, of not being able to afford housing at the rates of interest which are at present being charged.

My belief is that those two groups of people represent a very large sector of the community in South Australia. So far, we have not seen very much to indicate exactly what proportion of the community that has housing loans is very seriously affected. We have heard lots of stories about marches and about people who are likely to be thrown out of their homes, and this would have an incredible impact on society. The banks and the building societies had acted shrewdly and in their own interests, although I am not saying that I believe that entirely: I believe that many people who work in the banks and in the building societies are greatly concerned about the impact of this dramatic increase in interest rates on their customers, and are therefore doing whatever they can to try to ensure that their borrowers are not simply turfed out of their homes. Nonetheless, I believe that that time will come in the not too distant future unless something very dramatic is done about the situation.

This Budget provides absolutely no relief for people in that category, and it is interesting to note that the State Bank of South Australia, which is one of the three sources of State Government assistance to persons wanting to purchase their own homes, and one of the three State Government instrumentalities which have large amounts of money already lent to home buyers, has made a very significant profit increase this year. It has gone from \$1 000 000 to about \$4 500 000, and I think that is extraordinary in this particularly difficult year. It is not surprising given the increases in the amount of profits that the major private banks have made, but undoubtedly it provides a real indication of this Government's thinking. If the Government was seriously concerned about people who have home loan

problems because of the increase in interest rates, then it would have ensured that the State Bank profits were kept to a minimum, and that those profits were redistributed in the way of reduced interest rates to borrowers from that bank. I think that is a condemnation of the Government.

I realise that the government has indicated that there will be a \$20 000 000 boost for housing in South Australia—a shot in the arm, the Premier described it, and he said that that would come from the South Australian Superannuation Trust Investment Fund and from the S.G.I.C. I am very pleased to see that—it was not announced in the Budget, and of course it could easily have been consolidated into the Budget as an indication of what the Government was planning to do, particularly in the document which is associated with the Budget papers, but it was not. However, I am very pleased to see that. More importantly, I think that this Government could have done a lot to assist the situation if it had been prepared to encourage the establishment of small housing authorities throughout South Australia which could have borrowed under the smaller authorities programme.

I believe that the total amount which they can borrow during this current year is in the order of \$1 200 000. My view is that it would have been possible to establish as many small housing co-operatives as needed on a local level throughout South Australia. These could have been used to borrow money outside the normal programme to enable a much greater housing effort to take place. This would have provided a lot more rental housing, and it would also have provided (to use the Premier's words again) a great shot in the arm for the home building industry in this State.

I believe that that idea is well worth further consideration, and you, Mr Acting Speaker, should be intended in it, because I know that many of your constituents are in a similar socio-economic position to the people I represent in this Parliament. I know that many of those people are finding their housing plight to be completely desperate. More and more hidden housing needs are emerging in the community. There is more doubling up: two families are living in the one home. It would be interesting to see the Government have enough guts to undertake a survey of the number of situations where two families live in the same house. I understand that those figures are blowing out very dramatically. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education):** I move:  
That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I want to continue the remarks that I made earlier this evening about Adelaide Airport. The committee that has been established in the Thebarton area, known as the H.A.V. committee, is an off-shoot of the Anti-Airport Noise Committee, which has been in operation for some 12 or 13 years. I was sent a progress report by the information centre, which was established to handle complaints and queries about the airport. That report stated:

The above centre was established in April 1981 to co-ordinate the work of two committees—Anti-Airport Noise and H.A.V.—and to inform the western suburbs residents fully about the airport.

With the strong support of *West Side* newspaper, West Torrens council and Thebarton council and an initial door knock, we have formed a good strong grass roots contact with the people most

affected by the airport. We are very glad we now have the opportunity to correct a great deal of misinformation that has been floating about the area.

There have been 6 major phone-ins. Subjects are:

1. Announcement of proposed international flights and Airbus. Concern and fear expressed at the length of our runways and the so-called less than full payload flights. Major concern—the safety record of airlines proposing to use the airport—calls continuing.

2. T.A.A.'s negotiations to have night curfew lifted—using excuse that Airbus will be quieter than the current flights which are supposedly legal at the moment. *Concern*—any flight at night is one plane too many. Total outrage expressed and groups are gathering massive support for a complete ban on night flights. Reference—*Australian*, 18 June 1981 'Airbus fails to beat Night Curfew'. In this John Mulcair states decision will be reviewed in one year.

3. Mr Becker's strong stand on the curfew sparked a round of calls from grateful citizens—some 127 in all. *Major concern*—disgust expressed that the 3.30 flight carried nothing more than bank statements which could wait till 6 a.m. anyway. Amazed to hear that American Airports have a 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. curfew.

4. Mr Tonkin's statement in the House that the proposed lifting of the curfew was merely a rumour, and should be treated with contempt brought many calls expressing total disbelief and requests for the above reference—*Australian*, 18 June. Letters to Premier's office.

5. Flight of Qantas 747 over our area of Flying Doctor fund raising flight showed residents just how untrue are the claims that the new planes will be quieter. Noise was painful and very frightening and fears for our safety are very real. Regret was expressed that it did not pass over during prime T.V. viewing time and so educated more people. This horror passed over at approx. 4.15 on 19 May.

I assume that is 4.15 p.m. The letter continues;

6. John Scott's morning news statements on noise measuring equipment at Adelaide Airport sparked a rash of calls about the excessive number of flights over the city from the main runway and the resulting nightmare of noise during May, June and July. *Major Concern*—compensation from State Government for the damage and ever increasing noise inflicted on Western Suburbs, e.g. insulation to houses. Advice is being sought.

Our service is growing in a steady solid way which is gratifying to the volunteers who have given their time freely. My thanks to them all. Most gratifying is the support we are building up amongst the rare individual outside the area who, though they do not have the problem, unselfishly support us.

Main issues in order of importance to callers:

1. Safety—Big planes with 'so called part payloads' landing on short runways. Adelaide has housing to within 1 500 feet of the main runway, three-quarters of all crashes occur within three km of the runway. *Major Concern*—a Boeing 747 which ran off the end of Sydney's 13 000 feet runway would have been among houses in Adelaide (main runway 8 300 feet with upgrading). Are we set for a national disaster?

2. Noise—ever increasing—some people who do not complain admit that they merely tolerate the noise and would be very happy without it.

3. The curfew—too many so-called legal flights. No planes at night the ultimate aim.

4. If the Government plan to move the airport in the year 2000 as stated, why not now? *Major Concern*—Queensland with much better facilities than South Australia is campaigning for more and bigger airports. Are we being ignored again because our present Government is a completely inadequate spokesperson on our behalf.

Callers state flatly that they will be voting for the candidate who will move the airport to a safer site.

We would urge people to make use of the centre to gain the complete correct information about the airport. As we are staffed by volunteers we sometimes have to be shut in emergencies. On these occasions try either number (352 3874 or 43 3983) after 4 p.m.

This circular, I take it, has been sent to the various members of those organisations. Some statements are not completely accurate. It does not recognise my involvement over some eleven years, to control the activities of the Adelaide airport. I was one of the first—if not the first—to suggest that the Adelaide airport should be resited north of Adelaide. These new people coming into this area of concern should have consulted me further and perused my records on the Adelaide airport, which are extensive.

However, certainly they should be fully aware of the attitude of all members of various political Parties who reside in and have electorates around Adelaide Airport. To

add further weight to the concern of the residents in the region, the Metropolitan Region Organisation Western issued a statement some time ago that all western region councils are categorically against any reduction in the hours of the curfew at Adelaide Airport. I know that they are also against any extension. At least it is pleasing to note that the present Minister of Transport supports that stand.

**Mr Oswald:** So does the member for Morphett. That can go in *Hansard*.

**Mr BECKER:** The member for Morphett assures me that he does, too. I want also to have recorded a question that was asked in the Senate on 19 August by Senator Teague regarding Adelaide Airport. The question, which was replied to by Senator Messner, concerns the Budget allocations for civil works for Adelaide Airport. Senator Messner replied as follows:

Like Senator Teague and the rest of the people of South Australia, I welcome several features of the Budget as announced last night, including the statements concerning wine tax and the Adelaide Airport. It is intended that planning for interim improvements to the existing taxiways, aprons and the terminal building to permit the introduction of regular domestic wide-bodied jet services in June 1982 will be completed by that date. The honourable Senator will notice that at this stage I refer to wide-bodied jet services as distinct from international airline services. It is intended that the airport will be upgraded with those programmes and a start will be made on containerised baggage handling facilities, further apron works, further taxiway upgrading, and changes to the access road and car park.

Most of that has been done. The reply continued as follows:

Studies have shown that it is not feasible to upgrade the existing terminal building to accommodate domestic wide bodied jets in the longer run. Therefore, international services could not be accommodated in the existing domestic terminal because of the differing requirements of domestic and international passengers. However, the Government has approved the construction of interim facilities such as those I have mentioned, at a cost of \$3 000 000 to enable international air services to commence. However, this will require passengers to be processed through Customs and quarantine facilities at a gateway port. The amount of \$800 000 has been set aside in 1981-1982 to get this work under way.

We are still a long way from having international services at Adelaide's airport. We will never have true international services. I have never supported them, and I will not do so now. I believe that it is a myth and that we should be completing the arrangements to reserve the land north of Adelaide on which to build an international airport. This should have been done some time ago. Had it been done, we could make an assessment of the needs for an international airport not only for Adelaide but also for South Australia.

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

**Mr CRAFTER (Norwood):** I wish to take this opportunity in this grievance debate to bring to the attention of the House some problems that are occurring in the community as a result of Government inactivity. Last year, the Chief Secretary established a working party to report to him on noise associated with the operation of entertainment premises, licensed and otherwise. The Chief Secretary did this as a result of numerous representations that, he told the House, he had received, resulting from problems associated with entertainment premises throughout the metropolitan area.

I have raised this matter on a number of occasions in the House, as have other members who experience similar problems in their electorates. The problem varies widely from major entertainment centres such as Memorial Drive to small neighbourhood hotels that conduct discos and other forms of entertainment at those premises. It has been clearly demonstrated in the working party's report which was given to the Government and which was dated Novem-

ber 1980 (some 9 to 10 months ago) that our laws in this State are quite inadequate to deal with the problems being experienced by the community.

The report states very clearly, when it looks at the laws existing in other States to deal with this problem, that other States have adopted a more forceful approach than that adopted in South Australia. This is a most undesirable situation, that we are lagging behind the other States, and that the Government has known about this. It has had clear recommendations before it for a period of 10 months, and there has not been any comment at all from the Chief Secretary or from the Government about what they propose to do in this most important area.

The report has been used by Government officials and indeed by the Minister, in correspondence to me, as a justification for not taking other courses of action in the community. Correspondence was referred to me by a local government authority in my district that had corresponded with the Minister, and I also corresponded with the Minister. To paraphrase his reply, the Minister said that the working party was well aware of the problems raised. It had included those in its recommendations, in its report, and they were being considered by the Government—and so on it goes.

The Licensed Premises Division, in reply to representations made to it, pointed out to the correspondent who wrote to that division that indeed this matter had been considered and that it was contained in recommendations in the working party report to which I had referred. Briefly, there are very severe anomalies in the law, in particular in the Licensing Act, where it is possible for licensees of hotels especially to declare substantial areas of those licensed premises areas where *bona fide* meals can be consumed in declared dining areas, including such *quasi* outdoor areas as beer gardens, and in that way fit in many hundreds of people for the purpose of consuming alcohol until the very early hours of the morning—3 a.m. or 4 a.m.

As honourable members would know, with a *bona fide* meal patrons can consume liquor at all hours of the night. By this means, a ruse of getting around the law, entertainment can be carried on. Often it is carried on in premises that were designed as no more than small community hotels or taverns. They have now changed their character and have become quite major entertainment centres, and this brings with it substantial problems for the peace and tone of the neighbourhood surrounding the hotel. It not only brings with it parking problems, problems of noise in the community from the entertainment itself, but from those patrons, particularly when they are outside the licensed premises, and much of the time of the working party was spent in looking at some of the very vexed questions that occur as to responsibility for behaviour of patrons on licensed premises once they leave those premises.

It is the clear law in this State that the licensee does not have any responsibility vested in him for the behaviour of patrons after they leave the licensed premises; albeit that those persons may have consumed considerable quantities of liquor in those premises, responsibility ends at the doorstep. It has been my experience, from discussions with my constituents, that great harm is caused in the community. Not only is there disturbance to people sleeping and to the peaceful living of themselves and their families but there is much physical damage as well. In recent weeks in the locality of one hotel in my district there has been substantial damage to motor vehicles, to business houses, and to homes, and indeed there has been physical violence. There is great confusion amongst the various authorities. The police, in my experience, have done everything they could possibly do to minimise these problems, but they have not got the manpower to continually police many of these premises.

They can do that from time to time but it does not solve the problem.

The report of the working party suggests a number of areas of law reform in the controls necessary by the police. It also proposes, for example, an onus on the licensee to provide security guards in car parks around the hotels when patrons leave those premises. The Licensing Court has also shown considerable concern for this problem in its judgments and in its dealings with complaints before it. However, there are great problems with lodging objections to the continuation of a licence for a hotel, in that costs can be awarded against such a complainant. Indeed, that is a deterrent which is used, in my experience, by licensees to deter people from objecting to the continuation of a licence. It can be a long, protracted and costly process with great risks to the complainant, regardless of the merits of his claim.

There are also problems with respect to local government planning laws. As I have said, it is possible to get around many of the laws in that area, and planning laws are no exception, through the claim that it is a continuing use and that a hotel still provides the services that it provided previously. However, those services can be altered in such a way to meet the existing use requirements, and yet provide a substantially increased volume of trade and change its nature considerably.

In this way there is a use akin to entertainment. In many cases, it is a major entertainment use, whereas previously the use was for quiet drinking by patrons of a hotel. There is little that local government authorities can do. The report addresses itself to this problem, and brings down what I consider to be very practical and sensible powers to local government to detect such subtle changes of land use and then bring down adequate controls at local government level. This is very important in relation to off-street parking and other requirements, so that land use can be preserved in the community interest. I suggest that there are great problems in this area, yet the Government seems to be unwilling to bring down remedies which are clearly available to it in this area. Meanwhile, the community suffers as a result of this inaction.

**Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach):** I rise tonight to comment, first, on the previous speaker's remarks. I was listening intently to see whether he would spell out the recommendations he supports, or perhaps he supports all of them. The reports I have seen in relation to this area seem to me to have been made to the Minister of Environment and Planning, the Minister who administers the noise legislation. Perhaps the member for Norwood is referring to a different report that I may not have seen. I will endeavour to follow that up at a later stage.

I share his concern and have similar concerns in my own electorate, whereby an area that has been a quiet drinking area in years gone by has now become a regular meeting place for young people for a disco evening on Thursday, Friday, Saturday evenings and on public holidays. Again, it is a subtle change of use using the supposed legality of all the laws by providing a *bona fide* meal and going through until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, with the consequent impact on the local community. I know other areas throughout the city of Adelaide are having similar problems. The comments I have received suggests that one management group would be prepared to make appropriate adjustments and close down a little earlier, provided everyone else was asked to do the same thing.

I think he is on the right track but as yet he has not yet supported the recommendations and I hope that he will and trust that he will, at a later stage, present those points.



I rise to speak tonight to support the members for Price and Spence in their calls for the continuation of CYSS, particularly the member for Price who last night made some comments about the COMSKILL scheme. As I know and understand the COMSKILL scheme, I fully support it. It has not had a great impact on my own district but I know there have been other young people from my own district who have gone into that training area and learned some particular skills and gained confidence in the area of typing and clerical activities. I note that the girls have benefited greatly from that sort of opportunity. I support the member for Spence and the member for Price. One comment I would like to make is that the member for Spence quoted, I think, that it would cost roughly \$14 000 to keep the operation going.

**Mr Abbott:** \$40 000.

**Mr RANDALL:** That is fair enough. The member for Price was commenting on \$36 000. Obviously, we are talking around the \$40 000 mark per year. Unfortunately, that is a large sum, which the local council cannot pick up fully, so obviously we must look at alternative funding methods. My comment is a positive one in saying that while I support the schemes, let us try to find another way of keeping them going. Let us keep COMSKILL going at Woodville and let us keep the motor garage at Port Adelaide, because those two projects, of all the CYSS projects I know of in the western suburbs, have had the most impact in the areas they serve. There have been other projects, one of which I was associated with, which have had a lesser impact but those two, the garage at Port Adelaide and COMSKILL at Woodville, have provided young people with abilities and training in what I believe are job skills.

*Dr Billard interjecting:*

**Mr RANDALL:** I am unfamiliar with the district of the member for Newland. I do not know what activities he has in his area but he assures me there are similar activities there. He may like to speak in this House on those activities and tell us why he would support them, because I believe we are going through a phase when the Federal Government is changing its approach. The State Ministers have indicated there is a need, there is a clientele in our community, that deserves the sorts of schemes we have had.

I was Chairman of MOVE, which is again a CYSS project at Henley Beach, for a short time and relinquished that position after my election. The local representative stated in a letter to me dated 24 October 1979:

The MOVE Henley and Grange Local CYSS Committee would like to express their appreciation for your dedicated service while Chairman of the committee. We are disappointed to lose the skills, initiative and guidance you have been able to offer the project. We hope your interest in the project will continue despite your busy schedule.

I want to assure that group, as I have other groups, that I will have a continuing interest in such groups. As a matter of fact, the Chairman of the group wrote to me recently, asking again for my support. Part of that letter states:

Your close association with this committee in the past would give you a first hand knowledge of the value to the electorate of Henley Beach of the work of this project. The particular needs of young people assisted by the programme cannot be met by the alternatives that will be offered. Community support to the large number of unemployed young people who need assistance and encouragement is vital. My committee is particularly concerned about what support will be given to the young people now receiving help from the present project. We would like to see an expansion of the Henley Unemployed Group.

I would like to comment on that area. That letter was signed by Don Ferguson, who happens to be the candidate for the Australian Labor Party at the next election, so again, whilst Party politics may enter some areas, there are other areas where we can forget Party politics and work for the benefit of the community. I believe this is one area

and that is why I have no hesitation in supporting the members for Spence and Price in their call to see such groups as COMSKILL and the garage sustained.

I believe if a group like MOVE is to continue, there must be some assessment by the Government before it does. Obviously, justification for its continuance is needed, just as COMSKILL and the motor garage would also be expected to justify their positions. I refer to the Henley Beach unemployed group, which is a different group funded from the community welfare, funded by the State Government of South Australia, and which has been funded by previous Governments in this State for a number of years, so it has been a on-going project catering for young unemployed people. So young unemployed people in Henley Beach will not miss out, I hope. At this stage, I have not been able to have an assessment from the Minister for Community Welfare as to what projects will be funded next year, but I hope that HOPE will continue to receive funding so that the young unemployed people in the area will get the continued support they deserve, especially now that it seems that the MOVE project and CYSS will be closed down.

We need their support. Therefore, I look with interest to see what will happen. I find that in South Australia, for instance, there are 26 community-based unemployment programmes operating under CYSS. There are 70 skilled project staff employed as project officers. There are 18 metropolitan projects and eight country projects. Nearly \$1 000 000 was spent in South Australia last year on CYSS, so obviously there are implications there for the State Government to look at if it considers picking up the tab for all these projects.

**Mr Whitten:** The State Government shouldn't have to pick up the tab; it should be picked up in Canberra.

**Mr RANDALL:** Quite right, but unfortunately the decision has been made, so let us accept the decision and let us look at the funding being poured into South Australia and use it wisely. Let us maintain COMSKILL, for instance, under transition education. Let us get together with the D.F.E. at Port Adelaide and encourage it to pick this up as part of its programme because expenditure on manpower and planning programmes has been increased by 45 per cent to \$21 600 000. Trade training schemes have received a 12 per cent increase to \$6 500 000. That money is being poured into the State. With an increase like that more programmes should be able to be accommodated, so that projects like the motor garage in Port Adelaide should be able to shift over to the transition education programme conducted by the D.F.E. at Port Adelaide, and the same thing can happen with the COMSKILL programme.

That is my assessment, and what I believe should happen. If the funding is there let us use it wisely; let us keep the programmes going that are well established, and have a good clientele. It will not take a lot of administrative help to set up. If we cannot do it that way, let us look at another area. Unfortunately, I could not attend the meeting at the Woodville Town Hall the other night, because I was attending a high school council meeting. I have challenged the high school councils in my area to look at transition education for their own schools. Perhaps they are the ones that should conduct programmes like COMSKILL.

High school teachers may have to do some rethinking about some of the sorts of programme they conduct for early school-leavers. Perhaps we need to have a parent council on side, and to begin to look at this sort of area. If it is going to be lost by one decision-making body, we have

to pick it up somewhere else along the line. The challenge is to decide where we can pick it up. Logically, secondary education schools are one area and the D.F.E. is the other area we can look at. My challenge to those people is to let us forget the negative side and the politics and get on with the job. Let us maintain these programmes; let us get COMSKILL and HUG—

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

Motion carried.

At 10.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 24 September at 2 p.m.