HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 23 March 1983

The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: TEACHING STAFF

A petition signed by 149 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide sufficient staff to the Education Department to resolve the current staffing crisis was presented by Mr Mayes.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—Report, 1981-82.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I apologise to the shadow Minister for correctional services for not having a full report for him. I have only briefing notes about which I will make the Ministerial statement. I will be happy to give the member a copy of the briefing notes when I have finished with them. The reason for this is the considerable activity that has taken place within my department to resolve a very difficult situation as a result of which I have just received the briefing notes. No blame can be placed on my staff for this; in fact, they have performed remarkably well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yesterday afternoon a very serious incident occurred at the Yatala Labour Prison. A riot started and a message was passed through a member of the staff to the Executive Director who notified me and he then left immediately for Yatala. When the Executive Director arrived at Yatala at about 4 p.m. it was obvious that A Division was well and truly ablaze. The fire brigade and the police were in attendance at that time. The Executive Director was then advised, and it has since been substantiated, that two officers (Mr Smales and Mr Geen) had been injured when the riot started.

The fire had a massive hold on the building. Mr Roper, an officer at the Yatala Labour Prison, requested that negotiations be held with prisoners, and that was done. While the negotiations were taking place one of the officers noticed that the building was about to collapse. This resulted in the prisoners and the hostages leaving A block and so, thankfully, no individuals were then in danger of injury from the fire.

The injured prisoners and staff were transferred to the Modbury Hospital. At about 5 p.m. I arrived at the prison. I was briefed by the senior staff and officers of the police and fire services who performed magnificently. I then inspected the building in which the fire had taken place. Apart from spot fires, the fire was then under control. I was immediately assured that the situation at Yatala was under control, that all was quiet and that certain prisoners who had been placed elsewhere were being held securely. I then left Yatala and gave a press conference.

South Australians can be certain that the prisoners who cannot be returned to the cellblock that has been gutted are being held securely. We have lost 130 cells. Today, the police headed by Inspector J. Murray, have declared the incident a major crime and are investigating accordingly. Prisoners are being interviewed and the buildings are being examined by police for forensic purposes.

Technical personnel from the fire services are examining buildings and action will be taken by the Public Buildings Department to make the buildings safe. Protected prisoners housed in 'B' Middle have been transferred to Adelaide Gaol (Nos 1 and 2 Yards). Three prisoners at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre were seriously assaulted by other prisoners and will remain there for protection. Volunteers are being sought amongst the prisoners for transfer to Cadell, which is a low-security prison. Only five have volunteered so far, and others will be directed to Cadell. These prisoners to whom I refer are serving sentences of 12 months or less. 'C' Division will be managed as a medium-security section housing 40 prisoners from other sections of Yatala. Additionally, other prisoners will be moved to Adelaide Gaol; indeed, 15 have already been moved there this morning. The problem at Adelaide Gaol concerns the lack of suitable work for prisoners. Other prisoners are being transferred to country institutions.

There is still some difficulty with certain prisoners at Yatala which we are monitoring. Discussions are taking place at present with representatives of the Miscellaneous Workers Union and the Director of Operations (Mr G. Beltchev) regarding the manning scale required to cope with the emergency. I understand further that a meeting of union members is being held at Yatala at the moment.

The situation at Yatala is tense. The prisoners are locked up and have been fed, and the Acting Superintendent intends the prison to return to normal activity as soon as possible. I pay a tribute to Mr Peter Priest for once again performing magnificently under extreme pressure. This officer deserves the appreciation and support of all South Australians.

The Prisons Act provides the administrative capacity to release prisoners serving sentences of 12 months or less up to three days early, and two days early in the case of prisoners serving 12 months or more, and we are examining that provision so that the numbers of prisoners across the State can be reduced in order that cells in the prison can be kept for high-security prisoners.

Prisoners to be released will be those nearing the end of their sentence, those serving minor sentences, and those in minimum-security prisons. The records show that at present nine prisoners are close to being released and they fit within the criteria to which I have referred. The alternative to that procedure is to maintain within the prison those prisoners who are no threat to the community but who are serving the balance of their sentence. The power in the Act has been provided by Parliament for the Executive Director under circumstances he finds appropriate to make remissions in respect to certain prisoners, and that provision has not previously been criticised by the Opposition. Indeed, during the three years of the previous Liberal Government no action was taken to change that provision, yet now that we want to invoke it, we hear loud complaints. Additional pieces of information are still being received, both anonymously and from certain named persons, and these are being relayed to the police and other authorities.

Senior management at Yatala, in conjunction with staff and in consultation with unions, are developing a one-month emergency plan. Mr Glen Hughes, a previous Superintendent of Yatala Labour Prison and now Inspector of

that establishment, interviewed two officers. One is seriously hurt. Of the injured prisoners some have been returned to prison. One was released (because his term of imprisonment expired yesterday) immediately after the dispute. That is the current position at Yatala Labour Prison. I pay a tribute to my officers involved in the unhappy situation as they performed magnificently. I apologise to my shadow—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: —for not being able to provide him with the briefing notes but I will have them photostated and he will have them within 30 seconds.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

Mr OLSEN: I direct my question to the Chief Secretary. Before asking my question I seek leave to make a brief preface.

The SPEAKER: The Leader seeks leave.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: I seek leave to preface my question with one paragraph.

The SPEAKER: The situation, as I understand it, and as I am advised, is that no power exists under Standing Orders for that to occur except by the indulgence of the whole House. I suppose I should, in those circumstances, let the Leader pose some sort of question that he have the indulgence of the House to make such a statement. I will then ask whether or not leave is granted.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Leave is not granted.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is entitled to seek leave.

Mr OLSEN: I have already sought leave to make a very brief comment prior to asking the question. I take it—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has sought leave—is leave granted?

Honourable members: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: Will the Chief Secretary advise whether the Government was given prior warning of yesterday's riot at Yatala Labour Prison and, if so, by whom? I will now incorporate the sentence to which I was referring. I preface my explanation by emphasising that the Opposition recognises the seriousness of the situation which has developed at Yatala and is, at this stage, seeking information from the Government and nothing more. That is merely what I wanted to say earlier. I have been informed that the Government was advised by prison officers some weeks ago that a major disturbance was planned and that requests were made to the Chief Secretary for appropriate action, which was not taken.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have been contacted by a number of people including some of my own colleagues and people within the community who have informed me that a difficult situation exists at Yatala Labour Prison. I might say that I was also contacted by people who informed me of exactly the same situation when I was shadow Minister. The situation has not changed, but I had no reason at all to believe that there would be a fire at the Yatala Labour Prison, as occurred yesterday.

However, I am prepared to concede that some time ago I was asked to go to the Yatala Labour Prison to talk to the prisoners, and was told that if I did not turn up they would burn the prison down. Prior to my going overseas, I sent the message to them that I would be happy to go out and speak to them, but not under duress, and that I would not be brought to the prison to speak to prisoners at the threat of having the place burnt down, because that would then happen every fortnight or three weeks.

The threat of burning down high security prisons is rife throughout the world. It does not apply only to South Australia: it applies in all the other States of Australia and everywhere where there are high security prisons. Every now and then a prison is burnt down. Our prisons are no different from other prisons in that. I regret that that has taken place. There is no action that could have been taken by the Government to stop what took place yesterday, because we were unaware that that was going to happen.

Mr GREGORY: Will the Chief Secretary tell the House what is the status of the task force report on demands by prison officers and what action has been taken in regard to that report?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would be delighted to do so, particularly in reply to the accusation made by the Leader of the Opposition on the A.B.C. *Nationwide* programme last night, when he said that I had had a report on my table for some weeks and that I was negligent because I had taken no action on it.

An honourable member: Months!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member says 'months'. I received that report today. It was signed by the Executive Director on Friday of last week. It arrived at my office yesterday afternoon. It was presented to the Executive Director, to the Chairman of the task force, on Friday as a complete document and it has now reached my table.

I told this House and the Leader of the Opposition last week what the status was. He chose to ignore my assurance and he repeated on *Nationwide* that I had the report; in a sense he was saying that I had misled Parliament. I believe that the Leader ought to 'cough up or shut up' on this. If he believes that I am misleading Parliament, he ought to say so. If he is not prepared to sustain that charge, I think that he ought to apologise. Even worse than that, the Leader has tried to tie his action in with an alleged assurance given by my press officer. I believe that that is despicable, because my press officer has not the right to defend himself. My press officer gave no assurance at all in relation to the task force, and the task force report reached my table today.

I will make information available (and frankly, I should have done so at the time) so that all members of Parliament and the community of South Australia know exactly what were the 13 or so claims by the prison officers and what was my reaction to them. Then they would know that those claims and that reaction could not have been blamed for yesterday's incident. The only information which we have received from the prisoners who were involved in yesterday's riot and which would give any indication as to why the riot occurred relates to four or five items that I know are with the department at the moment expressing concern about the Parole Board in South Australia. There is not one concern about the Yatala Labour Prison, not one concern about the security at the prison or what goes on in the prison.

The only information that we have received from the prisoners is about the Parole Board. I know that there is concern in South Australia about the activities of the Parole Board, and I have instigated an investigation into the Parole Board legislation which I have inherited from the previous Government. I might say that that is an horrific Act, because it requires the very genuine and loyal officers of the Parole

Board to comply with an Act that requires them in a sense to re-try a prisoner.

The court tries a person, sentences him to prison and applies a non-parole period. At present, the Act requires that the Parole Board considers all the circumstances surrounding the original offence, the nature of the offence, and any other circumstances that it believes are appropriate in the consideration of a parole application. When a prisoner has been sentenced to prison for three years, believing that after the three-year period is up he should get parole, the prisoner goes before the Parole Board and, in a sense, the Parole Board retries him, in accordance with the provisions of the Act. It is double jeopardy. When the previous Government made provision for a non-parole period it should have made the necessary amendments to the parole legislation to allow a workable solution in South Australia. In Victoria and New South Wales prisoners are released at the completion of their non-parole period unless circumstances are such that the Parole Board can be convinced that they ought to remain in prison. The alternative applies in South Australia.

When a prisoner goes before the Parole Board, expecting to be released, but is then sentenced to, say, a further 18 months or two years imprisonment, he goes back into the prison a very unsettled person indeed. That is one of the problems that I had inherited due to the rather foolish legislation introduced by the previous Government.

I am in the process of reviewing that legislation and I will be making recommendations to Cabinet. I know that the concern I have expressed is shared by people within the Judiciary, the Parole Board, the prison system and the community at large. The only people who do not seem to be concerned about this matter are the perpetrators of that legislation, namely, the members opposite.

That is not the only problem that is concerning prisoners and prison officers. I might point out that it is the prison officers and prison authorities who must pick up the pieces when a prisoner comes back into Yatala. There should be certainty about a prison sentence. When a person goes to prison he ought to be certain that he will be released at a time stated by the court. If that is not to be the case, prisoners ought to know that. I shall be discussing with Cabinet amendments to the legislation.

An honourable member: What is the question?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The question deals with the status of the task force report. I have outlined what the status is, and I point out that most of the recommendations of the task force are in the process of being implemented. The departmental instructions have been considered by the prison officers in conjunction with management. They are management matters dealt with at the prison level. Some of them are already in operation and others will be operational within a week or so. They have nothing to do with yesterday's incidents.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It appears that my question to the Chief Secretary is supplementary to the previous question. When will the Government give its responses to all of the 15 demands made by prison officers following the violence at Yatala Labour Prison on 11 January? It should be borne in mind that the Minister was made aware of these demands in January of this year. The violence in the maximum security B Division on 11 January resulted in three prison officers being taken to hospital. Subsequently, prison officers presented their list of demands to the Department of Correctional Services. They included the provision of modern riot control equipment, more manpower, and the issue of two-way radios to officers in specific sections of the prison. The *Advertiser* of 15 January contained the following report:

> A Government spokesman said last night that a task force of union and departmental representatives would be formed next week to study some of the requests.

On 9 March, the day after another disturbance at Yatala in which 70 prisoners staged a sit-in, the *Advertiser* referred again to the task force, as follows:

> Mr Keneally appointed a special task force to review the officers' demands, and although complete it will not be considered by Mr Keneally until he returns to Adelaide on Friday.

I would like the Chief Secretary to explain that statement as well.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would be quite happy to. The actual task force operations finished on 4 March. It then presented its findings to the Assistant Director of the department (Mr Beltchev), who then prepared his report and submitted it to the Executive Director on Friday last. The Executive Director then signed the report and sent it to me, and I can assure the honourable member that it was stamped into my office yesterday afternoon; it is with me now.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I think that the honourable member raised some important issues. I will read out for the Parliament the list of—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member does not want to know the list of demands by the prison officers.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: We do want to know the demands.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will give the list, I will give my response to it, and the current situation—no problems!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The first demand by the prison officers was for immediate closure of weightlifting facilities during the week, to be available only on weekends. My response to that was that all prisoners are required to work, and weightlifting is not an alternative to work. Where there are workshop close downs, the question of access to weightlifting is a matter the task force should make recommendations on. Weightlifting will continue to be available during the weekends in accordance with current practice. Within the last fortnight new regulations have been agreed upon and the weighlifting facility will be available to prisoners during their lunch-hours, which is appropriate and I am pleased about that. It is not a replacement for work; the prisoners should have access to weighlifting in their free time. That matter has been satisfactorily resolved.

> All prisoners to report for work except those prisoners on call, court visits, hospital, etc. to remain locked up until required.

Mr response was that it was agreed that all prisoners would report for work—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Is this the report that was put on your desk five minutes ago?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is not the report that was put on my desk five minutes ago. This is a minute of a meeting we had and I have already read from the report that was tabled five minutes ago. My reaction was that it was agreed that all prisoners would report to work.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member does not want to know the truth; he wants only to score political points.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It was agreed that all prisoners would report for work except for prisoners on call for court visits and hospital escorts, and so on. Those prisoners

would continue to remain in their cells up to 10 a.m. That matter was resolved at that time. The next demand was as follows:

Prescribed medication to be issued in cells prior to 8 a.m. unlock, afternoon and evening medication to be issued after work in A and C division.

The immediate respose that has now been put into effect is that prescribed medication is to be issued in cells prior to the 8 a.m. unlock. This programme is to be conducted within available staff. The implementation of this matter will be referred to the task force and, if additional staff are required, this matter will be referred to Cabinet.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Are you talking about—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It has been put into effect and there is no need to go to Cabinet for additional staff.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: You have got the wrong list.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am absolutely astounded! This is the right list: I was there and I negotiated with the prison officers for 11 hours. This was in January.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Item 4 in the demands put by the prison officers was for the immediate disbandment of the inmates representatives committee. The Chief Secretary indicated that he remained wedded to the principle that prisoners have a right to some form of representation. He agreed to the suspension of the committee on a temporary basis. He indicated that he was prepared to accept the suspension of the committee until such time as he had an opportunity to consider their role and method of election within the institution. This matter does not refer to the 'C' division committee which will continue to operate. Subsequently arrangements have been made to allow prisoner representation. Continuing the demands:

6. Immediate issue of modern scientific aids for riot control, such aids to be as per issue to law enforcement agencies and other penal institutions (such issue to be made within eight weeks from date of demand). In the interim the issue of batons to all officers.

My response was that the Executive Director would immediately request a loan of sample riot control equipment from New South Wales and Victoria for examination by staff (uniformed staff), and modern equipment would be purchased to replace the antiquated existing equipment. The Executive Director would negotiate with the New South Wales authorities to train an officer in riot control procedures and an officer in hostage negotiation procedures. The Chief Secretary would not accede to the claim that all officers carry batons, but would refer the matter to Cabinet. I am pleased to say that Cabinet supported my statement that officers should not carry batons.

7. Officers to have qualified legal representation when appearing before visiting justices or other tribunals to be supplied by the department.

The Chief Secretary indicated that in principle he believes that prosecuting officers of the department should not be at a disadvantage in matters of prosecution of prisoners. He indicated he would discuss this matter with the Attorney-General. The Chief Secretary indicated he would work towards the principle of a lawyer to be present when a prisoner was represented at any stage in the proceedings. The Executive Director indicated he would take up a prison officer's suggestion that an exchange of staff with the Police Prosecutions Branch be followed up.

8. That the prison magazine be part of C division activities only.

The response was that the magazine *Vision* be moved to the Education Centre and transferred from its present location, and when the new Education Centre is completed the printing of the magazine will be transferred to the new complex. The editing of the magazine is not a paid work position but to be regarded as a component of the education programme.

9. All moneys to inmates from outside be suspended immediately and the only buying power of inmates be renumeration for work done within the prison.

My response was that the Chief Secretary would not agree with this. He indicated that legal advice has been obtained which suggests that the department has no authority to prevent access to private moneys. The department, however, does have a capacity to prescribe the type and the amount of private property which can be kept in a prisoner's cell, which it does.

10. That dogs can be used in riotous situations and recalciterant prisoners in cells or any other area; that handlers in closed hours and maximum security escourts be armed; the officer in charge of dog squad be allowed to authorise overtime when security and public safety is threatened; and all previous recommendations submitted by dog squad be implemented immediately.

At the time that request was put to us we were in the process, with the department, of preparing a manual for the use of the dog squad. The guidelines were to be in the form of a manual for the operation of the dog squad, they were nearing completion, and will be implemented as policy. The points in request 10 will be covered—not necessarily agreed to, but covered.

11. All barrier officers be issued with radio preferably with emergency call button—

The point the honourable member raised. The Chief Secretary indicated that he supported the view that radios should be provided to officers on the barriers. The Minister will obtain the costs and he may need to go to Cabinet to gain approval. Fortunately, the cost did not warrant our going to Cabinet.

12. Create suitable manning structure for B Middle.

The response was to create a suitable manning structure for B Middle. The Chief Secretary indicated that he wished this matter to be referred to the task force. He was unable to give any answer to 12 as it is a complex issue requiring further investigation. It was referred to the task force, and we now have recommendations about that.

13. That the Executive Director cease forthwith any further harassment or action against any officer when he has been dealt with by any other tribunal or court which finds those officers innocent.

I defended the Executive Director to the extent that a response was not required, as this matter was resolved. Two additional matters were raised in the course of 11 hours of discussions I had with the prison officers which the honourable member now knows was addressing the matters to which he was referring.

14. A strict policy regarding S and D divisions be laid down now, similar to those which existed in 1975.

15. D division be reopened as a disciplinary wing and that again strict guidelines be laid down; further, mentally retarded inmates not be admitted to D division as is the policy in existence.

Demands 14 and 15 relate to the operation of S and D Division. The unions agreed to the establishment of a task force where they would nominate a member from the P.S.A. and a member from the F.M.W.U. to look at this matter. I have already pointed out that a departmental instruction to cover prisoner movements has been prepared for issuing. A departmental instruction dealing with protected prisoners has also been prepared for issuing. The prison officers know about this because they have been involved in the discussions and the study. A departmental instruction regarding recreation for prisoners has been prepared for issuing. A departmental instruction on S Division has been prepared for issuing. A departmental instruction on prisoners' and convicted persons' mail has been prepared for issuing. There is

further discussion involving D Division, and the issuing of medication is a matter for preparation of discussion with medical staff. The final paragraph of the letter, dated 18 March and received in my office on 22 March, from the Executive Director to me states:

In summary, the achievements of the task force in terms of quality and quantity have justified the exercise and hopefully established the departmental executives' credibility in being able to undertake the consultative exercise in the development of policy and to do so with a high level of openness and commitment.

For members opposite to say that we have done nothing in relation to the task force recommendations is absolutely absurd, and it is patently absurd for those members to suggest that those negotiations with the prison officer (which they assumed had broken down—but they have not, because they already know that they have not), were responsible for the incident yesterday. The task force report is a valuable one, and certain departmental instructions have flowed from it. This problem was a departmental administrative problem that should have been dealt with at the Yatala prison level, and I am encouraging the prison authorities to so deal with such matters in future. The Minister will become involved only when absolutely necessary. I want to encourage the staff on the site to give the kind of leadership they have given in the past two weeks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Murray.

SWIMMING POOLS

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether his colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is aware that numerous complaints have been made concerning the faulty and incomplete construction of swimming pools in the metropolitan area, and that some of the contractors involved in these complaints are using the name of an association to advertise and to give a guarantee of good faith? Will the Minister indicate whether an investigation is planned into the Swimming Pools Association and its members? I understand that there are 27 consumers involved in the complaints. I specifically refer to evidence I have received showing that one of my constituents who signed a contract for the completion of a swimming pool on 8 August 1982 is still awaiting completion of that pool. This constituent was recommended by her doctor to have a swimming pool and spa built because of her medical condition. However, my constituent is still waiting for the contractor (Zeniou Pools) to complete the building of the pool. It has also been brought to my attention that the contractor has not been licensed since the end of last year but, in spite of that, the company in January signed four new contracts to build pools. This probably indicates the problem we are facing in this regard.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is tending to debate the matter.

Ms LENEHAN: The second problem concerns a Mr Bob Gaston who, in January last, had an article in the *Advertiser* stating that he, too, had not had his pool completed. The name of his contractor was Silver Lake Swimming Pools. Having spoken to Mr Gaston this week, I understand that his swimming pool is still incomplete. Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask his colleague to institute an inquiry not only into the Swimming Pools Association but also into the individual members of that association?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I will refer it to my colleague and bring down a report. Before doing so, however, I would remind the honourable member that there is at present before the House a measure to amend the Builders Licensing Act which addresses some of the problems associated with the building of swimming pools.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Chief Secretary say what disciplinary action was taken against prisoners at Yatala following disturbances in January and the sit-in early in March this year?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will get a report for the honourable member.

HOUSING POLICY

Mr GROOM: In view of the depressed state of the building industry in South Australia after three years of Liberal Government economic mismanagement, will the Minister of Housing say what steps his Government is taking to stimulate the building industry, to help people purchase their own homes, and to provide with homes the 24 000 people on the Housing Trust waiting list?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Hartley for his interest in housing matters, and I am pleased to tell the House of the efforts the Labor Government has taken in housing. May I start by pointing out the difficulties we inherited, not just within this State but throughout Australia. Let me give the House a list of figures on public housing finances, clearly showing the downgrading of public housing by the Federal Liberal Government over the past seven years.

In 1974-75 the Commonwealth Government advanced some $975 000 000 to the States (that is, 1982-83 figures adjusted for inflation). From then on it steadily decreased from $935 000 000 in the first Fraser Liberal year down $100 000 000 to $835 000 000, so that in 1981-82 the rock bottom figure of $237 000 000 was allocated. This financial year the figure was increased above normal by the wage pause money of $100 000 000. In South Australia this has meant that in 1974-75 this Government was in receipt of $95 400 000 (in 1982-83 terms) from the Commonwealth Government, but this financial year it is only $11 000 000 net, a staggering 88¼ per cent decline in funds.

Within this State the decline in the building industry has occurred because of these Liberal policies—policies which only now, with the advent of a Hawke Federal Government and a Bannon State Government, we can turn around. The figures showing the number of commencements in South Australia speak for themselves: in 1974-75 the total number of commencements of new dwellings in South Australia was 11 953. This dropped off to 7 790 in 1981-82; that is, a fall of 4 163 dwellings, or a 35 per cent decline in the industry. So, when family formation rates are increasing, when Housing Trust waiting lists are increasing and when people need housing, the policies were to force a decline in the building industry and dash the hopes of thousands of families.

The member for Hartley asked what the State Labor Government is doing to correct the situation. We have increased assistance to home buyers. First, the State Government has raised the level of exemption from stamp duty for first-home buyers from $30 000 to $40 000. This provides a saving of up to $300 per home. We have changed the mortgage relief scheme. The maximum assistance available under the scheme has been increased from $20 to $30 a week. (The assistance takes the form of an unsecured loan paid to the lender, and is available to households facing

genuine hardship in meeting their mortgage repayments and in receipt of a pension, social security benefit, or a salary/wage less than $300 a week.)

We have changed the State Bank's lending policies: the limit for individual loans has been raised from $33 000 to $35 000; and the purchase price limit for eligible houses has been increased from $45 000 to $50 000. We have changed the State Bank/Housing Trust low-deposit rental-purchase scheme: the income limit for eligibility has been raised from 70 per cent to 80 per cent of average weekly earnings; maximum funding available under the scheme has been increased from $33 500 to $38 000; and the purchase price limit for eligible houses is now $40 000, compared to $33 500 formerly.

We have established a Home Purchase Assistance Review Committee. The State Government has established this committee to undertake a comprehensive review of the schemes available to assist home buyers in South Australia. Submissions to the committee have been called from the public. We are reviewing the Housing Trust's construction programme to determine whether further funds can be channelled into the construction industry.

I hope to be able soon to announce to the House the Housing Trust's construction programme for next year. We are currently discussing with the Federal Government funding for public housing, and I envisage a significant increase in the Housing Trust programme as a result of the Hawke Federal Government's election. These efforts show the concern and effort of this Government to stimulate the building industry. All Housing Trust building is done by private builders. I am concerned that 24 000 people are on the Housing Trust waiting list. I can assure the House and the Government that it is the aim of the Government and myself as Minister to reduce that number significantly.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Chief Secretary say whether it is a fact that two units of the Police Star Force were called in to assist in yesterday's riot at Yatala prison and were not used for that purpose? I am informed that two units of the Star Force were called in to give assistance at Yatala and, although with their specialist training and efficiency in dealing with serious emergencies such as riots and terrorist activities (and they would have been of great benefit in these particular circumstances at Yatala prison, bringing the situation under control), they would have allowed other emergency services such as ambulances, fire units and the like to operate properly when, in actual fact, they were not used.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There were units of the Star Force and other elements of the police at Yatala Labour Prison yesterday. The members of the Star Force were inside the Yatala Labour Prison. They were available to be used if it was necessary to do so. Their presence was very useful to the authorities there in their efforts to overcome the difficulties that were faced. It is true, as the honourable member has said, that they were not used. It is also true, as the honourable member has said, that they are experienced in hostage and riot control. The matter was resolved without the necessity for the police to be involved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The police would have been used if the need was there and, the fact that they were not used was a decision of the police. They were there, and it was a decision of the police as well as the prison authorities. It was a joint decision.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TOURISM FAIRS

Mr HAMILTON: My question is directed to the Minister of Tourism. At the end of last month I accompanied the Minister of Tourism to London, where he attended the Corroboree Tourism Fair. The Minister also continued on to attend the I.T.B. Fair in London. I would like to ask the Minister of Tourism what his impressions of these two important tourism fairs were and what impact they might have on South Australian tourism.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Through the good graces of British Airways, I was able to travel to London and then to Berlin to attend two very important travel fairs that have significant benefit for Australia and South Australia. As the honourable member said, it was the Corroboree Fair, which is a travel fair for wholesalers and some retailers in the United Kingdom and Ireland. It is my impression from talking to these people that there is a significant potential for United Kingdom tourism in South Australia, particularly with the International Airport and the ability to fly direct. It is mainly 'visiting friends and relatives' type of tourism, but I was able to ascertain that South Australia should increase its efforts to be involved in the total Australian tourist package, so that we encourage tourists from overseas to spend four or five days in Adelaide on their original visit, because then they would want to come back to South Australia on their second visit.

I was very impressed with the I.T.B. and I feel that it is a pity that other Ministers have not taken the opportunity to visit the I.T.B. because it indicates the enormous competition for the tourist dollar throughout the world. Practically all countries of the world were represented in Berlin. The stands were magnificent. I am pleased to say that the Australian stand, which comprised 64 individual stands, wholesalers and Government agencies, was very successful: it was one of the best. I am also pleased to advise the House that Mr Graham Inns, who is the Director of Tourism in South Australia, was granted a very special tourism award, namely, the Golden Helm Award for Tourism, which is given to only 40 people yearly throughout the world.

I was very pleased to have the opportunity to be the only Australian to speak at the ceremony where the presentation was held. I was able to express my view that Australians wish to participate in the world tourist market, that we have the product, and that we invite people to come here and see what we have in the confidence that they will want to come back. We must be involved in the world market of tourism. It is the intention of this Government to ensure that this is done and in that regard the Government has refunded all, if not more, of the promotions budget that was allowed to deteriorate under the previous Minister.

TOURIST PROMOTION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I address my question to the Chief Secretary in his occasional capacity as Minister of Tourism. In view of the support that the Minister is giving to the promotion by the Chairman of the Victorian Tourist Commission, Mr Don Dunstan, of Victoria as a tourist destination, will the Minister explain to the House why the joint Government private enterprise promotion of South Australia's tourist attractions, which was budgeted for by the former Government and planned to take place this month in Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane, has not been proceeded with?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is a pleasure to receive a question from the shadow Minister of Tourism. I think it is probably the first question that I have received from her. It is nice to see her renewed interest in the portfolio for which she formerly had responsibility.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In response to the previous question I indicated that I had inherited a position where the Minister had granted $50 000 to the Convention Bureau in South Australia, but had not actually paid the money. It had been promised but it had not been funded by her Treasurer. Also, the Government inherited a promotion budget that was $300 000 less than that budgeted for, so that we were unable—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Answer the question!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The previous Minister is embarrassed. The budgetary position was such that we would have been unable to continue the promotion in Victoria, which is our major market, let alone consider New South Wales and continue our work in South Australia, or consider proposals for Western Australia. I am pleased to say that the Treasurer has provided that $300 000 which is now enabling the Government to continue the promotions, which I freely admit the honourable member started.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In regard to the directive of the Victorian Commissioner who visited South Australia yesterday, I was programmed to meet him and walk through the Mall with him. When that was not to be, I cancelled my engagement with Mr Dunstan and attended Parliament yesterday when Mr Dunstan was having his press conference. I was not with him and did not attend with him.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I want to share a tourist market with Victoria. As the honourable member ought to be aware, the Government is very aware of the fact that we need to co-operate with our friends interstate in promoting tourism in South Australia. One of the important ventures being promoted by the Director of Tourism in Victoria is a stopover programme which includes Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. There are significant benefits in this for South Australia. The Victorian and New South Wales markets are bigger than the South Australian market, and the more people that we can encourage to use that system, the more South Australia will benefit. There has been no cutting back of any programme.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles will come to order.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government has had a good look at the desperate budgetary position that we inherited from the previous Government. The Budgetary Review Committee of the previous Government would not give the previous Minister the money for promotions that she had asked for. This is true, as the Minister well knows.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Coles.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That is why the Treasurer had to find the amount of $300 000, which was very difficult to find, to carry on the promotion. However, the present Government believes that tourism is very important and that tourist promotion of the South Australian product is important. We are demonstrating this by providing the funds. The previous Government was all rhetoric but no money, and nothing can be done with rhetoric and no money, which is all that we got from the previous Minister. The industry was aware of that when I became the Minister. Industry representations were made to me pointing that out and we have been able to address that problem, and the promotion of the South Australian product will go ahead in leaps and bounds, I am certain, to the benefit of South Australians.

MURRAY RIVER MOUTH

Mr WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Water Resources say whether the Murray River mouth could close again this year and what is the current situation in relation to it?

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The question is about the Murray mouth and not the Mallee mouth, as the honourable member has been referred to on many occasions. In answer to the honourable member for Price, there is a possibility that the sand, due to low tide, will close the channel between the Murray mouth and the sea, as happened in 1981. After it was closed at that time, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, using earthmovers, cleared the mouth and flushed it with fresh water flows down the river. I am informed that surveys show that the mouth channel, which is maintained only by tidal fluctuations, is some 60 metres wide and three metres deep in places.

I point out that it is impossible to forecast accurately whether the mouth will close, because of the unpredictable nature of the sea and wind conditions. I also advise that the situation has been closely monitored by a committee comprising representatives of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Environment and Planning, Fisheries, and the Adelaide University. This committee is also studying the cause and effects of the river mouth closure and will recommend soon either a short-term or a long-term solution when the study is completed.

OVERSEAS TRIP

Mr BECKER: Is the Premier going overseas next week and, if so, why? Can he also give the House the details of his itinerary?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: At this stage, I do not know whether I will be going overseas next week and, therefore, the answer is no, I cannot give details of my itinerary.

TOBACCO ADVERTISING ON S.T.A. BUSES

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Transport inform the House if his department has made a policy decision on advertising by tobacco companies on State Transport Authority vehicles? The Health Promotion Services of the South Australian Health Commission in its publication, 'Life wasn't meant to be wheezy', stated that tobacco is a major cause of lung cancer. Ninety per cent of lung cancers are caused because of smoking. Lung cancers kill more people than any other type of cancer. The use of tobacco can produce other health problems including diseases of leg arteries, cancer of the bladder, gum infections, tooth decay, retarded foetal growth and many more. For all of these reasons, it would be desirable gradually to eliminate tobacco advertising from S.T.A. vehicles.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: In replying to the honourable member's question, I would point out that I can only speak on behalf of the State Transport Authority. The honourable member should direct his concerns about the general issue of tobacco and cigarette advertising to the Minister of Health. The Bus Pack Advertising Group Pty Ltd was awarded the five-year rights for all advertising on S.T.A. vehicles in

October 1981, to commence from 1 January 1982. However, there was a great deal of confusion that had arisen over certain clauses within that contract and an opinion was sought from the Crown Solicitor and that opinion was considered by Cabinet. The Government decided that specific approval should be given to adopt guidelines with respect to sponsorship and to corporate advertising by tobacco companies on S.T.A. vehicles which are the subject of the current Bus Pack contract. These guidelines are:

(1) that an advertisement will be acceptable providing there is not any reference to tobacco products either pictorially or written with the advertisement, and

(2) any advertisement which is comprised principally of a brand name used exclusively or predominantly in relation to tobacco or tobacco products will be unacceptable. With respect to future advertising contracts the State Transport Authority has been advised that no tobacco advertising, corporate or otherwise, will be acceptable.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Is the Chief Secreatry aware that one of the prison officers involved in the Yatala riots yesterday has confirmed that he and his colleague gave prior warning of the riot? This afternoon's *News* quotes statements made by colleagues visiting the injured prison officer Geen, and one of the officers said, 'The prisoners told us that they were going to burn the gaol last Wednesday.' They were talking of the Chief Secretary, who had visited them, and said that he had promised them the earth and given them nothing. He said:

All he did after the previous trouble was form a comittee—We told the chief—

I assume he meant the Chief Secretary—

'It was the same ringleaders who sparked the riot two weeks ago, so we asked for them to be separated from the others, but we were ignored.'

Will the chief, or the Chief Secretary, tell us why they were ignored?

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Chief Secretary, let me say that I will allow the question, although it seems to be bordering very closely on repetition. Because I am not completely clear in my own mind whether there may be some doubt that it is referring to some second incident after the earlier alleged information, I will allow it in the circumstances. The honourable Chief Secretary.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Quite obviously the 'chief' referred to was not the Chief Secretary, because that information was not relayed to me by the prison officers. All these matters will be addressed by the police investigation team. It is a major crime. It is being treated as such, and an investigation is taking place. The matters raised by the honourable member obviously will be within the terms of reference the police will be addressing.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Education say what is happening regarding the transporting of students in Education Department buses to and from the Heights school? In 1976 the then school zones were altered to largely increase the catchment area of the Heights school. This was done to alleviate the overcrowding of neighbouring schools, in particular, Banksia Park High School. Because the zones took in a large area around Banksia Park High School, the Education Department agreed that it had the responsibility for providing transport for the students in the enlarged sector of the zone, in particular, the students coming from Fairview Park, Surrey Downs, and parts of Redwood Park and Ridgehaven. Since then there has been sporadic attempts by the transport section of the Education Department to withdraw, or at least gradually withdraw, this mode of transport. The last such attempt apparently took place about a week ago and I ask the Minister whether he can clarify the situation.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This matter dates back to November 1977, when the former Minister of Education, my colleague the present Minister for Environment and Planning, had consultations with those involved at the Heights and Banksia Park high schools with regard to the transport needs of students in the Fairview Park, Surrey Downs and Redwood Park areas. Two difficulties were associated with the transport problem at that time: first, the matter of overcrowding at the Banksia Park High School at that time; secondly, the lack of an access road which would have given students easy access to Modbury Heights, easier than would have been the case without those access roads. It was the intention that once those two problems had been resolved the offer of bus transport for those students could be reconsidered and the member is quite correct in saying that the matter has been under constant review by the Education Department in the interim.

One other factor which would have been significant was the possible construction of a high school in the Surrey Downs area. That has also been a matter of constant review in the intervening period. Banksia Park High School is now able to take the increased demand of students for that school and also the access road problems seem to have been removed, to some extent at least. It is therefore appropriate that a further investigation should be made into the matter. We are very conscious of the fact that students and parents have expectations about schools to which they may go. There are older brothers and sisters who are presently going by bus transport to the Heights, and there could be difficulties to the families concerned if peremptory decisions were made. Before any moves are made in this direction, I intend to see that adequate consultation will be held between the parents and students affected, which the Heights school, Banksia Park High School, and also with the local member, who is genuinely concerned about this matter, and his concern is appreciated.

I anticipate that the consultations would involve discussions with the parents, so that we can talk our way around this problem and come to a solution that will meet the requirements of all. Quite clearly, undertakings were given in 1977. There were certain parameters within which the offer of a bus was made, and some of those parameters have change. We must look at how they have changed and at how that affects the offer of buses for 1984.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

Mr BLACKER: My question to the Chief Secretary is supplementary to a question asked earlier this afternoon and the answer he gave. Does he intend to introduce amending legislation to provide for automatic release of prisoners on the expiration of the non-parole period of court-imposed sentences, and is it expected that this will require a change of attitude by the courts?

Many people believe, on philosophical grounds, that a court-imposed sentence should be served, and the automatic release of prisoners upon the expiration of the non-parole period would be lessening that sentence. It also raises another philosophical question of minimum penalties, a matter that has been debated hotly in this House many times. I would

be grateful if the Minister could state his intentions about this matter.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The opinions being expressed by the member for Flinders are being canvassed in the inquiry I have under way and those attitudes are being addressed. I do not think that I am in a position to make any statement about how legislative changes will present themselves. It is a matter I will have to take to Cabinet and discuss with all the people involved. The points the honourable member has raised are well known to me and other people involved in this area and they will be addressed when the legislation is presented to Cabinet for its approval.

MELINA MERCOURI

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Will the Premier make representations to the Greek Ambassador and to the Greek Government to ensure that Melina Mercouri, the Greek film star and Government Minister who is soon to visit Australia, will include South Australia, and more particularly Adelaide, in her visit to this country? Recent press reports concerning the visit of Miss Mercouri to Australia indicate that she will be visiting only Sydney, Melbourne and Canberra. I have had representations from members of the Greek community in South Australia who are tremendously enthusiastic to have her visit South Australia, and particularly Adelaide. They have asked me to raise this matter in the hope that the South Australian Government might be able to intervene to have her extend her Australian tour or, alternatively, to reorganise her visiting arrangements while she is here so that Adelaide can be included in her itinerary. The Greek population of South Australia, I am informed, is the third largest Greek community in Australia and one of the largest Greek populations outside Greece. Miss Mercouri is know as a national heroine in Greece, and many people in the South Australian Greek community are extremely anxious for her to visit South Australia. I am sure that a visit from her would be welcomed by all South Australians.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I noticed the press reports about Miss Mercouri's visit. It is especially apposite that her portfolio is that of Culture in the Greek Government, and I would have felt that Adelaide, as the cultural capital of Australia, would have been high on her visiting list. However, as too often happens, it appears that the itinerary, certainly as reported, does not include South Australia. I have taken up the matter initially on an informal basis and will be pleased to take it up formally. As the honourable member has pointed out, we have a large and active Greek population here, and it would provide them with a great boost to have someone as internationally well known as a film star to visit us. Further, Miss Mercouri has a role to play in the Greek Government, especially in an area in which this State has interests and leadership in this country. Cultural exchanges also are something that we are concerned about.

PRISON DISTURBANCE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Chief Secretary give the House full details of the assault on the prisoners at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, to which he referred in his Ministerial statement earlier today?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Because so many reports are still coming to me from the department regarding a whole host of instances at Yatala, I think it would be appropriate for me to get a report for the honourable member.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

NATIONAL RECONCILIATION

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I move:

That this House, noting the economic mismanagement and failure of the policies of the Fraser Liberal and National Country Party Government, seeks the support of all South Australians, irrespective of political considerations, to support the programme of national reconciliation, economic recovery and reconstruction as called for by the new Federal Government.

My motion is in an amended form to the motion of which notice was previously given, because Australians on 5 March decisively rejected the policies of division and confrontation of the previous Liberal Government, and a new era of national consensus was called for. In dealing with the motion it will be necessary for me to analyse the failure of the policies espoused by the previous Federal Liberal and National Party Government, since it was those failures that created the conditions necessary for the call and the need for a programme of national reconciliation, reconstruction and recovery.

It will be necessary for me to descend into the purely political arena and analyse the policies of the previous Federal Government over the past seven years. Members will see that the important part of the motion deals with the call for national reconciliation, reconstruction and recovery, as called for by the Hawke Government in Canberra and as endorsed by the Australian people on 5 March.

I believe that this motion will have the support of all members. Indeed, I am sure it will have the support of the member for Mitcham, because last evening in the adjournment debate he said that he was a reasonable man, that other members were reasonable, and that what we wanted was consensus and co-operation. As that is just what this motion calls for, I expect to have the honourable member's support.

In 1975 Mr Fraser came to office in a way that divided the country. After his election as Prime Minister, he had a period in which to bring about national reconciliation but, unfortunately, he did not bring it about because of his policies. Prior to the 1975 elections, he was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that the Liberal and National Parties had spent their time in Opposition preparing one of the most far-reaching, exciting and progressive programmes ever attempted. However, as time unfolded no-one could describe the policies of his Government as exciting. One could hardly describe them as progressive either, although they were certainly far-reaching.

When Mr Fraser came to office, a Budget deficit of $3 500 000 000 had been projected for the financial year 1975-76 in the Budget introduced by the Labor Administration in August 1975. During the 1975 election campaign, as reported in the *News* of 17 November 1975, Mr Fraser hit at what he called big-spending wreckers in the Whitlam Labor Government and said that those wreckers were ruining the Australian economy. He described the deficit of $3 500 000 000 as bad housekeeping and economic foolishness, a remark that was to be thrown back at him in later years. Obviously, the economic foolishness of this type of Budget analysis will be readily apparent to all members. The nature of Prime Minister Fraser's remarks indicated a confrontationist attitude, and after seven years what did we find? Although the Budget deficit for 1982-83 was projected, in August 1982, at $1 600 000 000, at the commencement

of the 1983 election campaign, as a consequence of Mr Fraser's inability to control the economy (an inability that had been building up for many years because of his Government's ineffective policies), the Federal Treasurer expected the deficit for 1982-83 to be $4 300 000 000. Further, the deficit for the coming financial year, as reported in the *Advertiser* of 8 March 1983, could reach $7 000 000 000. This figure was released by the new Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) after he had consulted with Treasury officials. The position could be even worse than that, and the deficit for 1983-84 could go as high as $9 000 000 000.

Turning back to 1975, we remember Mr Fraser describing a $3 500 000 000 deficit as the work of big-spending wreckers. He said that such a deficit was bad housekeeping and that a Treasurer responsible for such a deficit was guilty of economic foolishness. Yet seven years later we find that, as a result of the failure of his confrontationist policies, the deficit for this financial year has ballooned to $7 000 000 000 and even higher, to $9 000 000 000, next financial year.

This is a tragic economic record, clearly seen by the people of Australia on 5 March when they overwhelmingly rejected a continuation of Mr Fraser's policies. It is in the area of unemployment that the failures of the policies of the Fraser Government are most appalling. Despite what it promised in the December 1975 election campaign, the previous Government embarked on a continuing policy of putting Australians out of work. During the last seven years the Liberals did nothing to arrest that trend—nothing of any significance whatsoever. They humiliated people who were required to go on unemployment benefits and did nothing to protect their jobs. All they were prepared to promise at the 5 March election was a continuation of that type of trend.

In the *News* of 6 December 1975 Mr Fraser said that he would cut the number of jobless by 200 000 people. At that time unemployment was running at about 300 000 people. After seven years in Government, let us examine his record. Unemployment in February this year was recorded at 746 000 people, or 10.7 per cent of the work force. Even in 12 months that was a rise of some 54 per cent. In January 1983 it was 691 000. Between January and February this year unemployment rose by about 54 600 people. In addition, the Department of Social Security figures show that there are at least an additional 382 600 spouses and children of unemployed persons also dependent on unemployment benefits but not counted in the figures. Furthermore, it is estimated that the number of hidden unemployed is something like 500 000 people.

On bare statistics alone, the number of unemployed recorded in February this year was 746 000 people. That is more than a doubling of the number of unemployed persons as at December 1975. The average unemployment period for males between 45 and 54 is now around 15 months more than the 1975 level—a fivefold increase. Those figures represent the failure of the previous policies of the Liberal Party Government. Mr Lynch, the then Treasurer, gave, in the *News* of August 1977, an indication of the type of sympathy that the national Federal Government had for unemployed persons and the youth of Australia, wherein he stated:

> The level of real wages paid to young people should be lowered to reduce youth unemployment. That is controversial and there are people here who will disagree but that is the conviction I do hold.

What type of appalling policy utterance is that for the youth of Australia—that the wages paid to young people should be reduced? Mr Lynch was an influential man in the Government and advocated lowering youth wages to reduce unemployment. There was no talk of job creation schemes, national reconstruction or recovery but simply that the young people of Australia can bear the burden of the failure of the Liberal Party's policies and have their living standards substantially reduced. It certainly was a controversial utterance. He was an influential member of the Fraser Government; he was not reprimanded, and nothing was said about it. One can only surmise (and as the record shows) that this type of policy utterance was accepted by the National Liberal Country Party Government. No wonder the youth of Australia rejected the policies of the Fraser Liberal Government on 5 March this year.

In two areas—Budget deficit and unemployment—specific promises made in December 1975, when looked at some seven years later, show the appalling record of the Fraser Liberal Country Party Government. It said it would help unemployed people but it increased unemployment. That is help in the wrong direction, because it doubled the number of young unemployed in Australia. That Government trebled the Budget deficit of the previous Whitlam Government in 1975. On youth unemployment it was saying that they should take home much less in their pay. What an appalling indictment.

In the *News* of 6 December 1975, Mr Fraser said that he would reduce inflation by 11 per cent down to 4 per cent. So, presumably, he was conceding that at that time, despite advertisements alleging it was 19 per cent through a manipulation of figures, inflation under the Whitlam Government was 15 per cent. It was much lower, in fact, around 12 or 13 per cent. On Mr Fraser's own statement he was alleging that it was 15 per cent when in fact the figure was lower. What do we get seven years later? Mr Fraser said that he would need three years to be able to achieve his election strategy but that the change in direction would be immediately apparent. Even 12 months later, by December 1976, the inflation rate had reached 14 per cent. From memory, except for one fleeting moment, over the last seven years inflation did not drop below double figures. Inflation today is running higher than Mr Howard was prepared to admit.

During the election campaign Mr Howard suggested that inflation was at 11 per cent. I believe he made a press statement to that effect. I understand that the inflation figure is probably slightly higher than that. We do not have updated figures but, as a result of the ballooning of the projected Budget deficit for 1982-83, it is probably higher than Mr Howard admitted. After seven years one would think that a Government could do better than reducing inflation by a mere 1 or 2 per cent. It is an appalling record. When one looks at inflation rates in other countries of the world, one can see the failure of the policies implemented in Australia. In employment we had a dismal failure and confrontationist-type policies. In Budget deficits we have a complete turn-about and, with inflation, no success. One could not call that success. We must look at the policies underlying the decisions that promote these sorts of conditions. After seven years, a reduction of 1 or 2 per cent, at the best, is absolutely appalling. What a dismal record!

What did Mr Fraser promise during the election campaign? He really promised nothing more than a continuation of the policies of the previous seven years and the type of confrontation approach adopted by Liberal Parties in Australia throughout those seven years. That appalling record was rejected by the people of Australia. One only has to look at the sort of approaches and the type of utterances that were coming from the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, and his senior Ministers. In the *Advertiser* of 24 February 1983, he stated that a Labor Government would rob the people of their savings. He was telling people to take money out of the bank and put it under the bed. As members may recall, Senator Chipp stated in a later edition of the daily newspaper, 'Mr Fraser is now ranting and raving off the hip.' Indeed, he was. That was an irresponsible utterance from the Prime Minister. He said, 'Take your money out

of the bank and put it under the bed.' It is a totally irresponsible utterance from a man supposedly leading the nation.

Mr Hamilton: That's where the Communists were.

Mr GROOM: As the member for Albert Park has pointed out (and Mr Hawke adverted to the fact), it would be irresponsible to put it under the bed, as that would be where the Communists were hiding, and we know what they would do with it. However, that was the advice from the Prime Minister to the people of Australia. What a destabilisation of our financial institutions, and no wonder he was reprimanded over this matter. One would think that, after the banking associations got on to the matter and spoke to the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister would wake up to himself and realise that something was terribly wrong in what he said. But, no, the *Advertiser* of 24 February reports that he would continue his claims, despite the fact that Mr Hawke stated that these claims were absolutely preposterous.

We all know that the unrepentant Prime Minister was rapped over the knuckles by the banking and financial institutions in this country and could not come to grips with or reverse the sort of things he said. He was not able to stand up and say, 'Look, I just cracked under the strain of an election campaign. You will have to forgive me, that is not what I intended.' No, he said that he would continue his claims and that the people's savings in banks were not safe, and he was backed up by some of his senior Ministers as time went on to bail him out of a very difficult situation.

However, the fact that he and Mr Peacock (because Mr Peacock came into the picture) both commenced to undermine the stability of Australia's financial institutions is absolutely appalling. They were people who were parading themselves as national leaders. What sort of approach is that for Australia's future development? The *Advertiser* of 23 February 1983, dealing with a slightly different topic, published a report by the Liberals, as follows:

> It is not to be at all surprising if Labor's economic policies already had caused a flight of capital out of the country.

Here are the first announcements by Liberals that money was leaving the country. The figures started to fluctuate when Mr Howard, Mr Peacock and Mr Fraser got into the act. It was $500 000 000 one week, and $1 500 000 000 the next. Whatever the actual figure was, Mr Howard put it at $1 500 000 000 on 2 March 1983. However, one witnessed the total irresponsibility of these types of utterances by Mr Peacock, Mr Howard and Mr Fraser, all parading themselves as national leaders, telling people that there was a flood of money out of the country, and pulling out of the air figures such as $500 000 000 and $1 500 000 000, and up it goes.

From leading journalists such as Maxwell Newton, who went over the hill during the election campaign, there were reports such as one in the *News* of 28 February 1983, as follows:

> One of Australia's leading brokerage houses has circularised thousands of its clients with a simple message: 'Get your money out of Australia while the going is good.'

What absolute irresponsibility, and he was writing from New York!

Mr Becker: Don't you think that he knew something about the devaluation?

Mr GROOM: I am pleased that the honourable member has drawn my attention to that, because I will elaborate, although it may take me some time. The member for Hanson knows that I have a lot of respect for him on financial matters. In fact, I think that he is the best financial spokesmen in the Opposition ranks, and he understands that if one starts calls for money to go out of the country it will lead to devaluation. Of course it will, and that is what Max Newton was saying—'Get your money out of the country while the going is good—and make a cop,' because if $2 000 000 000 is taken out of the country it either means having to borrow, which will force up interest rates (because one contracts the local market), or having to devalue.

However, here we had the national leaders of this country at that time, Mr Fraser, Mr Peacock and Mr Howard, telling people that there was a flood of money going out of the country. One does not have to be a genius to wake up to the fact that that destabilises Australia's financial position, and it is totally irresponsible. How would they get out of it, and if they were re-elected what on earth would they do? Having created the very conditions for that flight of capital, they somehow or other have to attribute the blame to someone. However, for journalists such as Maxwell Newton to give this prominence and to suggest to brokers, 'Get your money out of Australia while the going is good' is totally irresponsible. We all know what happened: the new national Government was forced to devalue.

One week previously, Mr Peacock was saying that there would be a devaluation of 15 per cent in our currency. What encouragement that was giving to speculators and to people who were going to make a huge profit on a potential devaluation! Mr Peacock understands financial matters: he must have known the consequences of his utterances. They were in difficulties at that time: the polls showed that they were heading for a massive defeat. Armed with that knowledge, he was telling speculators and friends of the conservative rump of the Liberal Party, 'Get your money out of the country while the going is good. There will be a devaluation. You can bring it back later and make a huge profit.' That is total irresponsibility.

Someone has to bear the brunt of that in Australia, and it is ordinary Australians who have to bear the brunt of that type of irresponsibility, because it has to be paid for in some way. The big speculators obviously made large gains as they increased their profits by bringing money back into the country. This happened for no good reason at all, and it is an indication that there needs to be proper exchange controls on the way in which people can ship their money out of Australia.

What Mr Fraser was promising was simply more of the same. His promises were the same sort of confrontationist approach. Trade unions, as you well know, Mr Deputy Speaker, represent many hundreds of thousands of ordinary decent Australians. What was Mr Fraser saying about unions during the campaign? He tried to run an anti-union campaign for no other purpose than a blatant political purpose, hoping that in some way he might capitalise on what he believed was the poor standing of unions within the community.

That might have been Mr Fraser's belief but it certainly was not the belief of the vast majority of Australians. Unabated, the Prime Minister and his cohorts throughout the election campaign referred to 'power-hungry union bosses' and a 'confrontationist, divided approach'. He made such references in the *Advertiser* of 16 February, hoping that the media would pick this up and that the anti-union campaign would be off and running, pitting Australians against Australians for no other purpose than a blatant political purpose. He announced tough new laws aimed at unions and what he called rampant union power. What colourful, descriptive adjectives!

He got back to the secret ballots. I do not know in how many election campaigns he has suggested secret ballots for proposed strikes. Many people who have had industrial experience find that, when there are secret ballots for proposed strikes, in actual fact the reverse takes place. Where there is a secret ballot on strike action, the number of people who vote for the strike is often much larger than when it is just an open show of hands. That has been reflected in secret ballots that have been conducted.

However, here we are—secret ballots for proposed strikes, secret ballots for unions, rampant union power, tough new laws aimed at unions, divide the country, smash the institutions of working people in this country, blatant divisive policies!

I read only this morning that in some South American country some five people have been sentenced to death for trying to organise a union. It is quite amazing. Unions do protect ordinary working people, and they are entitled to respect within the community. However, unfortunately, since the Menzies years, they have been good political bait at election time. Finally, the Liberals have overdone it, and they have over-saturated people in the community to such an extent that they just did not believe what the Liberal Party and National Country Party were saying about trade unions. That was indicated by the vote for the Hawke Labor Government.

Mr Hawke himself is a unionist. People had confidence in his consensus and conciliatory approach to problems, not to divide the Australian community or to pit Australian against Australian. Yet, here we had the Prime Minister and his cohorts still at this pathetic type of campaigning, the confrontationist type of campaigning. We had promises from the previous Prime Minister for more of the same of the last seven years: more unemployment and inflation, and higher deficits. Not that I think there is anything wrong with deficit budgeting at responsible levels.

In regard to home mortgages, what would have been the situation in regard to interest rates? We all know that, despite trying to sidestep the problem, the Prime Minister would have implemented the Campbell Committee's recommendation for the abolition of interest rate controls on bank mortgages, small overdrafts and rural loans. We all know that that was a pre-condition for the foreign banks entering Australia. We all know that the real reason why the Campbell Committee was set up was to deregularise the banking industries to bring in the foreign banks which do not want controls, just like the supermarkets, so that they would be able to put prices up and down as they please. That was what the Prime Minister was up to. He was going to implement the recommendations of the Campbell Committee. Interest rate controls would have been abolished on bank mortgages, small overdrafts and rural loans.

What would that have done to the rural communities and to small business people dependent on small overdrafts? The member for Hanson would know that the interest burden on small businesses with bank overdrafts is quite considerable, even at current levels. What the former Government would have done was to implement the recommendations of the Campbell Committee and the forlorn hope that at some time in the future the market forces would reach their own level and that they would come down. This action would have resulted in higher interest rates on home loans, and we all know that the mortgage interest rate commitment on the average home since 1978-79 has increased by some $88 a month at a time when real wages have been depressed because of the abolition of indexation.

Mr Gunn: Tell us what you are going to do about it.

Mr GROOM: If the honourable member is patient he will find out. I am pleased that the honourable member has taken an interest in what the Labor Party intends to do about the matter. I hope that he will join with members on this side of the House who support the consensus approach and that he will get behind South Australia and lead South Australians towards a consensus approach.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: As the member for Mitcham said last night, 'People opposite are reasonable people and support consensus politics.' He is reported in *Hansard* as having said that. I replied to him as follows: 'You will be supporting my motion tomorrow.' The member for Mitcham said last night 'We want consensus and co-operation.' Therefore, I expect to have the member for Mitcham's support for this motion, and in due course we shall see what he does. I believe that the member for Eyre will likewise indicate his support for a consensus and conciliation type of approach to Australian politics, because such an approach is needed and has been called for the Australian people.

Unfortunately, that was not the type of approach adopted by the former Prime Minister in regard to the steel industry in South Australia, an industry in which the member for Eyre is vitally interested. Over the past 12 months calls for assistance and predictions that the Whyalla steel mills might close by 1986 if assistance were not given went unheeded and it took the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Hawke, to pledge support for the B.H.P. steel industry at Whyalla. As you, Mr Deputy Speaker, would know, that industry employs about 45 per cent of the work force, and about 87 per cent of Whyalla township is dependent on the presence of B.H.P. at Whyalla. That industry is vital for Whyalla's survival. For the past 12 months in particular the calls at a national level for assistance for the steel industry have been greater but have reached deaf ears. It took Mr Hawke to pledge to recognise that South Australia, and in particular Whyalla, needed B.H.P. Following Mr Fraser's announcement that there would not be any assistance for B.H.P. and the steel industry, he was forced on 18 February to say that he would rethink the matter. There was no pledge given and we all know what would have happened with his promises after the election. That promise to rethink the matter would have gone into the dustbin as well.

Continuing the cycle of confrontation, the Prime Minister used descriptive words such as a Labor Union axis, which we all know is associated with another era. He said that on 3 March 1983, and it was another typical confrontation approach at election time, showing a complete inability to understand the mood of the Australian people, namely, that they were fed up with that type of nonsense and with the petty bickering, divisiveness and confrontation, and which indicated that the Liberal-National Country Party was completely out of tune.

It is regrettable that the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Rocky River, supported this type of approach. He issued advertisements urging people to support the Liberal Party and to support this type of approach and to support the Liberal Party Senate team, presumably so it could obstruct any future Labor Government programs. It is regrettable indeed that the Leader of the Opposition should allow himself to be used in this way in supporting this kind of confrontationist approach. At the conclusion of some seven years Australia had record unemployment, despite Mr Fraser's promises to reduce unemployment to only 100 000 people. There are now 750 000 people unemployed and a record Budget deficit, despite the fact that he accused the former Labor Treasurer of bad housekeeping and Labor Party policies as being wreckers of the economy. The Labor Party's Budget deficit was only $3 300 000, whereas the former Prime Minister was facing a deficit of something like $4.3 billion, ballooning to something like $9 billion if his proposals had continued for 1983-84. In regard to inflation, there was not one indication of there being a reduction after seven years, despite promises in 1975 that there would be an immediate change in direction.

It is no wonder that, as a consequence of massive unemployment, no reduction in the real level of inflation, with a reduced living standard for wage-earners, small business people, with pensioners and the like in our community, the Australian people lost hope and looked towards a restoration of that lost hope of bygone generations and the restoration

of confidence, national reconciliation, recovery, reconstruction and consensus policies. Indeed, this type of approach was supported by Mr Schrape of the South Australian Chamber of Commerce when he said in December of 1982, when dealing with the wage freeze issue that he welcomed the opportunity for early talks and that consensus was necessary if the pause was to work.

Even the business community, I venture to say, wanted a consensus type of approach, because it does business no good to have employers and employees fighting one another through their various organisations as well as on the job, because business people are genuinely desirous of making profits to enable their businesses to prosper and to enable them to employ more people. That has been my experience with the business community in general terms. They want the best for Australia and they do genuinely believe that a prospering business brings other benefits and increased employment. The important thing is a partnership between business and working people, the need for co-operation between employers and employees and between employer organisations and employee organisations. This is the approach of the new national Government which has clearly been endorsed by the majority of Australians.

The monetarist doctrines that have applied for the past seven years have worsened the situation. There is a clear need, as called for by the new Prime Minister, to restore economic growth by increasing demand, and there is a clear rejection of the policy of contraction and the Government having a role as a by-stander: the Government plays an important part in the regulation of the economy. There is a clear need for the reconstruction of the Australian manufacturing industry, because we all know that one of the real reasons behind the lowering of tariffs for the Australian manufacturing industry was due to Australia's foreign policy objectives in regard to ASEAN countries.

In return for regional security, they demanded a lowering of tariffs so that they could have their products imported into Australia. I believe that that is undoubtedly one of the prime reasons behind lowering the protection of the Australian manufacturing industry. It is not a matter to be set aside lightly. If one is going to dislocate people in the Australian work force, then one has got to make provision for them. One cannot lower tariffs knowing that one is going to put hundreds of thousands of people out of work without providing any alternatives for them. We simply need to provide retraining.

Where were the retraining programmes? Where were the job creation schemes? If that is a Party's policy, to promote dislocation in society, then that Party must make allowances for the people who have been dislocated. The Leader of the Opposition was bleating about the loss of jobs at Honeymoon. Here, as a result of deliberate Federal Government policies with regard to the manufacturing industry, thousands of people are now out of work and that Government did not make any provision and did not show any concern for their well-being. There is a need for the reconstruction of the Australian manufacturing industry.

The new Government is going to embark on a national work programme in consultation with the States. There will be guidelines set down for the movement in prices, the non-wage incomes, and wages and salaries. There will be a need for a body, not in terms of the previous Prices Justification Tribunal, but a body which will be a means for public surveillance of key prices and non-wage increases.

The small business people were a section which concerned the Hawke Government. The current situation, as the member for Hanson knows, is that those people are taxed at 50 cents in the dollar if they do not distribute their profits as dividends. As a consequence of this high taxing policy that has been in force for as long as I can remember, people cannot make those funds available for investment within their businesses and they have to go outside and apply for very costly external finance. Small business people will undoubtedly benefit from that type of policy.

In the area of housing the Prime Minister has pledged to inject massive amounts of money into the construction industry. It is intended that the target this year will be to construct 18 000 more houses, which will be a total of $235 000 000 to be injected into the housing industry. It is hoped that another $450 000 000 will be channelled through banks, building societies and other lending institutions. The target for the first year is 130 000 homes, which is an increase of 18 000 homes over the previous year, and which will increase to 160 000 in three years time.

It is these policies of expansion that are needed. I know they will be difficult to implement, because of the devaluation of the currency and the ballooning of the Federal deficit, but if all Australians work together and all members of the political Parties get behind the consensus approach of the new national Government, we will see those things happen in our community; we will see a lessening of industrial disputation; we will see the regulation of wage rises in the future. We all know that the wage increases of 1981 were due to the Prime Minister wanting to go to the Royal wedding. He held out what turned out to be a false promise to the members of the Transport Workers Union over a claim for $20. He had indicated that they were likely to get it, so their stoppage was called off. The Prime Minister went off to the wedding. When he came back he renegued on it, opposed it in the Arbitration Commission, and it was rejected. We were then faced with an increase of $39 when it would have been $20 if the Prime Minister had acted responsibly at that time. Here we are with a new approach to wage movements. Quite clearly there is a need for national reconstruction, recovery and reconciliation.

The economic summit was called by the Prime Minister on the first day he took over the position. He called for an economic summit and a consensus approach to politics in Australia. Clearly, I think it is an aspiration of every Australian that the economic summit will work and provide real and lasting benefits to the Australian community. It will succeed if people work together.

In moving this motion I had to descend into the political arena in relation to the events of the previous seven years. I make no excuses for that, except that it was necessary to show the type of policies that laid the foundation for the call for a programme of national reconciliation, economic recovery and reconstruction. I hope that members opposite will view the motion in those terms and in that time frame and that they will see that the real essence of this motion is the call for national reconciliation, economic recovery and reconstruction—a consensus approach. I urge Opposition members to view this motion in the way in which it is intended for all South Australians, and to lend their good offices to seek the support of all South Australians for a consensus approach to national recovery, economic reconciliation and reconstruction.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the concept of the present motion except for some of the wording in that motion. I am amazed that the member for Hartley went to such lengths to attack a previous Administration when he himself is asking for co-operation and reconciliation, as is the stated intention of the present Prime Minister and his Government.

I point out that until Tuesday the member for Hartley had a motion on the Notice Paper which he has since changed. Tuesday's Notice Paper read:

Mr Groom to move—That this House condemns the Federal Government for its continuing policies of creating massive unemployment and calls upon the Federal Government to immediately

implement an effective job creation scheme together with a development strategy to assist South Australian industry.

Mr Groom: That was placed on the Notice Paper last December.

Mr EVANS: I am not concerned when the member put it on the Notice Paper. He is a lawyer, he should be alert, and one takes for granted that he is not unintelligent. Yet, he had this sitting on the Notice Paper for weeks while the present Federal Government was in power. He never bothered to do anything about it until somebody jogged his memory last week that perhaps that is not the way it should be now that his Party is in Government in Canberra as well as in this State. He spoke at length on the point that he wanted all South Australians, including politicians in Opposition or wherever, to support a programme of reconciliation, co-operation and new economic growth. On today's Notice Paper, the motion states:

Mr Groom to move—That this House, noting the economic mismanagement and failure of the policies of the Fraser Liberal/National Country Party Government, seeks the support of all South Australians irrespective of political considerations to support the programme of national reconciliation, economic recovery and reconstruction as called for by the new Federal Government.

He immediately wants to play politics when he is asking for co-operation. That is hypocritical.

I support the concept in the resolution, that we should all support, regardless of our political Party, or whether we are in unions or in business, the call that has been made, and it has not only been made by the Prime Minister of Australia or his Government; it has been made by people in industry for years. Some of the union officials also have been making the call for years. Yet, the member wants to play politics and at the same time ask for co-operation. Virtually all of his speech was a straight-out attack on a previous Administration. In seeking to amend the motion, I therefore move:

To strike out 'noting the economic mismanagement and failure of the policies of the Fraser Liberal/National Country Party Government'; to strike out 'the' fifth occurring and insert in lieu thereof "A"; and to strike out 'as called for by the new Federal Government'.

I believe that that is what the honourable member was speaking to at both the beginning and the end of his remarks. If he wants to exclude politics, I am sure he will get the support of every member of this House for the motion as amended (if the honourable member wants to take the correct approach that I believe his Federal Prime Minister is taking). I have not referred to church leaders, who of course were making a similar call long before the Federal election was announced.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr EVANS: Before the member for Hartley attacks the policy of the previous Administration over the last seven years, I refer him to an article that appears on page 4 of today's *Advertiser*. Headed 'French experiment in growth "has failed" ', it states:

The French Foreign Minister, Mr Cheysson, admits that France's economic growth experiment of the past two years has 'failed,' according to an interview in *The Washington Post*. The lesson to be drawn is that economic problems can be tackled only 'at the world level, which means with the complete support of the American'.

Here is a person who is a member of the Ministry of a left-wing Government in France, stating that experiments in spending Government money to try to create jobs have not worked. I am sure that if the honourable member went back through that Government's record extending just over the past two years he would find that it has tried to implement the sort of policies that the present State and Federal Government have hinted they would like to put into operation. I think it is fair to ask the honourable member to think deeply before he starts advocating that Australia should follow a similar path to that taken recently by French Administration. The article continues:

In the interview, Mr Cheysson calls on America to exert as much effort in helping Western Europe out of recession as she does in defending herself from what she regards as the threat of Soviet aggression. Since 1981, under the Socialist Government of President Mitterrand, France has tried to pursue a policy of economic growth backed by Government spending, in sharp contrast to the anti-inflation policies of the U.S. and Britan.

Inside the European monetary system, the French franc was devalued yesterday for the third time since the Mitterrand Administration took office, and analysts say new economic measures to be announced by the President tomorrow are likely to pursue a line of austerity. Urging a U.S. initiative to revive the world economy, Mr Cheysson says: 'The U.S. is still the most powerful country . . . the country that has in itself the best potential, human and economic, the best unused capacities . . . so if you don't take the lead, I don't know how it's going to work.'

Mr Cheysson says 1983 is the most difficult year Western Europe has known since World War II because of the economic slump and negotiations with the Soviet Union on nuclear weapons. He says President Reagan should play tough with Moscow by insisting on his zero option proposal for dismantling all intermediate-range missiles in Europe, but he should also be prepared to negotiate a compromise privately.

The article goes on to state that France has some difficulties, as follows:

In Paris, informed sources say tough economic measures, designed to cut domestic consumption by the equivalent of about $7 000 000 000 have been agreed by France as part of the deal on the realignment of the currencies in the European monetary system. The new measures are due to be announced at tomorrow's Cabinet meeting.

The measures, which are expected to include increases in social security contributions [that is a form of tax], higher income tax for the better-off and increases in prices for public services such as gas, electricity and public transport, are aimed at reducing France's foreign trade deficit by nearly half through cutting consumption and so reducing imports.

France has tried the experiment of spending public money to boost employment and job opportunities and to lift the purchasing power and the demand within the country. It is a country surrounded by a controlled market—European Common Market—a protected market for many of its products, both manufactured and primary, but it has still failed when it has to produce the goods. Australia does not have that protected market. Farmers, particularly in those areas, many of whom are small operators, can still survive because they have the protection of the European Common Market, with guaranteed prices and embargoes or limited amounts of produce coming from other countries.

I would like the House to think about that. France has a population of over 50 000 000. Most of its roads have been developed for centuries, and it has a rail system we could not even dream of having in this vast country with a population of only 15 250 000. France has public buildings 500 or 600 years old, even though some of them have been remodelled to provide better office accommodation. That country, which has had all these facilities established for centuries, has tried the socialist experiment and it has failed. Its communications system is simple compared to ours, and its potential for tourism is simple. For example, during an Easter weekend 16 000 000 people could be on the road from Germany— more than the entire Australian population. France could have about 13 000 000 on the road, and there are all those other countries. Think of all that tourist trade.

Many people travel to Europe from America and Canada rather than travelling to Australia or Japan. After they have seen all the sights they want to see in Europe, they then think about coming to Australia, but we are not usually the first choice. Because there is so much history and character in Europe and parts of Asia, we have not been able to establish a comparable tourist industry; we are not old enough. I admit that people come to this country to see its vastness, the unusual arid regions and attractions such as

Ayers Rock and other sights which to us are quite common but which to people in other countries are unique.

France has tried the experiment. The honourable member said that a previous Administration in this country tried to carry out a policy of austerity, not spending great sums in the public sector and trying to encourage the private sector. One Government tried to encourage exploration in mining and other fields, and I believe quite successfully. There was a Government that did all in its power to counter the inflationary trend. The honourable member should realise that we have another difficulty in this country in that the system of payment for services—wages and salaries—is entirely different from systems used in other parts of the world.

Because Australia was so isolated, we took the attitude that we could live in a cocoon and say to the rest of the world, 'It doesn't matter.' I invite members opposite who are to speak on this motion to deal with the cost of producing our secondary products that are sold here and overseas. If we did not have tariff protection, other countries could bring their goods here, compete with local production, and still make a profit (and in this respect I am not just talking about dumping goods in Australia). If there were no tariffs, virtually all our secondary industries would be out of business. Our costs of production are excessive because of payments such as long service leave. Although I do not advocate that we cut out long service leave, I point out that it is a part of our standard of living and also a part of the cost structure of goods that we produce for other people to buy.

What other countries have a 17½ per cent holiday pay loading or four weeks annual leave? Does the Australian employee use flexitime correctly or is flexitime abused? Mr Clyde Cameron, a Minister in the Whitlam Labor Government and a man for whom I have the greatest respect because of his knowledge of the Australian Labor Party and the trade union movement, is on record as saying that, although flexitime was introduced for the benefit of employees, many have abused it. Many of the more dedicated employees become irate when their fellow workers abuse flexitime, but we must remember that many of the bosses, from top management down, have created much of the problem in this area. Although it is not such a common practice today, it is only two or three years since the managing director went out to lunch at 12.30 and returned to work at 4 p.m., feeling relaxed and not wanting to work. Perhaps he would not even return to work. Then the under manager went to lunch at 12.30 and, knowing the habits of his superior, would return at 3. Then the foreman would take a long lunch hour from 12.30 to 2.30, and so it went on down the production line with the thought, 'If the bosses can get away with it up top we won't pull our weight down at the bottom.'

Part of the blame lies clearly in the lap of some of the people to whom I have referred, although many dedicated people have done their best to keep down the cost of production and to raise the quality of the product. Indeed, many industrial leaders have tried to create a feeling of satisfaction among their employees.

Another aspect of the economy to which I must refer is the national debt. Australia has at present the highest debt it has ever had. In the 1950s the Federal Government owed nothing of any significance and the State Governments had virtually no debts. Our public transport systems in the main were running close to a balanced budget and our standard of living was high compared to that of the rest of the world. However, today the Federal Government carries a massive load of debt, which means that the people of Australia, whether they are on unemployment relief, in a job, or on the pension, must pay for the debt. Unfortunately, future generations will have to pay for it, too.

In the last 25 years the States of Australia have built up massive debts. The same applies to local government. For instance, Mitcham council, which years ago ran on a balanced budget, only recently borrowed money and thereby went into a deficit operation. Indeed, local government bodies throughout the country have built up massive debts which, added to the Federal and State debts, constitute a heavy burden on all Australians. The amount of money that Australians owe in this way is frightening and is a result of our having lived in a fool's paradise.

Then we must consider the debts incurred by community organisations such as the local football club or sports club, the scouts and guides, although not all these organisations have gone into debt. Many, however, have borrowed money and the community is trying to pay off the debt. Australians also thought they were entitled to live in a home better than their fathers and grandfathers had. Nowhere in the world is the average standard of housing higher than the average standard enjoyed by Australians today: the allotment in Australia is bigger and the size of the home is generally larger. We do not see these conditions as a privilege but as a right to enjoy such a high standard. I include myself in this criticism. I set out to strive for a big home. I got a big home but I am now prepared to sell it because I see the futility of it.

I am talking about the attitude generally in society, and our attitude does not stop there. If we had the money, we would buy a cabin cruiser or a yacht. The holiday shack we bought would be equivalent to the house in which our parents brought us up, yet we saw such a holiday shack as a right. Those fortunate enough to live in the 1960s and 1970s will remember the period of affluence enjoyed by society generally. Did people save money to help their children later or did they spend it on luxuries? Did they buy a block of land for a son or daughter or did they spend the money on an oversea trip or a second motor vehicle? It is interesting to go through the suburbs of Adelaide or of any other Australian city and realise that it is well nigh impossible to distinguish between the incomes enjoyed by houseowners merely by the type of car standing in the drive. It is possible to judge financial standing by the home in some cases, but not by the motor vehicle, as the motor car used in this country by the average income earner, as well as by the rich and the poor, is a high-standard vehicle because of the vast distances between our capital cities. Our public transport is too expensive, and one reason for this is that the State Transport Authority provides buses to service almost every corner of the metropolitan area, let alone the country. That is why I drew the comparison earlier between Australia and France and other European countries where the trains criss-cross all over Europe.

So, we have that expectation. There has been a saying going through politics as long as I have been here that, if you give a dog a bone and take it away, he will bite you. Human beings are no different. Political Parties are reluctant, regardless of their philosophy, to take action that will be strong enough to help correct a problem. Some would argue that we should tax the rich very heavily. We could do that for three or four years and we would then not have any rich. We would still have just as many poor. We have to get an attitude of mind as a society in regard to what we do. Our expectations are the problem. They are not going to level out unless those in the front line as leaders keep on talking about those of us who have got enough (and some of us more than enough) to stop asking for more and try to average things out so that we can start to export.

I am not advocating that those who have initiative and drive should be taxed to the point where they say that they are happy to work only three or four days a week and use a tenth or twentieth of their capacity. If they believe that

that is all they are worth they will be prepared to jog along at that. If we do that we will bring everybody back to a lower standard. We will not improve the standard of living and will not reduce the cost of production. We will not improve the amount of money coming in from exports, because we are not producing at a sufficient rate.

When the member spoke about reconstruction of industry and the economic position in Australia, he must remember that we have just over 15 000 000 people and that we can build factories today with computerisation to provide all the articles to supply our economy in about two or three weeks production. We have the capacity to supply the Australian market with cars in six weeks or two months if we want to run at full production, 24 hours a day as the factories used to. We could make proper use of the capital invested.

What would we do with the rest of the production if it is too high in price? Do we say to G.M.H. and those companies that we know that they are not making a profit and that they will get out of the game eventually, that we will take them over, and that the State will run their operation? That is one attitude that can be taken. If the State decides to run that industry at a loss, the community picks up the tab. The community may be already over-taxed to the point that it does not want to be over-productive. I know people in the building industry who are very good at their work but who work no more than four days a week. They are self-employed and work fewer hours because the tax bill is too high.

So, if we take over an industry that cannot show a profit because there is not enough demand in the country and the cost of production is too high for other countries to buy its goods, what happens? We will then end up with an organisation like the State Transport Authority making motor cars, providing essential services, producing clothes, farm machinery, or whatever. We put a bigger burden on the taxpayer if we take that line of argument. I can honestly say that, if we were talking to a small group of 200 or 300 or even 1 000 people and trying to get an agreement to solve the problems, it would be easy. However, in our political situation we are polarised. The member who moved the motion originally was trying to polarise the issue by talking about the difference.

An honourable member: You have to analyse—

Mr EVANS: There is no need to have the motion as it is worded to analyse the situation. We do not have to talk about the era of Whitlam, Fraser or Menzies, because in people's minds the community is divided. Some people believe that one group did very well and another lot did badly, and likewise for the next seven years. By talking about it we will create a bigger division and will not achieve what the Prime Minister and other community leaders are asking for. We will be doing the very opposite to what the honourable member says he would like to see. At the same time he wants to play politics, but that will not work. He has been in the House previously, he is not a new member, and he knows what he is doing. It is not that he wanted the Federal Government's policies to become operative; he moved the motion as a means of attacking a Government just defeated and, in particular, attacking an individual, and for no other reason. He should be conscious of that.

The people who make the decisions in the community know all the arguments of the past, whether against any of the previous Prime Ministers or their Administrations. It has been written about, talked about, broadcast, and televised. However, nobody has responded to it. I have no doubt that if we, as a country and as politicians in the House, want to tackle a problem in the correct way, we can still have our arguments about correctional services issues or those areas. However, when it comes back to getting people together, union leaders, politicians from all sides, church leaders, business leaders (from small or large businesses), we have to keep our minds on that path and not play politics to achieve it. If we do, it will not work. It is not just the member for Fisher who has a view on it. In the community 75 per cent of people have a fixed political philosophy. If we play politics in the field we will lose the argument.

Some people would argue that one of the problems is that we have so many dual-income families (600 000 or 700 000 more now than in the mid-1970s). We cannot talk about it as though it should not be the case, as that is unfair to the womenfolk who have stayed at home until recent years. They have moved into the work force; they get satisfaction and there is extra income to meet the costs of running a larger home. We cannot say that that is wrong. People write to me and telephone me to say that we should stop dual-income families or tax them more heavily. If we do that we will penalise the honest and the dishonest will get away with it. I refer to those living in a *de facto* relationship or under a false name, those who want to cheat. I say that it is not on and that we cannot do that.

The honourable member mentioned something about a statement being made about younger people being paid less. I am not advocating that as a view. Everybody in this Chamber knows that I argued, when we lowered the age of majority to 18, that we would be creating a burden for industry and for our country. Politicians did not want to accept that at that time because they believed that many young people out there were between 18 and 21 and that if we gave them the right to vote, the right to sign contracts, the right to be in hotels, the right to full adult pay if in the area of unskilled work, and an opportunity to get full adult wages earlier, often before they had any job experience at all, it would be great because they would vote for us.

So, everybody got on the band waggon. Is that part of our trouble in this country? Is it part of the trouble when Germany, France and many others took it from 20 back to 18? Did we create a situation for political purposes, hoping to win a few points? In doing that, did we place a burden upon our country? People come to my office (and I find jobs for quite a few), quite openly saying, 'Mr Evans, if we can go on a building site and do some builders labouring, we would be prepared to work for less than the full adult wage.' However, the law says that they cannot do so. In other words, the individual does not have the right to accept less to get job experience, unless he does it for nothing, and that is totally unacceptable, or for $20 a week or so before it affects his unemployment benefit.

I believe that there must be some method of giving young people the opportunity to take a job at less than the full wage if they have never had work experience in that area, subject to somebody having some say over the wages paid. I do not know whether it should be a local group of community leaders or some form of tribunal, but there should be some way that a young person can say, 'Joe Bloggs is prepared to employ me. The normal wage is $240 per week. He cannot afford to pay that. I want the experience and I am prepared to work for six months for less than that.' That is not lowering standards: it is giving those people the opportunity, if they wish, to get job experience on a salary on which they can live and get vital work experience.

I do not wish to say any more except that I hope that members now would realise that if this motion is to be considered as the member for Hartley said that he would like to see it considered, not as a political ploy or a bashing argument against a previous Federal Government or a previous State Government, but in honour and with respect, then I ask the House to support the motion as I have asked that it be amended.

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Honourable members: Yes.

Mr MAYES (Unley): I have taken note of the member for Fisher's amendment, and it intrigues me. In fact, I would feel that in my interpretation it is a concession to the member for Hartley's motion. In effect, it is conceding that the previous Fraser Government was a Government of divisiveness, a Government that lent itself towards a group in the community at the expense of the major section of the community. It would appear to me that the amendment in effect takes on board the comments that the member for Hartley has already made in moving the motion. I am sure that he will pick up that issue when he replies.

It is interesting to note, after that tour we have had of the world economic situation of Adelaide and various backblocks of the member for Fisher's electorate, the issues that have been raised are many and varied and really drift away from the pertinent direction, not only of the motion but also of the amendment. What we are looking at is a question of the economic reconstruction of this country after seven years of Fraser's Government, and I agree with the member for Hartley when he says that one cannot take an isolated situation and establish a policy of reconstruction which faces the current Prime Minister and the Premiers of Australia. It is something that must be taken in the context of what has passed over the last few years. I think that it is very pertinent then to refer to the period of the Fraser Government and what effect that Government had on the economic situation in this country.

The member for Fisher mentions France. I suggest that he should look at the article in the *National Times* this week which refers in some detail to what is happening in France. I think that a lot of assumptions are made when people look at the French model, under Mitterrand, as to what is occurring. That article in the *National Times* clearly suggests that the experiment has not failed. I suggest that there ought to be more time given to the French model to allow it to undertake its process of reconstruction after a very long period of conservative Governments in France. One assumption often made about the French model is that it was a complete *laissez-faire* structure. In fact, that is not true at all, because under de Gaulle the original reconstruction commenced and nationalisation of many major industries took place.

In fact, the French economy had a large degree of nationalisation because de Gaulle regarded himself as a nationalist. I think that many people assume that the Mitterrand Government has come in and undertaken a reconstruction programme which involved massive nationalisation. Many of the industries in which they are working have been nationalised for 30 years, and many of the plans and programmes that have been instituted are just an extension of what was established 30 years ago. However, unfortunately they were left to drift under a conservative rule. Although the member for Fisher has left the House, I would refer him to that article because I think that he will find it enlightening and I am sure that it will certainly change his views on what he sees as being the French model.

The other issue that the member for Fisher drifted over dealt with particular individuals' objectives or goals in life and how one can decide to determine one's economic achievement. We are told that everyone aspires to a yacht, a holiday house, a large home like his in the hills, two imported cars and varying other chattels that are often recognised as established indicators of wealth and status. I assure him that I have none of those aspirations, and certainly my goals and my endeavours will be very humble compared with what he assumes most Australians endeavour to achieve. I am sure that my views apply to the majority of people with whom I have contact in the community.

On my door knocking—and I door knocked the electorate of Unley twice, which is at least 1½ times more than my opponent did in the recent State election—I found that one could clearly identify the quality and the sort of life style that people enjoy in the electorate of Unley. There are very few common automobiles parked in Unley Park or Kings Park which have any similarity to those parked in the areas of Parkside, central Goodwood, or Everard Park. It is very rare to see a Volvo or a Mercedes parked in Goodwood or in Everard Park. I think that the honourable member's comments do not reflect the true picture, that there are very few common indicators which reflect a commonality of life style.

If we travelled throughout the electorates of Adelaide and into some of the western suburbs, we would find that there are very few cars similar to those parked in driveways in the eastern suburbs in the areas that the member for Fisher represents. I suggest that some of the so-called facts that he wished to throw into his argument were not the truth at all, and should require some careful examination before one accepted the sort of proposals that he put up.

I wish to turn my attention to the initial part of the motion put by the member for Hartley in regard to the economic mismanagement and failure of the policies of the Fraser Liberal and National Party Government and I think that they are pertinent at any debate that looks at a process of national conciliation, national economic recovery and reconstruction, which I support. One must refer to past experiences in order to establish a model to prevent those mistakes from occurring again, as the member for Hartley has said. If one looks at what has happened in the seven years of National Liberal Party Federal Government, one sees a definite process by which there was a redistribution of wealth away from the poorer of the Australian community, to a very small minority of wealthy people. There is a clear direction not only in taxation, income, social welfare or health policies. The Federal Government of that day directed its policies towards a redistribution away from the poor. I think that it can be summed up by a statement from the Prime Minister, Bob Hawke, in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 11 July 1981. It states:

> In politics today there appear to me to be very few self-evident truths. They include gross disparities in the distribution of income, wealth and opportunity (which) are not only inequitable but will make for a less cohesive and stable community. This is also true of the international community.

The Prime Minister was highlighting one of the major problems of divisiveness, one of the issues that must be dealt with in any national reconciliation, namely, the unequalness of distribution of wealth. He said:

> Australia, in fact, is excessively inegalitarian. The wealthiest 1 per cent of Australia's population own 22 per cent of the country's total wealth. Half the population owns less than 8 per cent of the wealth. The richest 2 000 people own as much as the poorest 2½ million. It is a travesty, in these circumstances, that about 2 million people are living in poverty in this country.

Where were those people referred to in the member for Fisher's summary? They are not the people who have the opportunity to buy a yacht or a holiday home. It is absurd to consider that in this country there are people living in abject poverty. I refer to 1978-79 figures from the Bureau of Statistics concerning total income from interest, rents and dividends on shares. They indicate that half a per cent of adult Australians get 25 per cent, 1 per cent of adult Australians get 35 per cent, 5 per cent of adult Australians get 70 per cent, and 10 per cent of adult Australians get 84 per cent. Therefore, the gross disparity in the distribution of wealth in this country is clearly evident. It is a major problem that must be resolved. It is a problem that faces

the Prime Minister and one that must be dealt with during the summit conference of reconciliation.

When looking at the issue and the way in which the Federal Government of the day approached it, one must refer to profits. One finds, from the Australian *Financial Review* of 12 October 1981, that in 1981 profits of industrial companies increased by 28 per cent. That is an indicator that during the years of the Fraser Government a situation existed where there was a distribution away from wage and salary earners to the profit makers, to industry and to industrial companies. Yet we constantly hear a cry that the situation is the reverse. From 1976 to 1981 personal income from profits rose by 190 per cent compared with 150 per cent for wages. Again, that indicates the extent of the returns to the profit makers.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: What is your source?

Mr MAYES: The Australian Bureau of Statistics national accounts. It can be seen quite clearly that there has been a redistribution from income and wage earners to owners of capital and to those obtaining returns from profits. In regard to salaried staff and self-employed staff, we find that top management and executives are also getting a much bigger slice of the cake. A 1981 survey of 5 700 people (my source is the Australian *Financial Review* of 3 November 1981) found that the already extremely high salaries of those people were increasing more than 3 per cent faster than inflation during that period. Half of the companies involved in the survey paid bonuses to their executives, the average size of which had risen to 20 per cent of their basic salaries. Further, 40 per cent of them also received superannuation, fully paid for by the company. Therefore, again we see the average worker having to take a reduction in wages (and this was not put to us by the member for Fisher), while the top executives in this country have not had to do that. By way of lurks and perks they are able to avoid not only increased taxation but also a drop in real income.

The Government made an estimate in relation to the introduction of the fifth health scheme which showed that there were about 3 000 000 Australians living in poverty or on the border line. Again, we see clearly that the Fraser period of government brought to Australia a very divisive policy which must be changed by the Hawke Government, and it is a policy to which the Hawke Government is committed. Daily, more and more unemployed were hitting the work line. In November last year, I was told by a person whom I know in the C.E.S. that nationally 1 700 people were coming in per day seeking unemployment benefits. That figure is simply incomprehensible. We can now talk about the policies of the Fraser Government which deliberately created unemployment. Those policies really began to come home to roost in late 1982. Is it any surprise that the electorate nationally turfed out a Government that followed that sort of policy?

The situation was highlighted by the member for Hartley when he referred to the latest employment statistics and to hidden unemployment. In 1981 the estimate provided in the Australian *Financial Review* of 12 March put forward the proposition that hidden unemployment brought the unemployment figures of that date to more than 12 per cent, when the employment figure nationally was about 8 per cent. So, we can see that there is a massive area of hidden unemployment in addition to that unemployment recorded in existing statistics.

In summary, we find that there has been a massive redistribution of wealth from the poor to the rich during the term of the Fraser Government. In regard to taxation, the Fraser Government promised taxation indexation, but how far did the Government go? During the same period of the Fraser Government (1976 to 1982) there were massive taxation increases. In the main, it was taxation on the workers, on the wage and salary earners. For example, the average tradesman from 1975 to 1982 incurred an increase in taxation of 11 per cent. That is a reduction in real income and means a loss of about $25 every week in 1981-82 figures compared with 1975—a staggering total of $1 300 per annum. Although the Fraser Government was committed in 1975-76 to a policy of tax indexation, it did nothing to implement it. In fact, it allowed taxation for wage and salary earners to increase. A male process worker on an average rate in 1981-82 figures was losing $31 in additional taxation every week compared with 1975. Ninety-seven per cent of taxpayers, that is, anyone who earns less than $596 in 1981-82 terms, are paying a bigger proportion in income tax now than they did in 1975-76. Eric Ristrom, from the Australian Taxation Association, says that average taxpayers with two children are now paying 241 per cent more tax than they were paying in 1975-76, whilst their incomes have in fact gone up by 88 per cent.

We can see quite clearly the policies of the Fraser Government directing a heavier taxation burden towards the wage and salary earner. The average Australian household was paying 13.2 per cent of its income in such taxes in 1975-76; in 1982, 15.5 per cent. There is a deliberate and direct movement away from indexation to heavier taxation. Since coming to power in 1975, the Fraser Government had introduced over 40 major tax concessions, only two of which involved wage and salary earners; the rest were for the wealthy and for companies. The Fraser Government admitted that it did not even know how much these concessions cost in lost tax. It was unable to provide any costings for 27 of those taxation concessions.

I will quote from Professor Mathews, Director of the Centre for Research into Federal Financial Relations, Australian National University Press. It was a paper presented at the 46th Summer School of the Australian Institute of Political Science. He said:

> The taxation system has become a major instrument for redistributing income and wealth in favour of the rich.

We can see quite clearly that under Fraser's policies we did not have a process of reconciliation: we had a process of division directed towards the top 5 per cent of income earners and away from 95 per cent of wage and salary earners in this country.

What about health? What policies did the Fraser Government introduce regarding health? It promised to support the Medibank scheme but that was only for a short while. It killed off Medibank. It cut spending on health in real terms by a total of over $8 billion in the past six to seven years. It created three separate health systems, bringing about inefficiency and disorganisation, and produced identity cards for the poor to enable them to receive health benefits—again, another instance of a policy of divisiveness and separation with the community.

What about social security? What did the Fraser Government do in its period of Government? Since 1975 that Government cut spending on social security by a total of $2.5 billion—again, a distribution away from the poor. Family allowances have not kept pace with inflation, and the real value of the standard age and invalid pension has decreased since Fraser came to office. We have again seen a distribution away from the poor.

The editor of the *Australian Financial Review* stated on 8 March 1982:

> The present pension system is benefiting people who are in least need of assistance at the expense of many people who are in genuine need.

Under the Fraser Government, we had a process of taxing pensioners. I think it is important that these points be made and that any process of natural reconstruction take into account what has occurred over the last seven years under

a Liberal National Party Coalition Government. It must be given recognition that there has been a distribution of wealth and income away from the poor to the richer classes, and that we must endeavour to correct that in order to bring the community closer together. I support the motion.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak to this motion. It is the second attempt by the member for Hartley to put a motion on the Notice Paper. The previous attempt was obviously a political move, whereas this motion is couched in somewhat more subtle terms. However, the opening lines of the motion clearly set out to castigate the previous Federal Government. The honourable member then goes on to talk about a 'programme of national reconciliation, economic recovery and reconstruction as called for by the new Federal Government'. On the one hand the honourable member, by his motion, is most critical and, on the other hand, he is calling for national reconciliation.

I think that all of us in this House (or I would hope all of us) could arrive at a situation where development can take place, where unemployment will fall and where we can exploit those natural resources we have, in the interests of every citizen in this country. However, unfortunately, there are no simple solutions to the problems that this country and many other countries overseas are facing. If there were simple solutions to those problems, they would have no doubt been adopted a long time ago. However, we are unfortunately living in the real world, and we have to face the economic reality that confronts us.

It would appear from the comments made by the member for Hartley and the member for Unley that they are somewhat confused in their thinking. The member for Hartley, in particular, should have a basic understanding of the market place and know how to run a business. The member for Unley has not had the same opportunities in those areas, and no doubt he has been looking at things through rose-coloured glasses and, therefore, has not been in that situation.

Mr Mayes: They're blue.

Mr GUNN: I was being very complimentary to the honourable member, but he has not had the same opportunity to have to live by the decisions he makes. My colleagues and I believe that the amendment which the honourable member for Fisher has moved is a far more realistic assessment of the situation we are facing. If the honourable member wants me to support the policies put forward by the current Federal Government, he has to be a little more explicit about those policies. Does he want me to support a course of action which was adopted by the previous Federal Labor Government headed by Mr Whitlam which took decisions that had a disastrous effect upon the primary industries of this country? I believe that some of the economic problems we are facing at present will be overcome if we have a series of good agricultural years in this country—if we can have a good wheat and barley crop and the effects of the drought become less evident.

I have to tell the member for Hartley that I sincerely hope that this Federal Labor Government and this State Labor Government do not make the same mistakes that the Dunstan and Whitlam Government made. As a reasonable person, I am prepared to give them a fair go. I see that the member for Brighton is having some trouble containing herself. I am always a most reasonable person, and all the honourable member has to do is ask my constituents. They think that I am a reasonable person, because they have kept sending me back to this place, and no doubt they will continue to do so.

Mr Trainer: That's to keep you out of the district.

Mr GUNN: Let me tell the honourable member that I was born in my district, and my family and I have been known for a number of generations.

Mr Trainer: That really reinforces what I just said.

Mr GUNN: I am quite happy to place myself before them in future. As a reasonable person, I am prepared to give the Federal and South Australian Governments a fair go, but I warn them not to make the same mistakes that their predecessors made, or they will be headed for the same fate as the Dunstan and Whitlam Governments, and that is defeat. Let us not make any mistake about the situation. I am prepared to accept that the Australian people have voted for the Hawke Government, but the same electors can turn that Government out just as easily as they turned the Fraser Government out.

No-one wants to delude himself that that will not take place, because unfortunately the expectations of the people of this State and of this nation were raised. They were told by Premier Bannon and Prime Minister Hawke to trust them with their confidence and all would be well. On both occasions, from the first day after the election, they have started backing down. Obviously economic reality started to dawn on them as soon as the polls closed and they realised that the policies they were putting forward would not be so easy to implement.

I say to both the Premier and Mr Hawke that if they want the co-operation and support of the people they will have to be responsible and use common sense. The member for Unley talked about taxation. My view is that taxation is far too high now and that the community will not accept any further tax levies forced on them, no matter in what area. I accept the fact that Government charges have to be adjusted in line with inflation. I take the opposite view to that taken by the Premier when he was in Opposition and talked about electricity charges, because the Electricity Trust is not under the control of the Government, but he went on and on about that matter. Everyone knows that these charges will have to be increased, but general taxation in all areas is far too high.

I do not believe that the community at large will accept any further increases in taxation. I believe that the taxation system is far too complicated and that people do not understand it. There are far too many different taxes and charges and something ought to be done about this. There are also far too many regulations and Acts of Parliament regulating people.

If we want to create the situation where we are going to encourage employment and development, the State and Federal Governments will have to do many things. I believe that they would attract support from the total community if they rapidly instituted a programme of deregulation. There are far too many Acts of Parliament, making it difficult for people to engage employees. The filling out of forms and obtaining licences and permits is absolutely unnecessary and nothing more than bureaucratic red tape. The frustration and annoyance caused are disincentives to the employment of more people. That is one area to which the Governments ought to give their attention quickly. I was disappointed that the proposal of the Tonkin Government to establish a statutory review authority was not put into effect.

This motion and the call of the member for Hartley for national reconciliation affects my district. I was amazed yesterday to learn of the decision to prevent the development of two projects in my district, bearing in mind that much has been said about unemployment. The member for Hartley referred to that matter and expressed concern and alarm at the ever-increasing numbers joining the dole queues. I am sure we are all concerned about that. I think the only difference between us is the method we would use to alleviate the problem. To members opposite, that isolated community

living close to the South Australian-New South Wales border might be insignificant, but I would like to quote from an article appearing in today's *News* and headed 'Last ditch bid to save U-mine jobs', as follows:

Unless urgent last minute talks can avert a shut-down of the Honeymoon uranium venture the sacking of up to 40 workers would begin almost immediately. Partners in the venture, C.S.R. and M.I.M. Ltd were today trying to arrange talks with the South Australian Minister for Mines and Energy, Mr Payne, in a bid to clarify yesterday's announcement which prohibits further development of the Honeymoon and Beverley uranium prospects.

Negotiators for the companies would be C.S.R.'s General Manager of the Minerals Division, Mr J.K. McLeod and a director of M.I.M. Ltd. The local manager for Mines Administration Pty Ltd, an A.A.R. Ltd subsidiary which is owned by C.S.R., Mr R. Wecker, said the partners wanted to know all the ramifications of the Government's decision before taking any action. The meeting is being arranged as a matter of urgency.

I understand that in the Legislative Council today the Hon. Mr Sumner admitted that there was very little difference in the ore from Honeymoon and Beverley when compared with the uranium coming from Roxby Downs. There is a quite conscious decision made by this Labor Government which will throw at least 40 people out of work. I have always believed that when any political Party in Government allows its philosophy to blind its judgment it is heading for trouble, and I believe that this is a classic example of where a political party has been blinded by political dogma and has not been prepared to face up to the economic realities of its decision. I realise that we have many new members in the Labor Caucus who are full of political rhetoric. They have been going around their districts telling the people what they want to hear, but nevertheless the economic and political realities will catch up with them. This was a political decision and the member for Elizabeth had his way in this particular exercise.

Under the previous Administration in this State, we had record mineral exploration taking place. Wherever I went around my district I was confronted with mining companies carrying out various work which I believe was in the interests of this State and this nation. I was hoping that in this area we would have a bipartisan approach and that we would all come together to see that these companies, which are employing large numbers of people, could continue the excellent work they are doing. The article in the *News* also stated:

Another local firm to suffer from a shut-down of the uranium venture was A.W. Fertilisers,

The article also stated that a person (Mr Thompson) involved with large-scale drilling operations was most concerned about what would happen to his employees and his company. I hope that the motion was moved in good faith. It was originally put forward by the honourable member in a completely different way. It was designed to embarrass the Fraser Government, and we are aware that the member for Hartley is fairly fleet-footed and quite skilled in the art of making barbed political comments, and that he can extricate himself when things get tough. He got caught up with that exercise when he was a member for another district, but he has now moved to what he believes are greener pastures. I believe that he has some cause for concern in relation to that area but I had better not dwell on that matter or I would be out of order, and I would not want to transgress Standing Orders in any circumstances. The honourable member is probably well meaning, even though he is misguided in what he has had to say. The *News* report continues:

But unless the high level negotiators perform a negotiating miracle and reverse the decision, lay-offs are assured.

Mines Administration has four employees on the site in the far north-east of the State. Another 10 are exclusively involved in uranium work at the company's Adelaide office. 'There will have to be lay-offs,' Mr Wecker confirmed today.

'The leaching plant on the site will be pulled down completely, put on a care and maintenance basis or some shade in between,' Mr Wecker said. The company would try to have the workers absorbed in to some other area of operation, but 'times are tough', he said.

The company is involved in the Lake Way (W.A.) uranium project. Another firm hard hit by the decision is locally based, Thompson Drilling Proprietary Limited.

Most of us who know anything about exploration know of the excellent work that company does. The article continues:

The company has been left 'without a future' by the Honeymoon and Beverley shutdown decisions, general manager Mr D. Wilson said today.

Mr Wilson went on to say later that at a stroke it had lost 58 per cent of its repetition business. The Government's decision will not bring about co-operation from that section of industry. The proposals at present being put forward for support have already been tried in other parts of the world and we know the unfortunate results of those experiments. The member for Fisher briefly referred to the French experiment, and in that regard it is interesting to read the following article in this morning's *Advertiser:*

The French Foreign Minister, Mr Cheysson, admits that France's economic growth experiment of the past two years has 'failed . . . Since 1981, under the Socialist Government of President Mitterrand, France has tried to pursue a policy of economic growth backed by Government spending, in sharp contrast to the anti-inflation policies of the United States and Britain.

These are the matters that should interest all members because they indicate what the results will be for Australia, and especially South Australia, if such a programme is implemented. The article continues:

In Paris, informed sources say tough economic measures, designed to cut domestic consumption by the equivalent of about $7 000 000 000 have been agreed by France as apart of the deal on the realignment of the currencies in the European monetary system . . . The measures, which are expected to include increases in social security contributions, higher income tax for the better-off and increases in prices for public services such as gas, electricity and public transport . . .

These same results will follow if the programme is put into effect in this country. If the Federal Labor Government applies the same policy to all primary industry as did the Whitlam Government, it will be heading for trouble and primary industry will suffer greatly. Where does the member for Hartley stand in this regard? Does he support the abolition of the investment allowance for primary industry for the purchase of plant and equipment that is so important to primary producers in a State that manufactures some of the best farm machinery in the world? I invite him to travel down South Road, where on one block he will see 200 tractors just standing there. That is the result of a severe drought and, if we want to see that machinery shifted for the benefit of the State, investment allowances must remain.

Does the honourable member support the continuation of the 100 per cent write-off in respect of the cost of windmills, pumps, dams and tanks? After all, those measures are important to industry. If we can have a bipartisan approach in such areas as these, all well and good, because such policies are essential, especially for a district such as mine which has suffered from drought and where it is important that people be encouraged to use all methods of water supply by building dams and erecting windmills. I should have thought that those members of the Labor Party who preached the environmental cause should be in favour of providing water in as many places as possible so that stock would not have to walk such long distances to get a drink. More watering places would probably also mean that we could have smaller mobs of sheep and cattle. There are many other matters on which I could speak in relation to this motion. I believe that all members should support the excellent amendment moved by the member for Fisher. Indeed, when the member for Hartley replies later in this

debate, I believe that we will hear his enthusiastic support for the amendment.

Mr Groom: The failures of the past must be analysed.

Mr GUNN: If we are to refer constantly to past failures, I could list many mistakes made by the Whitlam and Dunstan Governments. I could start talking about the financing of the future of Australia by Mr Khemlani. Then there is the matter of the Frozen Food Factory, and the member for Price knows all about that. I could talk about grandiose schemes which could not be achieved but which come readily to mind. How about the transport programme planned by Dr Breuning? Members would be in fits of laughter when they heard about the transport project, but such recapitulation would achieve nothing.

The member for Hartley said that the Fraser and Tonkin Governments had been divisive, but he started off in a divisive manner himself with a strong attack on the previous Federal Liberal Goverment. However, I remind him that that Government inherited a situation involving an economic recession across the whole country, unlike the experience of the Whitlam Government in 1972 when the economic situation was far better than it was either in 1975 or in 1983. The same applied to the accession of the Tonkin Government in 1979, when it took over a difficult economic situation, unlike the situation in 1970 when the Dunstan Government took over at a time when much more money was available and when it was able to get millions of dollars to spend, dollars for which it did not get a good return. The member for Hartley asked other members to support the Federal Labor Government's attitude towards Tasmania but, if he wants me to support intervention in Tasmania either by a Federal Labor Government or by a Federal Liberal Government, he is sadly deluding himself.

There was no way that I would give my support to intervention by the Commonwealth in the internal affairs of Tasmania. The people of Tasmania have, on three occasions, made their position very clear on the dams matter. I believe that the Prime Minister got himself into an issue upon which he never thought he would have to act. If he thinks that he is just going to get out of this confrontation by passing an Act of Parliament, he ought to have second thoughts. If he wants a divisive issue, or to cause division in the community, he should pursue the line that he is now pursuing. I would be surprised if other members of State Parliaments are going to sit idly by whilst he blunders into Tasmania with an axe.

If he is successful in Tasmania, other environmental groups could come to this State and say, 'You are going to dig coal out at Port Wakefield. What a shocking thing—you cannot do that; They can rush off to friendly Bob to stop it. Who is going to supply electricity to South Australia? They could go to Leigh Creek and say, 'You have dug out huge mounds of dirt and have spoilt the environment—what a shocking thing, it should be stopped.' That is the mentality of the people who are making those noises. They rush off to Canberra to have an Act of Parliament passed. That sort of nonsense should be shown up for what it is.

The people of Tasmania are the best ones to make decisions affecting themselves. They are the ones who have to live by the decisions of the Tasmanian Government. The Tasmanian Government was elected on a policy to build a dam. The five House of Representives seats in Tasmania were retained by supporters of that Government. A referendum was also held about this matter. The honourable member is talking about national reconciliation and yet he is talking about a Government that would take the most Draconian steps in relation to a local community's affairs. If he is asking me to support that course of action by supporting this motion, he has another think coming. If I were the only member in this House I would not have my name attached to any support for an interventionalist policy in the internal affairs of Tasmania. Not only is it morally wrong, it is against the spirit of the Australian Constitution. Also, it is contrary to what has happened under all other Commonwealth Governments.

I believe that a small group of people, who may be well-meaning but completely misguided, are involving themselves in things about which they have little real knowledge. Fortunately, they are not the ones who have to make the hard decisions about the State's future. They would be the first people to stand up and complain if there were a shortage of electricity. They just change their signs. Most are professional agitators. One fellow at the Honeymoon demonstration could only stay for a few days after doing a few somersaults around the fence because he had to go to another demonstration interstate. These people are professionals organised by extremist groups within the community.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Labor supporters.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member may say that, but they were extremist groups who delight in organising well-meaning but misguided people. If the honourable member is calling on members to support the intervention in Tasmania, it is quite wrong of him to do that. It will be one of the most divisive courses of action taken in this country for a long time if the Federal Government attempts to intervene in this issue in Tasmania.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: It will go to the High Court.

Mr GUNN: Yes, Tasmania will have great difficulty in proceeding with that work. I intend to support the motion moved by the member for Fisher.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I congratulate the members for Hartley and Unley for their thorough and detailed contribution to the debate. I wish to support the motion and highlight several consequences of the economic mismanagement and failure of the policies of the Fraser Liberal National Party Government. The area I highlight first is that of unemployment, which has been referred to by previous speakers. However, several aspects of unemployment must be discussed. If one looks at the latest figures available on preliminary estimates in February 1983, they show that Australia now has a level of unemployment of about 746 300 people. If we look at South Australia's figures, that translates into 68 900 people looking for work. The average unemployment rate, therefore, in Australia is 10.7 per cent, but in South Australia is 11.1 per cent. Once again we are worse off than the rest of Australia.

The unemployment rate for the 15 to 19-year age group is much worse. The Australian average for that group is 27.3 per cent but in South Australia the rate is 30.5 per cent. This means that almost one in three teenagers between the ages of 15 and 19 is currently unemployed. When one looks at unemployment figures for all persons and when one looks at the breakdown of those figures, one finds an interesting comparison between the figures for men and those for women. For males in South Australia, in February 1982, 7.2 per cent of the work force were unemployed. In November of last year (the time of the South Australian election) 8.7 per cent of the males in South Australia were unemployed. If we look at the figure for females we find that that percentage had changed from 9.9 per cent in February to 8.8 per cent in November. One might be deluded by those figures into thinking that the situation of females in South Australia in terms of unemployment had therefore improved. However, I will take up one of the points made by the member for Hartley.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: Didn't you say 9.9 per cent in February?

Ms LENEHAN: Yes. One might think that the employment situation for females has improved. However, I wish

to add a new dimension to those statistics. As the member for Hartley said, there was a discussion on the point made that wages should be lowered in preference to looking at meaningful job creation programmes. That was stated by Mr Lynch. When we look at the figures for females unemployed, relative to males unemployed, there has been an apparent improvement caused by an increase in the number of part-time jobs available. Since January, part-time employment has increased by 23 200 jobs. Of that 23 200 jobs, 16 800 have been filled by females and only 6 400 positions filled by males.

The statistic is important because full-time employment has declined by 21 000 jobs. Therefore, the employment market is changing from a full-time employment market to a part-time employment market for the women of this country and this State, who are being asked to accept part-time employment, which is generally marginal employment. It has very little job security and very little, if any, career structure attached to it. It is, therefore, the sort of employment where, particularly for young women working in supermarkets, fast food areas, and so on, once they become a senior, their services are dispensed with. Whilst it may seem that there has been an apparent improvement in employment for women in the State, I would argue that the position for them has markedly decreased.

Mr Evans: Do you believe those jobs should be full-time jobs if an employer has only enough work for a part-time job?

Ms LENEHAN: I suggest that they should have much more career structure attached to them. Some of these jobs pay marginally more than, the same as, or marginally less than the unemployment benefit. I wonder how many members in this House would be prepared to work for that sort of remuneration. One has to look at the whole labour market in this State to see what is happening to people. I am not suggesting that every one of those jobs should be full-time, but we have to look carefully at what is happening to the labour market in this State.

I would like to make a point about the keeping of statistics in respect to unemployment. I think that it is very interesting that a Federal Liberal Government actually directed the Commonwealth Employment Service to stop collecting figures for the number of people who went into Commonwealth Employment Service offices looking for work. As we all know, those figures have not been kept now for a long time. We now have a system where we have estimates of the number of people unemployed which are arrived at by taking a survey. I would suggest, and this has been mentioned by the member for Unley, that these estimates in fact hide an enormous number of hidden unemployed, an enormous number of people who do not come forward and who do not show up in surveys. It is also interesting to note that the C.E.S. figures for unemployment were consistently higher than the A.B.S. figures at the time that the Federal Government decided to work only on the A.B.S. figures. I think that that is significant and says something about its wanting to know the true position relating to unemployment in this country.

I now move to the second area which I want to discuss in respect to the abysmal record of the Fraser Liberal National Country Party Government—the area of poverty. I believe that the previous Liberal Government has presided over the highest levels of poverty ever seen in this country. The fact that these figures are no longer kept by the Federal Government and that, indeed, the discussions about levels of poverty in this country have revolved around the work done by the Brotherhood of St Laurence indicates a tremendous abrogation of responsibility by the previous Federal Liberal Government.

I want to take up the issue of poverty because it is not just my opinion that the Federal Government was responsible for presiding over the worst increase in poverty that this country has ever known. I will refer to a couple of articles which appeared in the *Australian* on Friday, 17 December 1982. One article, written by Paul Lynch, states under the heading 'Nearly 3 000 000 on poverty line'.

> Nearly three million people are living on an income computed to be the poverty line for a couple with two children.

It goes on to say that in December of last year, according to the institute (and, of course, that is the research team from the Melbourne University), the new poverty line for a family with two dependent children was $189.80 per week including housing costs. What an indictment! Three million Australians are living on or below the poverty line.

Let us have a look at what an *Australian* editorial stated (and I do not think that anyone in this House would suggest that the *Australian* is some radical, left wing paper—it is probably, if anything, quite the opposite) under the heading, 'Getting the "poor" priorities right.' Once again, it acknowledges the point I have just made. The article states:

> It is well nigh impossible to measure the degree of poverty in Australia. Full marks to Professor Henderson who, in 1975, calculated a level of income for individuals and families below which people were, technically, poor. Melbourne University's Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research has been diligently updating the line, quarter by quarter, ever since.

Not the Federal Government, not the people who were entrusted by this nation to look after the poor of this nation, but, indeed, a university research unit has taken the responsibility of updating and making some kind of contribution to the debate about poverty in this country: that is another indictment of the former Federal Government. I think that this editorial is relevant. It continues:

> The wage freeze, if ratified by the Arbitration Commission, will also further reduce living standards.

I would like to finish this section of my remarks by further quoting from this editorial in the *Australian.* The editorial further states:

> It is worth recalling that when he—that is, Professor Henderson—compiled his report on the poverty line, Professor Henderson said the only way to wipe out poverty is economic growth. This gives the incomes to the community to be distributed more fairly, without making anyone else worse off.

I make that comment in support of my colleague, the member for Unley, who has very clearly articulated in this Chamber exactly what has happened to the income distribution in this country under a Fraser Government since 1975. I think that all of his remarks are endorsed by that editorial in the *Australian.* The editorial concludes, 'We do not help the poor by joining them.' I can only say to that, 'Hear, hear.'

It is interesting to note that on page 2 of today's *Advertiser* we have a further reference to Professor Henderson saying the following:

> The election of the Liberal Government in 1975 was a disaster for the poor. It came just two months after the Poverty Commission's final report. It was a Government with aims very different from those of the previous Government. 'It means that very little was achieved by the Commission in practical terms.'

This is the interesting part:

> Its only main achievement was to convince Australians that there was a poverty problem here.

What an indictment of a Federal Liberal Government!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LENEHAN: I would now like to move on to a third area, that of women in Australia. I think that women have probably faired worse than any other group in Australia. I wish to talk about just two areas in respect to women, one of which is not just a woman's issue but an issue that concerns all Australians—the issue of health care.

The fact is that, despite the assurances of Mr Fraser, Medibank as it existed in 1975 was disbanded. We now have a shambles of a health system. I am finding that people come into my electoral office who are probably $4 or $5 over the limit which entitles them to one of these 'poverty cards'. They are not entitled to receive any health benefits at all, so these people are taking a chance with their own and their children's health. It seems to me that it is an indictment of any Government that people who just do not have the financial wherewithal to be able to take up private health insurance are denied health cover.

I now move on to another area which is most interesting because it is now starting to concern the Liberal Party through the activity of women in the Liberal Party. I can only congratulate those women, because it has finally been brought to the attention of many members of Parliament that child care is no longer just a women's issue, or something about which we can just say, 'Let somebody else worry about it. We, as a Government, do not want to know anything about it'. I would like to briefly outline what has happened in respect to child care since 1975. In 1975, under the Whitlam Government, 75 per cent of the recurrent funding for the operation of child care centres was provided by the Federal Government. That was the position in March 1983 when the Federal Fraser Government went out of office? What we found was a complete reversal, that only 25 per cent of recurrent funding was being provided by the Federal Fraser Government and the States were expected to pick up the bill for the remaining 75 per cent of that funding. I think that those statistics speak for themselves and I do not think that one has to go on about them anymore.

One area which I think requires change, and in which there has not been any change, involves the Child Care Act of 1972, which was introduced by the Whitlam Government and, which at the time, was very progressive. However, in the ensuing 10 or 11 years since the Child Care Act was introduced, it has been shown that the system operating under the Act is not only confusing but is also inequitable and impossible to staff. I believe that the current Federal Government will in fact repeal that Act and, I hope, replace it with an Act which takes us into the 1980s and 1990s in respect to the provision of inexpensive, quality child care.

Before I conclude my remarks I would like to endorse the second part of the motion in which it seeks the support of all South Australians, irrespective of political considerations, for the programme of national reconciliation, economic recovery and reconstruction called for by a new Federal Government. As Professor Henderson stated in respect to job creation:

> We have now to look to the service sectors such as education, welfare services, tourism and restaurants. That's where the growth is and where employment will be in the future.

I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES REPEAL (AGRICULTURE) BILL

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal certain Acts relating to agriculture. Read a first time.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill seeks to repeal some 31 Acts relating to agriculture which have been found to be obsolete and/or duplicated by other Acts still on the Statute Book that we believe should be retained. Whilst the Liberal Party was in Government from 1979 to 1982 it set out deliberately to remove from the Statutes such obsolete material. Indeed, the former Government set up a deregulation unit in the Premier's Department to research the Statutes applicable to all portfolios, and the unit did an incredible job, having regard to the time and facilities available to it. The unit identified an enormous amount of material that had been stored, stacked and retained for whatever reason over the years. Consistent with this objective, as time and opportunity permitted, the former Government introduced Bills into this House for the purpose of repealing Acts that fell into this category.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I believe that the new Government has a somewhat different philosophy: I think it is a Government of regulation, not repeal.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The member for Davenport reminds me that the present Government has a somewhat different philosophy, that it has a different attitude of governing, and I accept the fact that in may respects the new Government is different. The Government has a different style, which at times might amount to dictation in regard to application of policies, and so on. However, that is not the purpose of this exercise. I am simply demonstrating the Liberal Party's desire (even though we are not in Government at present) to proceed with this programme of removing obsolete material from the Statute Book.

In respect to the Bill before the House, members will recall that last year, when in Government, I introduced an identical measure which proceeded to the second reading stage in this House, but the Government was unable to conclude that action before being displaced from office. The present measure is a repeat of that action. Upon introducing the Bill as Minister of Agriculture in 1982, I sought and secured the support of the then Opposition in this House, and a report that came back to this House from another place indicated that that support had also been secured from the Upper House. I would hope that, although there has been a change in Government, the Labor Party has not in the interim changed its attitude towards this most desirable measure.

I look forward to support for the Bill from members opposite. It is not unlike a Bill that I introduced during the Liberal Party's term of office in Government which was debated and passed. At that time the Government removed from the Statutes a number of obsolete Acts pertaining to the agriculture portfolio, including those provisions covering the Fruit Fly Compensation Committee, Oriental Fruit Moth Committee, Renmark San Jose Scale Committee, Waikerie San Jose Scale Committee, Berri/Bamera Red Scale Committee, Markaranka—Pooginook Red Scale Committee, Renmark/Lyrup Red Scale Committee, Swan Reach Red Scale Committee, Waikerie District Red Scale Committee, and so on. On that occasion we enjoyed a swift passage of the Bill which was introduced for exactly the same purpose as the one before the House at the moment.

The Liberal Government sought to deregulate controls on small business in South Australia, and the deregulation unit did an enormous amount of work and was very successful in the action that it instigated in regard to several administrative directions to take away encumbrances concerning the activities of small business. I refer to the consolidation licensing and registration and various other details surrounding small business in South Australia which were welcome improvements. The unit was begun by the Tonkin Government and performed very well during its period in office. I hope that present and future Governments will continue to monitor the superfluous encumbrances hovering over businesses and the community at large and to limit them where possible.

Returning to the second reading explanation, and before seeking leave to have the detail inserted in *Hansard*, let me say that, on coming into Government and gaining the responsibilities of agriculture, I inherited more Acts as a

Minister of this State than did any other Minister of that Government, including the Premier. Added to that massive list of Acts, associated in the main with agriculture and in part with the portfolio of forestry, was another quite significant list of statutory authorities. Added to the responsibilities of those Acts and statutory authorities coming under that portfolio was an incredible number of committees that had been set up over a long period to service the respective departments, in particular, the Department of Agriculture.

Some were of an inter-departmental nature, some were of a standing committee nature, and some of an *ad hoc* nature. It appeared that the pattern and attitude over the years had been to accumulate, build up and add to, but never to take away the superfluous or obsolete activities of those respective groups. Even in that latter area we deliberately set out while in office to reduce the number of committees servicing the Department of Agriculture, and in fact we reduced the number by 90. That theme or style to cut out the red tape and the superfluous and obsolete areas was not only introduced when we came into office but positively adopted throughout that period.

I am not here to boast about our successes and achievements during that period, but I raise the subject in introducing this Bill for the simple reason of seeking the co-operation from the Party that is now in Government to continue with that style and get off the Statute shelves all material that is of no value now and would seem to be of no value in future. We are too cluttered, as a community and as a Parliament, with such measures. In this instance, I believe that this Bill covers the greatest number of Acts ever contained in a Bill in Australian political history for repeal at the one time. I am proud to be associated with an action of that kind, and I look forward to the support of the Party in Government in this House and their colleagues in another place. I seek your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the House to have inserted in *Hansard* the balance of the second reading explanation without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to repeal a number of Acts relating in general to agriculture which are now obsolete. The effect is to clear the Statute Book of redundant enactments, an object to which this Government is committed by its policy of deregulation. In most cases the Acts were passed to provide financial assistance to farmers in times of hardship by reason of disastrous seasonal climatic conditions. Another large category is that of fruit fly compensation which concerned the urban community and in each case related to fruit fly outbreaks in a specific year.

Each of the Acts was designed to meet a contemporary situation which was of a limited duration. It is desirable that obsolete enactments be repealed in order that the Statute Book remains as uncomplicated as possible. The provisions of the Bill are as follows. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the Acts set out in the schedule. The schedule sets out the Acts which are to be repealed. I shall summarise briefly the effect of each of the enactments which the Bill proposes to repeal, and the reasons for its redundancy. The Drought Relief Acts of 1914, 1919, 1923, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1940, 1945 and 1946 were all basically enacted to provide drought relief to farmers for that particular year. Some of the Acts related to previous seasons as well, when these were drought years. These Acts had a finite time of operation.

Acts which related to the same problem were the Drought Relief Act Amendment Act, 1920, which was introduced to overcome a legal difficulty in recovering moneys loaned for drought relief and the Drought Relief (Extension) Act, 1929, introduced to assist farmers because of poor seasonal conditions. In a similar vein the Drought and Frost Relief Act, 1944, was introduced for the purpose of providing assistance to primary producers who suffered loss through drought or frost in 1944.

The Frost Relief Act, 1927, was introduced to assist fruitgrowers whos crops were destroyed by the frosts that occurred in September 1927. The Voluntary Wheat Pool Agreement Ratification Acts, 1924, and 1925, were introduced for the establishment of a voluntary wheat pool in South Australia for the marketing of wheat of the 1924-25 season in the first instance and in the second instance for its continuation for another three years. The Hailstorm Relief (Validation) Act, 1925, was introduced to ratify action taken by the Government to get relief for those unable to assist themselves or get relief from other sources for the damage done by a hailstorm in 1924.

The Farmers Relief Act, 1931, the Farmers Relief Act Extension Act, 1931, and the Farmers Relief Act, 1932, were introduced to provide finance for farmers due to the effects of drought in previous years. In the first instance this was for the season 1931-32 due to the effect of previous drought years and the poor return in 1931-32. The passing of the Farmers Relief Act Extension Act, 1931, had the effect of extending the assistance into the 1932-33 season and the Farmers Relief Act, 1932, extended the period of the operation of the legislation to cover the 1933-34 season.

The Chaff and Hay (Acquisition) Act, 1944, provided the necessary powers for the Government to acquire supplies of chaff and hay in order to meet the requirements of primary producers in drought-affected areas of the State. The powers of the Act were to remain in force until 30 September 1945.

The Wheat Stabilisation Scheme Ballot Act, 1948, the Wheat Price Stabilisation Scheme Ballot Act, 1953, and the Wheat Price Stabilisation Scheme Ballot Act Amendment Act, 1954, were introduced in the first instance in 1948 to authorise the holding of a ballot of wheatgrowers on the Commonwealth Government proposals for the stabilisation of the price of wheat. The 1953 Act was introduced to ascertain the views of wheatgrowers on a further stabilisation scheme. Due to the delay in getting all Governments to agree to the stabilisation proposals, it was necessary to amend the 1953 Act to include growers who delivered wheat in the 1953-54 season. Hence the 1954 Act was introduced to amend the 1953 Act, to allow those who delivered wheat to the board in 1953-54 or who planted 50 acres or more of wheat for the 1954-55 season to also be included in the poll.

The Waite Agricultural Research Institute Grant Act, 1948, enabled the South Australian Treasury to make an additional grant for the upkeep of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute for the financial year 1948-49. The grant ($7 000) that was requested by the institute (through the University of Adelaide) was to help the institute balance its accounts. The University of Adelaide in its budget for 1948-49 had actually requested $8 000 extra for the operation of the institute, but this had not been accepted. It was hoped that in future years the budgeted figures for the operation of the institute would be sufficient and additional grants not necessary.

The Fruit Cases Act, 1949, was introduced to alleviate a shortage of packing cases for fruit and vegetables during 1949. The Act was intended to prevent the removal of these boxes from the trade either through non-return or in some cases destruction for kindling. The Fruit Fly (Compensation) Acts of 1967, 1968, 1971, 1971 (No. 2), 1972, 1972 (No. 2), and 1974 were introduced to provide compensation for fruit losses arising from the campaigns for eradication of fruit

fly by South Australian Department of Agriculture officers. These Acts related to particular outbreaks in particular years.

Since 1974 the method of fighting fruit fly outbreaks has changed. Whereas in earlier outbreaks all fruit for a 1½ km radius was stripped from trees, from 1974 only infested trees were stripped and any fallen fruit within a radius of 200 metres was taken. Compensation under this method of control is now very small and if required is paid from Ministerial sources. Hence no Acts are required. Therefore, it is appropriate that each of the Acts contained in the schedule to the Bill be repealed.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 5.54 to 7.30 p.m.]

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this House welcomes the choice of Adelaide as the venue for the Australian Constitutional Convention to be held from Tuesday 26 April until Friday 29 April 1983, and accordingly will make available this Chamber and related services for the meetings of delegates, representatives, and advisers during that time; and that this resolution be communicated by the Speaker to the Chief Executive Officer to the convention.

Since Federation, there have been only two Constitutional Conventions. The first, in 1942, was called by Prime Minister Curtin and was the occasion of the transfer to the Commonwealth of the powers which now see it as the pre-eminent Government in Australia, war-time powers and national responsibilities. The second, in 1973, was called by Prime Minister Whitlam.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It was initiated by the previous Government. Prime Minister Whitlam only got into the act afterwards.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That convention held its first session in Sydney in 1973. At that time it was agreed between the Commonwealth and the States that there were some areas of the Commonwealth Constitution that needed revision and change. There was great enthusiasm in those early years of the convention, but that early energy and enthusiasm unfortunately has not been sustained. Indeed, conventions doing something positive have been overdue since 1959, when the Commonwealth inquiry into the Constitution was held. We now have the opportunity to pick up on that energy and go forward with the optimism that many of the issues that were being canvassed 10 years ago have now had a substantial airing in the community, in Parliaments, and in political Parties, and have also been the subject of articles in magazines and academic journals.

The Fifth Plenary Session of the Australian Constitutional Convention, which will be held in Adelaide from 26 to 29 April 1983, will, I believe, be one of the most important sessions of the convention. It has the potential to effect great and substantial changes to the political life of Australia. South Australia has led the way over many years in a number of areas of Parliamentary and legal reform. It is these matters that will attract most attention when the convention meets here next month.

The agenda for the Fifth Plenary Session covers a number of areas related to an integrated system of courts, specific items that ought to be included in the Australian Constitution and, perhaps most importantly, the issue of fixed terms of Parliament, the conduct of elections, and the role of Upper and Lower Houses. It will also deal with a number of matters relating to the legislative power of the Commonwealth and the nature of future meetings of the convention.

It is worth reminding members that, as they enter this building, they pass each day a plaque that commemorates an earlier meeting of representitives of the States, although not a Constitutional Convention because it was held in 1897 before the Federation was formed. Indeed, yesterday (22 March) was the 86th anniversary of the Adelaide meeting of the Australian Federal Convention. It was dominated by such men as Charles Cameron Kingston, Richard Chaffey Baker, and Edmond Barton. That meeting produced a draft Bill which, though amended at later meetings, formed the basis of the Constitution. Interestingly, the major debate at that 1897 meeting was over the powers of the Senate, especially its power to reject money Bills. Perhaps that is ironic, because there was a plenary session of the present Constitutional Convention scheduled to be held in Adelaide in November 1975, but events in the Senate in relation to money Bills made that meeting impossible.

I consider that the convention session in Adelaide has the potential to achieve much. In a number of areas there seems to be a consensus across Party lines, whereas in other areas there are strongly opposed views. However, by the active participation of all delegates it is to be hoped that the results of this convention will be a clear picture of what is considered to be desirable constitutional change for better government throughout Australia and for the benefit of all Australians. I am happy that Adelaide is the venue for this convention, and I ask members to support the motion.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of Opposition): I second the motion, which has my strong support. I remind the Premier that it was the McMahon Liberal Government that perceived the concept of a Constitutional Convention in the early 1970s but, when an election intervened, the idea was taken up by the Whitlam Government. The Constitution of Australia is essentially sound but this does not remove the need for reassessment and review from time to time. Such reassessment and review is an important part of the democratic growth of Australia. The convention should avoid the temptation of making change for the sake of change, and I do not doubt that it will avoid such temptation. Instead, it should look at those sections of the Constitution that are no longer meeting the changing demands of the Parliaments and the people of Australia.

South Australia has long been a leader in social reform in Australia; therefore it is appropriate that the Constitutional Convention should be meeting here next month. On behalf of the Opposition, I assure the House that members on this side support the motion, and I give an assurance that we will provide any help required by the delegates, representatives and advisers to ensure that the Adelaide convention is a successful occasion.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I cannot support the motion. A similar resolution passed by the House late last year was couched in similar terms to that now before members.

The SPEAKER: Order! I wonder whether the honourable member for Flinders has been misled somewhat, because the Premier did seek leave as to the use of the facilities of the Chamber and other matters as distinct from the substantive motion appearing on the Notice Paper and providing for the make-up of the South Australian delegation.

Mr BLACKER: I thank you kindly, Mr Speaker, and I withdraw my remarks. I was referring to the Notice of Motion (Government Business) No. 1.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): Mr Speaker, may a member speak in general terms about the convention and present any views held on the goals of the convention and the original intention of the Australian Constitution, or should that debate take place on the substantive motion?

The SPEAKER: My ruling is that the motion as moved by the Premier is limited specifically to the provision of facilities; therefore, it does not give the opportunity for a philosophical or political discussion at large. In saying that, and in case anyone should wish to dissent from my ruling, I should also point out that the foreshadowed motion on the Notice Paper would be interpreted by me in the same way, although I would grant greater leniency in respect of the make-up of the delegation. Does that help the honourable member for Fisher?

Mr EVANS: Yes, Mr Speaker, it helps me, because I believe that, if a member wishes to support the appointment of certain delegates, that member may want to express an attitude and should be able to indicate to the delegates what that member sees as the function of the convention. The member should take the opportunity to speak then.

The SPEAKER: Rather than at this stage commenting on the expressions on the honourable member for Fisher, who has had a long association with the convention, I will simply let the matter lie without pre-empting a ruling. Does any other honourable member wish to speak on the motion before the House? If not, I would by leave of the House simply say one thing and that is that, as Speaker of the House and as the proposed Chairman of the Constitutional Convention, I am very grateful indeed that honourable members of all political persuasions have been so co-operative in the various quite intricate moves that have had to be made in relation to making those facilities available to the members of the convention as distinct from members of this House.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That whereas the Parliament of South Australia by joint resolution of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly adopted 26 and 27 September 1972 appointed 12 members of the Parliament as delegates to take part in the deliberations of a convention to review the nature and contents and operation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose any necessary revision or amendment thereof and whereas the convention has not concluded its business now it is hereby resolved:

(1) That all previous appointments (so far as they remain valid) of delegates to the convention shall be revoked;
(2) That for the purposes of the convention the following 12 members of the Parliament of South Australia shall be appointed as delegates to take part in the deliberations of the convention: the Hons J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins, M.B. Cameron, G.J. Crafter, B.C. Eastick, E.R. Goldsworthy, K.T. Griffin, T.M. McRae and K.L. Milne, Mr Olsen, the Hon. C.J. Sumner and Mr Trainer;
(3) That each appointed delegate shall continue as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia until the House of which he is appointed otherwise determines, notwithstanding a dissolution or a prorogation of the Parliament;
(4) That the Premier for the time being, as an appointed delegate (or in his absence an appointed delegate nominated by the Premier) shall be the leader of the South Australian delegation;
(5) That where, because of illness or other cause, a delegate is unable to attend a meeting of the convention, the leader may appoint a substitute delegate;
(6) That the leader of the delegation from time to time make a report to the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council on matters arising out of the convention, such report to be laid on the table of each House;
(7) That the Attorney-General provide such secretarial and other assistance for the delegation as it may require;
(8) That the Premier inform the Governments of the Commonwealth and the other States of this resolution.

This motion deals with the membership of the delegation from the South Australian Parliament, the arrangements for appointing substitute delegates, the means by which the delegation shall report to Parliament and the support to be provided to the delegates. The composition of the delegation is six Government members, five members from the Opposition and one member from the Australian Democrats. The composition of this delegation is similar to the delegation which the former Government had nominated, in that it also sent six Government members.

However, it does differ in one respect, namely, the substitution of a representative from the National Country Party for that of an Australian Democrat. Given the results of the last election and the fact that there are now two members of the Australian Democrats in the Legislative Council, it was considered appropriate that they be represented at the convention. The delegation from the South Australian Parliament will be supplemented by the three delegates nominated from local government. I believe that the composition of the delegation and the persons nominated to it will do justice to the South Australian community at that convention.

I would draw attention to the fact that we are not, as is the case in at least one other Parliament (I do not know whether that has been persisted with—I would sincerely hope not), attempting to ensure that there is an absolute overriding Government majority on such a delegation. There are, in fact, equal numbers, if you like, from Government Parties and from Opposition Parties. As such, I believe that the delegation will represent very well the overall South Australian community.

I also indicate that I am pleased that the local government delegation being sent to the convention has people on it with long and varied experience and background in that area, and that will contribute greatly to the discussions and debate that will take place. There are a number of issues on the agenda of the convention which attract bipartisan support. There are others that have a lesser degree of consensus, but I believe that the spirit in which the convention is being called and the climate of expectation building up about the convention, particularly in respect of the decisions it will make about elections and the conduct of Parliament, will make it a most important one. There is no doubt that it can provide clear guidelines to the sort of constitutional and Parliamentary reforms necessary to take us into the next century. There will undoubtedly be more sessions of the convention.

One of the items that will be considered will be the composition of future delegations. There is a proposal that the composition of the delegations to future plenary sessions extend beyond the existing membership and allow for much greater direct community participation in the activities and debates of the convention. This is an issue which has a great deal of merit, and it certainly deserves a great deal of attention. I am sure that, like all of the other topics, this issue will receive that attention, but for the moment the delegation is as proposed in this motion and I commend it to the House.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the motion, including the composition of delegates representing this Parliament at the convention, and I do not think that there is any need for me to enlarge on the Premier's remarks.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I wish to comment briefly and say that I support the people who have been nominated by the Premier as delegates to the convention to represent this Parliament. However, I regret that the member for Flinders is not able to continue to participate. Along the way, we have seen changes in the minority group representation. In the first instance, we may recall that the member for Mitcham was included, and numbers were used to bring that about, while the member for Kavel (now Deputy Leader of the Opposition) was eliminated. The member for Flinders was

subsequently brought into it, and I believe that he was keen and enthusiastic to have the opportunity to represent the Parliament at the convention. Each member of Parliament would like the opportunity to attend, but I nevertheless support the nominations as they are. I regret that I am not continuing, but I know that we are not now in Government, so there is one less on the major Opposition Party side than there would have been if my Party were still in Government.

I believe that the three people nominated are the proper people to represent our Party from the House of Assembly, namely, the Leader, Deputy Leader, and the member for Light, and I am quite satisfied that their knowledge and understanding of the position is quite adequate to serve the interests of Her Majesty's Opposition. In supporting the nomination of the delegates, I think it is quite proper for me, as one of the members of this Parliament representing part of the State, to say that we need to be conscious at all times that the Australian Constitution was created to form a central Government to govern in those areas where the States could not.

The SPEAKER: Order! At this point—and the honourable member paid me the courtesy of foreshadowing what he was likely to say—I must rule that the motion is couched very specifically so that it deals with the persons who make up the delegation, the circumstances in which those delegations may be changed and the duties which may lie upon those persons. Even though I know and acknowledge that for 10 years the honourable member for Fisher has been a leading member of the Australian Constitutional Convention and a person who has performed great work on its subcommittees and, in particular, on some of the subcommittees referred to by the Premier—given all that atmosphere of bipartisanship—I do not believe that the honourable member can steer the debate into a philosophic area.

Mr EVANS: I will attempt to stay with the ruling, Sir. I will pick up the point the Premier made when he said he believes there is an opportunity for the delegates to come to a consensus agreement on some issues that would lead to better and easier government. Although I do not necessarily agree with the comment, I do not want to debate it. The purpose of the convention is not to look, as the Premier may have suggested, for easier government for political Parties. Its purpose is to try to find the best Constitution to serve the Australian people and to amend it if necessary. Before the convention begins, if I wish to expand the debate, I will have to give notice of motion in order to do so. I find some difficulty, when we are discussing the delegation and the names being submitted of people who represent the Parliament and the State, if we cannot give some indication of the responsibility of those people. I accept your ruling, Mr Speaker, but in so doing I can understand why some States talk of secession as against a central government.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I do not oppose the spirit of the motion moved by the Premier and seconded by my Leader. I am concerned, however, to draw members' attention to the wording of the substantive clauses which give effect to the intention of the motion. My intention is to seek to ensure that, on this occasion (and on subsequent occasions), there is no uncertainty whatever in any circumstances as to who the delegation shall comprise and who shall lead it. I believe at the present time, given the wording of the motion the Premier has moved, that, whereas in subclause (2) the Premier is named as a member of this place, he is then referred to again as the Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to interrupt the member for Mallee unnecessarily but it might help the business of the House if, prior to the honourable member moving his proposed amendment or speaking to it, the other honourable member wishing to speak (the member for Flinders) is heard. That would in no way detract from the right of the member for Mallee to move his amendments, according to the wishes of the House, either together or separately. I propose to rule accordingly at this point. The honourable member would appreciate that he loses no rights. I call the member for Flinders.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I express my concern at the manner in which the issue has been dealt with. I apologise for debating the wrong motion. I was reading the white Notice Paper which gave the first resolution in detail whereas the green paper itemised the two motions to be moved by the Premier. I raise a matter which I believe is consistent with the debate that took place late last year. In particular, I refer to the implications of subclause (3) of this motion which is couched in the same terms as the provision previously passed by this House. It states:

> That each appointed delegate shall continue as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia until the House of which he is appointed otherwise determines, notwithstanding a dissolution or a prorogation of that Parliament.

Those exact words were the words passed by the House and, as a result of that, a delegation representing South Australia was appointed. I find that those same words have been put into this resolution, despite the fact that the Government of the day has seen fit to change the delegation's composition. How valid is the resolution we are passing now? It is couched in identical terms and, notwithstanding a dissolution or prorogation of the Parliament, its specific meaning is the same. Now we have the Premier or the Government of the day coming forward with the same resolution. I question the validity of any resolution passed by the House in this way if an incoming Government can do the same thing.

I refer to the Premier's remark about the Australian Democrats. When the matter was before Parliament on the last occasion, there were two Australian Democrats in the 67 members of the two Houses of Parliament. There can be no doubt about that. The numerical strength of its representation has not changed one iota but, in this case, contrary to the resolution passed by the House and to other requirements of that resolution (I refer specifically to subclause (3)) the Government has decided to recognise that there should be a change. I was looking forward to the Constitutional Convention. I was a delegate to the South Australian Constitutional Convention, which I believe was another step forward. After having 10 years experience in this House, I could have played my part, small though it might be. I believe that my involvement in constitutional debates in this Chamber over that 10 years would give me at least some background to be a delegate to the Constitutional Convention.

Again I express my disappointment, first, at being removed from the delegation in such a way; and, secondly, I question the validity of any resolution couched in the same terms, notwithstanding a dissolution or prorogation of the Parliament, being ignored in such a way.

Mr LEWIS: I do not intend to proceed with the amendment which I have before the House to subclause (2) but I do intend to proceed with the amendment to subclause (3). I do not believe that it is good practice in any circumstances to have a method of appointment of delegates from this Parliament in which it is possible for people who are not members of the Parliament to be its delegates. The effect of subclause (3) at present could result in a situation where members of the delegation may no longer be members of the Parliament. I believe that that is wrong. Therefore, I move:

> Leave out subclause (3) and insert—

(3) That each delegate shall continue as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia until—

(a) the House by which he was appointed otherwise determines;

or

(b) he ceases to be a member of that House, whichever first occurs.

The SPEAKER: As I understand the situation, the member for Mallee wishes to leave out subclause (3) of the Premier's motion and to substitute a further subclause. In putting the amending motion, I must warn the House that if the Premier speaks he closes the debate. I think that in fairness I should indicate to the honourable member for Flinders that, in the fairly murky water that we are in, it may be that on this subclause he will have a further opportunity to speak although, again, I would have to think on that.

Mr BLACKER: Mr Speaker, with your indulgence, I do not wish to further complicate the matter, but I accept the point of the amendment moved by the member for Mallee. I think that it is only right and proper that such an amendment be entered on the record. However, whatever we do with this resolution, I question whether in fact it will have any effect on this Government or any future Government because, as I pointed out previously, a delegation was appointed 'notwithstanding a dissolution or a prorogation of the Parliament', and that resolution has been totally overruled. We have not met since that happened and I query the validity or effectiveness of such a resolution irrespective of which way it passes this House.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not prepared to accept or support the amendment, because I believe that it is effectively redundant. Subclause (3) *(a)* of the proposed substitution is in fact already covered. It refers to the House being able to determine whether or not a person shall continue as a delegate. That power is always open to the House. It can change the delegation as and when it wishes, of course, provided it is in session so to do.

Subclause (3) of the motion I moved points out that each appointed delegate shall continue as a delegate of the House in which he is appointed until the House in which he is appointed otherwise determines. Therefore, paragraph *(a)* is covered. The substantive difference is paragraph *(b)*. The motion before us talks about a person continuing as a member of the delegation, notwithstanding a dissolution or prorogation of the Parliament, whereas this amendment would have any individual ceasing to be a member of that House, whichever first occurs. Again, I think that this is redundant, because we are talking in terms of the House of Parliament establishing a delegation. Once that delegation is established, unless and until the House changes composition of that delegation—and it can only do that when in session—the delegation remains as the representatives of the House.

The effect of the honourable member's amendment could be that somebody ceases to be a member of the House, but is still quite capable of taking his or her place on the convention floor but, because the House of Assembly is not meeting, we simply go into the convention a member short with no means of replacing him.

Mr Lewis: Subclause (5) covers that.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: True, it allows for a substitute, but that says 'because of illness or other cause'. I guess that it depends on whether one would interpret it in that way. However, I would suggest that to make the position clear the honourable member should also amend subclause (5) to refer to any procedure under subclause (3).

However, be that as it may, the fact is that it could still leave a hiatus, and I do not really think that there is much point to that. In fact, the onus should be on the House wherever possible to meet and ensure that its delegation is up to date, that it has been appointed and that it is truly representative. We are doing that on this occasion; I hope that the House, however composed, will do so in the future, and I think that that is where the power should lie. Once we have appointed delegation members, let them get on with their continuing work while they remain capable of so doing.

Amendment negatived; motion carried.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Racing Act, 1976-1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to amend the Racing Act to provide financial assistance to the racing industry in South Australia. In 1980, both Houses of Parliament approved amendments to the Racing Act which put into effect certain recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry into Racing. Those changes were intended to alleviate the critical financial position that confronted the three codes and to offer them a means to re-establish their viability by improving the quality of racing offered to the public in this State. One of the major points of that legislation was the sharing of the operating surplus of the Totalisator Agency Board equally between the Government and the racing codes.

Since that time the position has been closely monitored and although there has been a considerable increase in both on-course and off-course totalisator betting and the situation is continuing to improve, the Government considers that further action is required. The decision to take further action has been made in recognition of the important role that the racing industry plays in the State's economy through its investment in property, plant and equipment and its provision of employment both on a full and part-time basis.

The Government, therefore, in light of the continuing difficulties of the industry, proposes to provide to the industry additional funds of approximately $761 500 per annum. This will be achieved through the sharing of unclaimed dividends and fractions on dividends related to Totalisator Agency Board betting, one-half being paid to the Hospitals Fund and the other half being shared between the separate funds of the three racing codes within the Racecourses Development Board in the proportion that amounts bet with the Totalisator Agency Board for each form of racing bears to the total amount bet with the Totalisator Agency Board.

As an adjunct to these legislative amendments, further assistance will be provided to the industry through an agreement reached between the Government and the Totalisator Agency Board. Under that agreement the outstanding balance in the Capital Loss Account on Databet will be amortised over a period of 10 years, and the amount made available as a result will form part of the board's surplus and be shared equally between the Government and the racing codes. The interest earned on the capital fund and commission fees received from the operation of the agency at Broken Hill will also be shared on the same basis. Collectively this should generate an estimated $162 750 per annum.

The Bill also provides for the restoration of the 1979-80 bookmakers' income by a reduction of .23 per cent in turnover tax without restoring the stamp duty on betting tickets. This will have the effect of reducing the Government revenue by approximately $393 000 per annum based on 1979-80 figures (the last year in which stamp duty was collected). The 1.4 per cent of turnover tax paid to clubs will not be affected.

Finally, the Bill includes an amendment that will authorise the Racecourses Development Board, with the approval of the Minister, to pay an amount standing to the credit of the fund for any of the codes to the controlling authority for that code for the purpose of providing stake-money. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amendments made by clauses 3, 4 and 6 (relating to the application by the Totalisator Agency Board of moneys accruing through the non-payment of fractions and through unclaimed dividends) shall have operation from 1 August 1982. The other clauses of the measure are to operate from a day fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 76 of the principal Act which provides that any amount accruing to the Totalisator Agency Board by virtue of the non-payment of fractions is, within three weeks, to be paid to the Treasurer for payment into the Hospitals Fund.

The clause amends this section so that only one half of any such amount is to be paid into the Hospitals Fund. The amount remaining is, under the amendment, to be divided between the funds for the various forms of racing kept pursuant to Part V in the proportions that the amounts bet with the Totalisator Agency Board in relation to each form of racing bear to the total amount bet with the board in relation to all forms of racing during the period elapsing from the date of the last payment under the section.

Clause 4 amends section 78 of the principal Act which provides, at subsection (3), that an amount accruing to the Totalisator Agency Board or an authorised racing club by way of unclaimed dividends shall be paid to the Treasurer for payment into the Hospitals Fund. As in the case of clause 3, this clause amends the section so that only one half of any such amount accruing to the Totalisator Agency Board is to be paid into the Hospitals Fund. The amount remaining is to be divided between the funds for the various forms of racing kept pursuant to Part V upon the same basis as is provided for under clause 3.

Clause 5 amends section 114 of the principal Act which provides for the payment by bookmakers to the board of a percentage of their winnings from bets. Under the clause, the percentage applying in relation to a bet made within the metropolitan area or at registered premises on a South Australian race is reduced from 2.3 per cent of the amount payable to the bookmaker under the bet to 2.07 per cent of that amount. In the case of such bets made on races held outside South Australia, the clause reduces the percentage from 2.9 per cent to 2.67 per cent. In the case of bets made with a bookmaker on a racecourse outside the metropolitan area, the percentage is reduced, in relation to bets on South Australian races, from 2.1 per cent to 1.87 per cent, and, in relation to bets on races held outside South Australia, from 2.7 per cent to 2.47 per cent.

Clause 6 makes an amendment to section 133 consequential upon the amendments made by clauses 3 and 4. Clause 7 substitutes for section 137 (the operation of which has expired) a new provision authorising the Racecourses Development Board, with the approval of the Minister, to pay an amount standing to the credit of the fund for a form of racing to the controlling authority for that form of racing for the purpose of the provision of stake-money for races held by registered racing clubs.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ALSATIAN DOGS ACT REPEAL BILL

Adourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 December. Page 106.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I point out at the outset that the Minister who has introduced this Bill is flying in the face of opposition from a large section of the community. However, I acknowledge that the Minister is supported by a large section of the community in the action that he has taken. However, many responsible people in the community are concerned about the fact that the Minister of Local Government is prepared to take from local government a right which has been developed and been in vogue for very many years. I know that it has been argued that there is an alternative and that under the new Dog Control Act local government has been given certain powers which will offset some of the loss of power that they will have to accept as a result of the repeal of the Alsatian Dogs Act. However, notwithstanding (and it is still a matter of legal question), there may be ample opportunity for councils to protect their ratepayers by another means. Local government authorities are gravely concerned that the Minister has undertaken this action without prior consultation. In fact, he brought the matter before the House before he assumed his present office without direct consultation with local government authorities.

I refer to two telegrams that I received a few months ago, when it was first publicly announced that the Minister intended to introduce this measure, which demonstrate how clearly local government authorities feel about this matter. The first telegram through the C.T.O. Adelaide on 14 December 1982, and adressed to me, states:

> Council wishes to reaffirm its previous opposition to repealing of the existing Alsatian Dogs Act. Council also wish to retain their right to determine control over specified classes within their council area as now provided under regulation 66 (2) *(e)* of the Act. They are also concerned with the fact of the premeditated act of disregard to law in regard to the original keeping of the dog 'Tara'.
>
> Moffatt, District Chairman.

That telegram was from the Penneshaw sub-office. On the same date, again through the C.T.O. Adelaide, I received a telegram from the sub-office at Kingscote which states:

> Council wish to reaffirm its previous opposition to the repealing of the existing Alsatian Dogs Act notwithstanding council's retaining the ability to hold the keep of prescribed classes of dogs prohibited within their council area as now provided under the provisions of regulation 66 (2) *(e)* of the Act. Council also wishes to advise that there is a deep concern on Kangaroo Island that there may be a blatant disregard of due legal processes with regard to the matter of the dog 'Tara'.
>
> (signed) District Council of Kingscote.

Those two telegrams give a clear indication of the genuine feeling of those two councils. They were concerned not only about the overall repeal of the Act but also about the matter of a legal argument involving the people of Kangaroo Island in regard to a dog that had been illegally transported to Kangaroo Island. I have no doubt that some of my colleagues will refer to that matter later.

Other local governing bodies, although they have not contacted me about this matter, at the Local Government Association annual meeting in Adelaide some three weeks ago drew my attention to their concern that they had been by-passed and to the fact that there was considerable concern expressed by their legal advisers that they would be unable to adequately control the Alsatian dog menace, as they put it, as a result of the Minister's action. Another organisation which is very positively opposed to the Government's action and which is quite publicly concerned about the lack of consultation with regard to the responsible position that it holds in the community, is the United Farmers and

Stockowners Association. That association has recently reaffirmed the fact that it is totally against the repeal of this Act. It also questions the manner in which the Minister has got around (as they put it) the Act thus far by way of executive regulation. That is a matter that has been brought to the Minister's attention and to the attention of the public on several occasions. I am not suggesting that such regulations have not been passed previously, because they have been, following a very real request. I say 'real' in the sense that it was a considered judgment and a positive request by the people concerned to the Minister of the day to pass a regulation to allow an Alsatian dog into an area which otherwise prohibited that breed of dog.

The Minister would be aware that in the North of South Australia in some of the opal mining places, in Leigh Creek and at other places, as a result of requests, regulations have been passed, at which times there has been no adverse criticism of the Government in responding to the legitimate requests of people who had positively considered the matter. The Kangaroo Island situation is entirely different in that the Minister has taken action against the expressed wish of local government and of the community that it represents. I have mentioned before the matter concerning possible control or alternative control as provided by the Dog Control Act. I do not want to canvass the entire aspect of the Dog Control Act because I do not believe that that will assist the debate on this issue. However, I refer to an amendment to the Dog Control Act introduced by the previous Government (Act No. 58 of 1981, page 577 of the 1981 Statute Book). Provision is made for orders of seizure and detention of savage dogs in new section 50a.

I will read the whole of this section so that it fits in with the balance of the debate on this issue. Section 50a states:

(1) Where a justice is satisfied, upon the application of an authorised person, that there are reasonable grounds for believing that a dog is dangerous, the justice may, by order, authorise the authorised person to seize and detain the dog under this section.

(2) An application for an order under this section shall not be made to a justice who is a member, officer or employee of a council.

(3) An authorised person, acting in pursuance of an order under this section, may exercise such force as is necessary to seize and detain a dog to which the order relates.

(4) As soon as practicable after a dog has been seized under this section an application for an order for destruction of the dog shall be made.

(5) Where the application for an order for destruction of the dog is refused, the dog shall be returned to its owner.

(6) The council may recover from the owner, as a debt, the reasonable costs incurred in the seizure and detention of a dog under this section.

There are some questions in the public mind, and, I am led to believe, by legal representatives, as to whether the term 'savage dog' in this particular context relates only to the dog which is savage in the sense of its apporoach to human beings or its danger to human beings.

One of the real reasons for the original Alsatian Dog Act was that there was a concern about the interrelationship which might develop between the Alsatian and any wild dog, possibly including the dingo. I say 'wild dog' on the basis that there are a number of dogs that have escaped from normal custody that roam in packs and that live in the wild. They are in every sense a feral animal exactly the same as the feral cat, goat or camel, or those other domesticated pets or livestock belonging to the human population which have escaped and which have created some problem in outback areas.

The Alsatian dog was, regrettably, seen by a large number of people as a potentially savage animal and that savageness, if interrelated to dogs in the wild, was perceived to be a very real danger to livestock. The Alsatian was also one of the largest dogs which was then currently in human domestication. Since that time, there have been a number of other breeds where the size of the dog is equal to that of the Alsatian or even heavier and one would have to admit and accept that the fear expressed about the Alsatian in the past could equally well be expressed today about a number of other dogs, some of which have been used for guard dogs and a number of which (certain strains) are known to possess savage characteristics.

I would not want it believed that I accept that all Alsatians are savage. Any dog is a potentially savage animal, particularly if it is aggravated or has not been controlled and properly trained in its upbringing. Regrettably, in the post-war years in Australia, because there had been very little genetic material coming into Australia to allow for an upgrading of Alsatian dogs in Australia, there developed a rather unfortunate characteristic aggressiveness among a large number of the Alsatian breed. It was the knowledge of that aggressiveness that enabled this Act to remain in force for the period that it has. Concern continued to be expressed about this breed because of the real danger that once existed.

I have indicated to members previously that in my previous vocation before coming into this Chamber I had a good opportunity to recognise the traits and habits of a large number of dog breeds. I place on record that I would not rate, from my own experience, the Alsatian as the most savage animal in relation to stock. There are pure-bred and cross-bred breeds that would win hands down over the Alsatian for savagery, from my knowledge. Even though it may upset some people who are owners, I would have to say that I have never seen greater damage to livestock, particularly to lambs, than that which is created by the Labrador dog that disappears from home and gets amongst a sheep flock. With jaws like a vice, they can do more damage than any other dog that I have yet met. Certainly with the fads which relate to the dog world in the sense that a particular breed is more commonly sought after, we have progressively seen over the past 20 years an increase in the number of Dobermans, Boxers, Labradors, Retrievers—

An honourable member: Afghan hounds.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: —Afghan hounds and—

Mr Lewis: Rotweillers.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: —as my colleague from Mallee indicates, more recently the Rotweiller, a dog which has far greater physical capacity and weight than the Alsatian, which is the subject of this piece of legislation.

I make mention of this matter because I also want to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that the community concern, particularly in rural areas and in near rural areas—that is, in the hobby farm situation and in the small farm development close to urban development—is for the overall problem of attacks on livestock by dogs. The Alsatian has, regrettably, by virtue of the existence of this Act, been charged with a degree of discrimination, or a degree—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: That is not proven.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: If the Minister gives due consideration to all of the factors I have mentioned thus far, I have never said that it is unproven, I have said that it has not been my experience that the Alsatian is necessarily the worst. I can certainly give him line and verse on a number of occasions when an Alsatian has been in the middle of a pack of dogs or been the only dog creating trouble. Let us not discriminate against a breed, which the Act thus far has done. I point out to the Minister that while the Alsatian Dog Act has existed, there has been no discrimination against other breeds of dogs which have become more popular and which are probably causing just as much concern.

On that basis, the action that the Minister is taking could be conceived to be quite reasonable. However, that is not necessarily the way that local government sees it; it is not

the way that the United Farmers and Stockowners sees it; it is certainly not the way a lot of individual stockowners would see it.

I highlight the point that, even with the demise of this Act, there will still be an urgent need for those persons responsible for the conduct of the Dog Control Act to make sure that it has sufficient power within its sections to allow a more effective control of wayward dogs than has necessarily been the case in the past. I have already picked up the introduction of clause 50a as possibly being a means whereby local government can exercise the type of control necessary in this matter.

I do not suggest for one minute that section 50a is necessarily the only section of the Dog Control Act that can be used by local government or by a person aggrieved by dog attack. This matter requires constant monitoring and may well require a further alteration to the Dog Control Act if it can be demonstrated that there has been a relaxation in respect of any breed requiring legislative control or support.

Under the heading 'Messages from the PR desk', the December 1982 issue of the *South Australian Canine Journal,* at page 10, states:

> My thanks also to those people and organisations who went to bat for the dog fancy on the recent issue of proposed legislation which would have led to the restriction of ownership of certain breeds in the various council areas. To everybody who cared enough to take a stand on the issue, thank you.

In the period leading up to the 1982 State election, there was almost hysteria in the canine world. There was also considerable misrepresentation as to what was intended by the previous Government when it accepted the premise of the member for Napier (now the Minister of Local Government) that there was an urgent need to ensure beyond any doubt that protection was provided under the Dog Control Act that would adequately replace any dilution of legislative control that was currently available under the Alsatian Dogs Act. The way that action by the then Government was noised abroad does not reflect any credit on the Minister and certain other people who took and beat up the articles and made the assertions that were made on that occasion.

The United Farmers and Stockowners questions the tremendous outlay that must be made under the Dog Fence Act for the maintenance of the dog fence. As they see it, the door is being left open for dogs, especially the Alsatian, to create far greater difficulties than the dog that is presently being controlled by the Dog Fence Act. This is not a matter of which I can speak with any great knowledge, and the member for Eyre and the member for Alexandra, a former Minister of Agriculture, would know more about this matter than I. However, the stockowners are concerned about the interplay between the Dog Fence Act and the repeal of the Alsatian Dogs Act.

As this matter was dealt with publicly before the last election by the member for Napier, and as it was publicly stated during the course of the election campaign that this action would be taken if the member became a member of the Government after the election, I believe that the Bill should be supported. However, in saying that, I express the qualification that South Australian stockowners and local government bodies must be backed up adequately and, if it is perceived that a change is necessary to protect their interests, that change should be made. That is the basis on which I support the Bill. My support is therefore qualified by the reality of the matters I have brought to the attention of the Minister and I should like to believe that he will undertake, as a matter of course, to seek from his officers in about 12 months time a report on the effect of this repeal or on any problems that have arisen over that period as a result of the repeal of this legislation. I believe that is the least the Government can offer to do and I will certainly follow up on such a course of action.

The only other qualification which I believe is necessary is that the Minister should check closely so that, in respect of any future action contemplated to alter legislation that affects the important local government lobby and the United Farmers and Stockowners Association lobby, he does these organisations the courtesy of initiating discussions as to his intended action. There have been cases already in the life of this Government where a Minister has failed in the consultation process and I believe that that consultation is a must on the part of any Party that aspires to assume office in this State. Ministers must recognise that they have been appointed not as dictators but as representatives of the people, and the best way to represent the people includes discussing fully and frankly the problems of people and the effect that legislation to deal with those problems may have on them.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. In particular, I support the latter part of the comments made by the previous speaker as to the need for consultation with local government on the effects of legislation the Government may be contemplating. Only after the Government agreed to vary the situation on Kangaroo Island so that Alsatian dogs could go there were comments made by several councillors and people representing councillors. There was a feeling of hurt that consultation had not taken place, especially as the Minister at a certain function had indicated that the policy of his Government would be one of consultation. So the people at Aberfoyle Hub who had an interest in Kangaroo Island and in other rural areas were concerned to know that there had been no consultation in relation to that change in regulation concerning the presence of Alsatian dogs on Kangaroo Island.

I will not cover the same ground as did the member for Light, who made a fine contribution on those aspects of the legislation with which he dealt. However, I emphasise to the Minister that, while he and his officers are trying to improve dog control in the community by eliminating discrepancies (which this Bill does), he should also be looking at other areas.

The Alsatian or German shepherd, as it is more commonly referred to today, is a large animal and can do a lot of damage if it is allowed to run wild. I am not saying that that breed is the worst offender. Like the member for Light, I am conscious that in the Hills area the Labrador is the worst killer. It is not so much that they carry out the most frequent attacks; when they do attack, they do not make any noise. They do not bark, and one is not aware of the damage that is being done until too late. Most other breeds tend to bark and cause some commotion, which gives one an indication that something is going on. If one is within a reasonable distance, it is brought to one's notice.

The Labrador is a very good leader. That breed is highly intelligent. I am not saying that other breeds are not intelligent, but Labradors are quite often found to be leaders of a pack. Strangely enough, very seldom do we find an Alsatian or Great Dane, or that type of breed, acting as a leader. It is either a very small dog or one the size of a Golden Labrador; sometimes if the cattle dog is a rogue dog, they are leaders.

A sudden increase in the number of large dogs within our community, whether Alsatians or any other breed, because of action this Parliament takes to encourage people to keep larger dogs, will create a menace for the near-city small property owners. I hope that the Minister would pick up the concern the councils have about identification of dogs. Tattooing really needs to be implemented so that the council can enforce both tattooing as well as collars and discs.

Part of our bushfire problem is related to this area. In days gone by many small properties, even within the inner metropolitan area, were able to raise one or two sheep, but that has now disappeared, because people are now more affluent and more dogs are being kept. The dog population is enormous compared to what it was 20 or 30 years ago, because people in those days could not afford to keep dogs except for work, show or breeding purposes. A few mongrel dogs were kept, but not in the numbers that they are being kept today.

Many people have properties which they would like to have cleared of undergrowth. The simple way of doing that is by grazing. It is not appropriate to keep cattle and horses, because if children throw stones at them or they become disturbed, they smash fences and cannot be contained. Sheep are the logical choice. In one case in the hills face zone an owner has lost over $6 000-worth of sheep in a period of 10 years, and he has just given up and let it go. That land goes back to wilderness. It is on a steep part of the hills face zone, and it is fuel for a fire in the future in the back part of the Happy Valley area.

I support the move. I am disappointed that under section 57 of the Dog Control Act it is still not clear whether councils can limit the number of dogs of a particular breed a person may keep on a property to none. I think we should give local government the opportunity to decide what breeds can be kept in the community, more in relation to size; if they believe that large dogs are a menace around shopping centres they should be able to discriminate on size and also on numbers down to none. I think from the way section 57 is worded they can only limit the number, and I do not believe nought is a number. That is the difficulty; they cannot exclude dogs altogether.

The local council is elected, and people support that council. It can make by-laws banning dogs in a street or shopping centre, and if people do not agree with that, they can vote that council out. We are taking out discrimination against a particular breed of dog. I hope that local government will have the opportunity to control this area, because if ever there was an area which should be under local government control, it is the dog-menace problem. I am not referring to the responsible dog owners, but rather the irresponsible owners who have let their animals roam the streets.

I support the measure, and I hope that the Minister will bring down a report over the next 12 months, and then 12 months after that, to see the results of the repealing of this Act. More particularly I hope he will take up the challenge to tighten the Dog Control Act and give local government as much power as possible in controlling a menace in its own area. I support the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): This measure, which has been debated in this House on numerous occasions, is one on which I think the views of country members have been made quite clear. I have a great love of the German shepherd, and I hope one day to be the owner of a German shepherd. Members of my wife's family are owners of German shepherds and they are, to say the least, magnificent animals. That is not why the original Bill was brought before Parliament. It was brought before Parliament to protect the pastoral areas of the State and to control the spread, if we like, of Alsatians and to attempt to prevent owners from allowing the dogs to become wild animals. I think we have all recognised that an Alsatian, if allowed to run wild, can do a tremendous amount of damage in the livestock industry. It is a large animal and can cause wholesale slaughter within a pastoral flock. That was the purpose of the original Bill.

The Minister has indicated that the provisions being repealed by this amending legislation are covered by the Dog Control Act. That could be questioned. I think we will find that the provisions within the Dog Control Act deal primarily with the control of domestic dogs in and around towns and nearby country areas. The United Farmers and Stockowners have been consistently opposed to this legislation, and many areas of local government have been consistently opposed to the repeal of the Alsatian Dogs Act. I have in my electorate three district councils which border pastoral country and it is their concern that Alsatians may be allowed to become killers again. The real problem is not the dog or breed of dog, but the irresponsibility of the owner. That is where the need for control is the greatest. Responsibility should be the order of the day for any person who owns a dog, irrespective of its size or breed.

At the end of this saga, I am still not convinced that the repeal of the Alsatian Dogs Act is the best way to handle the situation. I know that if I talk to pastoralists or people in the northern areas of the State, they are not convinced that this should occur. As much of my area does border on pastoral country and as I have some pastoral country in my electorate, I do not feel I can support the legislation as proposed. I reiterate, for the sake of German shepherd owners, that it is not my intention to reflect upon the breed. I hope to have one in the not too distant future, as I believe they are very loyal and valuable dogs. I cannot support the legislation for the repeal of the Alsation Dog Act, for the reasons mentioned. I believe that the Minister has run clean over the top of the producer organisations and many local government areas which are having problems. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I do not propose to speak at length in this debate but I signal my opposition to the Bill before the House. I believe that every member in this place, and indeed a wide section of the South Australian community, is aware of my views on this subject. As has already been indicated, it is not a matter of whether one loves Alsatian dogs or does not love them. It is not a matter of comparing the marauding features of that dog with another breed or breeds. It is a matter of principle that the Minister of Local Government chose, before becoming Minister, during and since that appointment, to abuse his authority. He took a step to override community feelings and views and has set an incredible precedent in that respect. In particular, it is the impact on the Kangaroo Island community to which I shall refer in this debate.

As was pointed out to the House by the member for Light (the shadow Minister of Local Government), the Minister has abused his privilege. He ignored the views expressed by the Kangaroo Island community, not only through their State representative but also through the voice of officers of two local government bodies representing that region. He failed to discuss the subject with me. He abused the community mercilessly after his trip to Kangaroo Island when he said that, on walking down the street in Kingscote, he found a dog on every doorstep. I assure the Minister that he did not endear himself to that community. Those people will not forget. In the long term his actions and remarks will prove an embarrassment to his Premier and colleagues.

The Minister smiles, and I know that he is taking great delight in his unprecedented measure. He is reported to have said, when expressing glee about the subject, that, on ultimately becoming successful, he will invite the local member for Alexandra to a celebration. He has made other such cynical remarks. If the Minister is relieved or pleased with his comments in that direction, I suppose some good comes out of it. Many little men do enjoy such capers. I hand it to him as one of those situations where he has got some real personal enjoyment.

This subject goes much deeper than that petty behaviour. A deep principle is involved. Never before in this State

(and to my knowledge never before in Australia) has a Minister of Local Government walked over the top of a community and condoned the abuse of the law as he did during the period when the law was abused by the Doig family in taking a dog to Kangaroo Island. Never before has a Minister completely ignored the requests of the community to the point where he did not even bother to speak to the council or its representatives. It was not until he made his first public appearance as a Minister of the Crown after the 1982 election that he was ultimately fronted by the Mayor of Kingscote—a delightful lady.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: And well received.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: That is rubbish! The Minister was embarrassed, and deserved to be embarrassed, throughout that public occasion. That delightful little lady, the representative of local government in Kingscote ground the Minister into the dirt. Indeed, he deserved every bit of it. I can assure the Minister, and every member in this place, that what that little lady said to the Minister on that occasion at the Meadows District Council centre she meant. She said words on behalf of every person on Kangaroo Island, except may be the Doig family, who had abused the law. When we talk about abusing the law, it was not the first time that that family had abused the law. One does not have to go very far up the Riverland to pick up evidence of the abuse they exercised before shifting to Kangaroo Island. One does not have to go beyond the Renmark police station, where evidence of that abuse is locked up in the safe. However, that is not a subject before the House tonight. The subject before the House involves, amongst other things, the gross abuse of the law in relation to the activities of that family. As cited by the member for Light in his address, they tried to take that Alsatian dog, Tara, to Kangaroo Island via the ferry. They were informed by the authorities that to do so would be to break the law. They failed to get the co-operation of the shipping authority. They tried to take the dog via the regular airline service through West Beach airport, where again they were told that it was a breach of the law. They did not get co-operation from that authority. However, by devious means—either by private aircraft or by fishing vessel—they sneaked the dog into the community in the face of public opinion, thereby grossly breaching the law and the Minister condoned every move they made. Indeed, he publicly commended them for their action. He supported them all the way down the line—even after they had been charged and after they had been issued with a summons. He unsurped the law by introducing a regulation in order to not only retain the dog on the island but also to get the family off the legal hook. I believe that that action, in isolation from the whole of the broad elements of the subject, was a gross breach of the law and a disgraceful act by a Minister of the Crown. I do not believe that he will ever live it down.

When we talk about the memory of the community, we should not underestimate the memory of the Kangaroo Island community. They do not forget. One only has to go back to 1971, when the late Jimmy Dunford tried to walk over the top of them as, indeed, in 1982 his colleague in this place has done. What happened then? A view was expressed and that gentleman and the union organisations he represented abused that view and placed not only the industrial people directly involved under a so-called black ban, but placed a black ban on the whole of the community. That community stuck to the principles which it espoused at that time—and would again, if necessary—locked in together, fought the case, and won it with considerable help from certain communities on the mainland. To avoid that individual receiving a six months gaol term, the Premier of the day bailed him out with public funds.

To cite another example, that community did not forget, has not forgotten and will not forget that incident. They went to the courts at that time not only with their own resources but also with the assistance of a number of districts on the mainland. One of the many districts and communities that helped Kangaroo Island citizens in that instance was the Meadows District Council area, in particular, that southern region of the Meadows District Council area comprising the Kondoparinga ward which was almost totally burnt out in the recent fires. As I said before, those people on Kangaroo Island did not forget: as soon as they heard about the plight of the people in Kondoparinga, they came to their aid and put 20 semi-trailer loads of hay on the boat and sent it to them. They do not forget, and I repeat that they will not forget this incident. They will not let the Minister or his colleagues in Government forget it, either. I will not let them forget it. I repeat that it was a disgraceful act.

I support the principles outlined in relation to the keeping of Alsatian dogs in confined areas. I support the objectives expressed by members of keeping them out of the pastoral region of South Australia, in particular. I support the United Farmers and Stockowners' organisation view, which they as recently as in the last 24 hours reaffirmed, and I seek from the Minister a little common sense in his attitude to this subject. I urge him to set aside more time for himself or his department to find some other way of rationally dealing with this subject and to avoid abusing the long-standing communities in this State which I believe deserve to be heard in this place. I reiterate my stand: I bitterly oppose the Bill.

Mr Becker: When are you going to secede?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: There are a number of grounds on which that matter ought to be considered, and this may well be one of them. As they accumulate, I imagine that we will continue to monitor that situation and consider its advantages and disadvantages from time to time. However, I have no desire in this instance to hold up the workings of the House. I signal my intention to oppose the Bill at every reading and at every level of its progress through this Chamber. I look forward to support from fair-thinking people in this Chamber to oppose the Bill *in toto* at the appropriate time.

I realise that personal, sensitive views are held by a number of members in relation to the breed and their association with Alsatian dogs. However, I, too, have had some association with Alsatian dogs and, if members have not experienced the sort of savagery that can occur and has occurred as a result of attacks from that breed—and I concede other breeds as well—on children even when accompanied by members of their families, then perhaps those members just do not understand. I understand the feelings of people who have experienced that sort of situation, and I would hope that the sort of mockery that has been demonstrated by the Minister and some of his colleagues in relation to this subject ceases and that, whatever the decision of the Parliament is, it will ultimately result in improving the law on this matter. However, in relation to this subject, let it never be said that I have not put my views clearly and plainly on the record.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): First, I would like to thank the member for Light and the member for Fisher for their contributions. Whilst criticising certain aspects of this Bill, they gave qualified support. The member for Alexandra was true to form, and I accept his opposition: he has an obligation to the people on Kangaroo Island in voicing his violent opposition in this matter.

I will not enter into the debate about how the people of Kangaroo Island view me or the Government on this matter,

because the last correspondence I had with both the Mayors of Kingscote and Penneshaw indicated that everything had settled down. There has not been a large influx of German shepherds into the area, but what is done cannot be undone, and they are left with the situation. Perhaps the contribution made by the member for Alexandra will make great front-page reading in the *Islander*, but that is basically what we expect from that member.

I make perfectly clear that all Opposition speakers have mentioned the United Farmers and Stockowners and their opposition to this Bill. I made my position perfectly clear when in Opposition I introduced a private member's Bill to repeal the Alsatian Dogs Act. I also made it patently clear that, if we were to win Government and I became a Minister, I would move to repeal the Alsatian Dogs Act. It seems that the United Farmers and Stockowners have consulted with everyone but the Minister. All I received was one letter, and that was when I was an Opposition member, saying that they were opposed to my private member's Bill. They never consulted me as Minister.

The member for Light talked about consultation, and I am perfectly honest when I say that I, too, believe in consultation. However, there must be consultation from both sides. All that the United Farmers and Stockowners needed to do was lift the telephone and arrange a meeting, and I would have seen them and explained why I was going to introduce this Bill. The member for Light, who I think made the best contribution from the other side, said he recognised that the German shepherd is not the most vicious dog or kind of animal that has been portrayed by those people who live in the Far North or on Kangaroo Island. There are other dogs that are more savage.

The member for Light suggested that, under the Dog Control Act, I should review the repeal of this Act within 12 months, and I give an undertaking to this House that, if this Bill is successful tonight and passes through the other place, officers of my department will carefully monitor the situation throughout the State. If there is a need to strengthen the Dog Control Act, I will introduce the relevant amendment. That is a fair undertaking that I am giving to the House.

I have always maintained that the Alsatian Dogs Act has been superceded by the Dog Control Act, which contains a number of provisions for the effective control of all dogs. Under that Act, any dog, irrespective of its breed, worrying stock and farm properties can be destroyed on sight. That is the important point that we should understand tonight. We are not talking about German shepherds: we are talking about any breed of dog which is worrying stock.

The important provision is in section 66 of the Dog Control Act which permits the Governor to regulate the keeping and control of any class of dog in any area. So, if any breed of dog is causing a problem anywhere in the State, the Governor can regulate, through section 66, to prohibit that dog from the area. That is the most important section. Notwithstanding the views of the member for Light, I undertake to carry out a complete review within 12 months.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (36)—Mr Abbott, Mesdames Adamson and Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, P.B. Arnold, Baker, Bannon, Becker, D.C. Brown, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Hopgood, Keneally, Klunder, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, Wotton, and Wright.

Noes (4)—Messrs Blacker, Chapman (teller), Gunn, and Lewis.

Majority of 32 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (35)—Mr Abbott, Mesdames Adamson and Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, P.B. Arnold, Baker, Bannon, Becker, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Hopgood, Keneally, Klunder, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rodda, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, Wotton, and Wright.

Noes (4)—Messrs Blacker, Chapman (teller), Gunn, and Lewis.

Majority of 31 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing): I move:

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

Motion carried.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 March. Page 385.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I am very pleased that the present Government has seen fit to reintroduce this Bill because it was a measure that I had drafted last year as a result of considerable discussions that I had with the two elected members of the South-Eastern Drainage Board, members of local government and also landholders in the South-East of this State.

It became apparent to me after quite a bit of discussion with the various persons and the groups that I have mentioned that there was a need to relook at the role of the South-Eastern Drainage Board and in particular where the future of the board and its responsibilities should lie. There is no doubt that the board has had a very responsible role to play from the time of its inception with the development of the South-East. But now that the development of the South-East has largely been achieved and the engineering side of the works has been undertaken, I believe that it is very appropriate that the elected board members should take a more prominent role in the running of the board and also with the responsibilities that the board has vested in it under the South-Eastern Drainage Act.

As a result of the discussions that I had in the South-East with local Government and with the board members, I decided that it was time that amendments were made to the Act and that, in fact, an elected member of the South-Eastern Drainage Board should be in a position to be elected, or appointed, as Chairman of that board.

One of the principal amendments provided in this amending legislation is that an elected member of the board can be the Chairman. In the past the Chairman has always been a member appointed by the Minister (which in this case is the Minister of Water Resources) and that person has usually been an officer of the E. & W.S. Department or the Lands Department, who in many instances has had significant engineering or administrative experience within the Public Service.

As I said before, I believe it is very appropriate at this stage that the role of Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board should go to one of the elected board members. To effectively achieve this, and to make certain that there is a continuity of elected representation on that board, a provision

has been included in the Bill for staggered elections. This means that instead of the elected board members serving for three years they will now serve for two years, with a board member being elected every two years. That in itself is extremely important because a situation could arise where both board members came up for election at the same time creating a position where, if they were both defeated at that election, the board could be left with very little expertise on it. The other two appointments are made by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister. One of those appointments is usually (or has been in more recent times) the Regional Manager of the E. & W.S. Department in the South-East. The other involves the appointment of the Secretary to the board.

With the change of positions (and this was highlighted by members of the board) in Government departments, the situation could arise where the two elected members were defeated at an election and the member appointed by the Minister (the Regional manager of the E. & W.S. Department in the South-East) was transferred to a different position in South Australia, thus leaving the board with little expertise.

As I said at the beginning of my explanation, I am delighted that the incoming Government has seen fit to reintroduce this Bill because the former Government did not have time to put it through prior to the State election. I am quite certain that the local government, land holders in the South-East and the two present elected members of the South-Eastern Drainage Board, namely Mr Norsworthy and Mr Spier, will be extremely pleased that this legislation is proceeding at this time. On behalf of the Opposition, I support the Bill, believing as I do that it will not only improve the operation of the board but also conduce to the welfare of the people in the South-East generally.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I do not intend to delay the passage of the Bill. I reassure the member for Hanson on that point and note the comfort with which he is occupying his bench at present, not wishing to disturb him. I find it necessary to support the remarks of the previous speaker, who was Minister of Lands in the Tonkin Government. It is with great pleasure that I do so because I know of the enormous amount of time he spent investigating thoroughly the operation of the board and the way in which it discharged its responsibilities to the people of that locality. I especially admired the sensitivity with which he saw the changing role for the board emerging as a result of the perception in the minds of many of my constituents who had their farmlands drained by means of drains owned and maintained by the board.

That changing perception means that they now find that the volume of water (at their immediate disposal) just subsurface is falling and that some more appropriate means of retaining, or at least trying in some part to restore, the immediate sub-surface water table is necessary. Clearly, the policy that the board develops and administers in respect of the restoration of the immediate sub-surface water table is best determined by people with local experience of the effects of drains on land in that locality: local experience not only in the general context but also in the specific context. Where weirs should be placed; whether they should be permanent impediments to the free flow of water away from that land or only temporary or seasonal impediments; whether they should be complete or partial: such matters need to be determined on the basis of experience derived season by season and locality by locality. The former Minister (the member for Chaffey) understood the need for consultation with the communities of the South-East and, in consultation with the board itself, devised these amendments as to the way the board should be comprised and determined.

One matter that concerns me is that the board has a limited jurisdiction as to the geographical area it covers. It is a moot point in the local community whether the jurisdiction over the area for which the board is responsible for draining away surface water is sufficient or insufficient. Seeing and understanding the dilemma of the people in that locality, the Minister gives greater control to those people to solve that problem through this Bill. The area is clearly delineated at present, but that does not mean it must remain so. Apart from the South-Eastern Drainage Board itself, there is also the Tatiara Drainage Trust and other areas, similar in geographical formation to the area for which the board is responsible. However, these areas are not controlled by any Government or semi-government authority. In such areas problems are emerging as neighbour contends with neighbour as to how excess surface water should be moved from one locality to another and from one property to another.

In this respect, I foresee that, without the capacity for further consultation of the kind of which the new board will be in respect of communities for which it will be responsible, it will not be possible to resolve any changes in the boundaries of the board. I am talking about the areas farther north, about the waters from within the board area and from the Tatiara Drainage Trust area flowing out of those areas over the surface of the land onto areas not controlled by anyone responsible for the drainage of that surface water. That is the problem.

I hope that we have now come through one of the worst droughts in the history of the State, but we need to remember that in the previous year, at any rate in the South-East of South Australia, we came through the worst year of flood since the inception of the board, a devasting 'wet drought' when thousands of hectares were inundated not with inches but with feet of water which moved slowly but surely along the water-course it took in times before the board was established and before any drains for which the board was responsible were built. It cost those landholders who were affected a loss in income of millions of dollars and it damaged their property greatly, not so much the fences and buildings but more particularly their pastures.

It was seen as especially difficult to manage the flow of water, given the distance from which decisions were being made (in Adelaide) as to how to control the movement of those waters from Victoria into the area controlled by the board. For instance, in the Bool Lagoon area, where waters flowed northwards from Kalangadoo and areas farther south and east, when the drains overflowed into and along Bakers Range, where water had never flowed since the building of Bakers Range drain. It took too long for authority to be vested in the people who controlled the weirs on those drains to respond quickly enough. The inevitable consequence of not getting weirs out of the way of that moving floodwater was the flooding of the old Bakers Range water-course.

Some people saw that as a blessing and a necessity, whereas others saw it as incompetence and a scourge, and such people cursed the inflexibility and the incapacity of the board's management system to respond to the immediate emergency as and when it might have been able to. We see by this amendment that the board will be more effectively controlled by the elected representatives. They are the representatives of the local agricultural communities engaged in crop production and grazing. We can expect a more effective response to that kind of emergency in the future and, indeed, at other times a more effective management policy in the retention of scarce water in years like the one we have just been through, when it is desirable to retain as much water as possible for as long as possible in the drains so that they can replenish the immediate subsurface underground water table.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): First, I point out I am grateful to the Opposition for its support of the Bill. I appreciate the efforts of the previous Minister in his discussions with landholder members and with local government which led to the introduction of the Bill in the previous Parliament. The Bill ensures a continuity of experience and expertise with staggered elections in relation to the board. Members would be interested to know that I recently visited the South-East with a view to inspecting firsthand the South-Eastern drainage scheme. I was accompanied by the current board members. I take this opportunity of conveying my appreciation to those board members for the time, effort and courtesy extended to me during my visit to the South-East. I appreciated the very comprehensive nature of the drainage scheme, which has been operating for some years and which from time to time has been added to. There were substantial amendments to the Act in 1980, the major one of which meant that rates were no longer levied on landholders in the area.

I note the comments of the member for Mallee about the area of board responsibility, but the board does have responsibility for administering and indeed maintaining the scheme. The information I gleaned when visiting the South-East and my experience indicate that the people concerned, the South-Eastern Drainage Board members and their staff, do quite an effective job in maintaining the system.

The board also has a responsibility, as the member for Mallee would know, for the administration of the Eight Mile Creek area, which was also part of our inspection, and for the supervision of expenditure of funds that are allocated to the District Council of Millicent and its drainage operations. So I am very grateful for the support of members opposite. As I said previously, I appreciate the efforts of the previous Administration and, in particular, the Minister in presenting this Bill to the House on a previous occasion. It is true that it lapsed owing to events at that time. I believe that it was our responsibility, in the interests of people living in the South-East, particularly the landholder members of the board, to reintroduce this legislation, and that is what this Government has done.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Chairman, Deputy Chairman and other deputies.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: In relation to clause 5, dealing with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and appointment to those two positions, I ask the Minister what is the Government's policy in relation to the other appointed members of the board. Does the Minister have a policy as to how the appointments will be made in relation to the recommendations made to the Governor on this matter, because the other two are not elected?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I understood that the question asked by the member for Chaffey related to policy. It would be my view that the persons who are presently appointed by the Governor are public servants who have certain expertise and knowledge, and we would want to retain that expertise and knowledge. As Minister, I certainly would wish to retain them in order to facilitate the effective and efficient management by the board of the South-Eastern drainage scheme. I would be surprised if the member for Chaffey did not agree with that line of thinking, so I do not intend to change the policy. I believe that the appointment of those members should be made. This amendment gives the Minister that opportunity only after first consulting with the board and considering any recommendation that the board may make.

I do not reject that theory, either, and if one of the landholder members is recommended to be Chairman, as Minister I believe that I would have to take notice of that recommendation. However, I do not think that would impede the opportunity for appointment of other members. My view of the matter, in my short experience as Minister, indicates to me the very effective capabilities of current members in regard to this operation. As the member would know, the two landholder members have been there for some considerable time, and they contribute very significantly to the operations of the board. So, in answer to the matter raised by the member, I think that the current situation should be maintained and, as this amendment indicates, it would then be necessary for the Minister to take note of the board's recommendations in regard to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I could not agree more. The whole purpose of clause 5 is to enable one of the elected board members to be Chairman. I was ranging a little wider than the clause. My real concern was that the Government's policy in the past to appoint a person in the nature of the Regional Manager of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in the South-East was a very logical one.

I think it is extremely important, not only in the normal running of the board but certainly in a time of crisis when a flood situation develops. The expertise of someone like the Regional Manager of the E. & W.S. in the South-East is extremely important, as are the resources available to the Regional Manager to bring into the board at that time. I was concerned that the Government may have other ideas about appointing other than someone like that.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 March. Page 385.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I take it that I am not the lead speaker for the Opposition in this case. However, I would like to take the opportunity to support the measure, as introduced by the Minister, and indicate that it is merely a broadening of the terms of reference to allow handicapped persons to apply to the council for permits for exemption. It has been rightfully brought to the attention of the Government that the original interpretation of the Act was such that a person was physically disabled if he had a leg injury, artificial leg, paralysis or some impairment of that kind. Obviously, physical impairment can cover a broader area and can limit one's mobility. It has been suggested in the second reading explanation that a heart condition, or something of that kind, could be a reason for the disability. The amendment is commendable. I hope that it does not open a panacea which could cause some embarrassment to the Adelaide City Council. I do not believe that to be the case. In the Minister's summing up of the debate, I hope he will say whether these provisions could apply to other regional cities throughout the State or whether this Bill is purely for the Adelaide City Council. Needless to say, the measure has merit and has my full support, knowing full well the restrictions that handicapped people have, particularly when it comes to mobility around the city.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I also support the Bill. As stated by the previous speaker, it is a commendable effort to expand this provision for parking for the disabled. The previous speaker said it was a broadening, but that does not cover the effect of the amendment. To me it is significant.

I have had protests from people who have a disability and who cannot get a parking concession. I was surprised to see the number of people who have been allowed this provision—only 430 permits. It has been restricted; it would be hard to get a permit for persons with a disability.

The second reading explanation implied that people had not applied for it, but I believe that it was that interpretation put on it by the council that was far too rigid. The extension of it is a good thing. The other point made by the previous speaker was also significant. The Bill as such applies only to the Adelaide City Council. That is far too restrictive. I do not know what would be required to make this provision available to other councils and corporations in this State, but it is certainly a facility that should be considered and looked at because, obviously, everybody who needs the concession will not be going to the city. Many shop or live in regional cities or outer suburbs. Many do not get into the city but live within their own community. It would be a vast improvement to this concession if it were allowed to other areas as well.

I fully support the amendment, and I am sure that many people in our community will now benefit from it. I ask the Minister to clarify what will be required for people to get a certificate or concession. Will they have to be certified in some way? Will they need medical evidence to present to the council? How will it be done? In summary, can it be extended to other council or country areas and what form of certification or application will be required?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): The Liberal Party certainly supports the amendment to the Motor Vehicles Act now before us. It was the Government of 1978 that introduced this measure. It allows disabled persons to have certain parking rights which other people do not have in the City of Adelaide. A number of members have mentioned the small number of disabled persons who have made use of the provision—only 430. All of us were rather surprised at that low number. One problem has been that the amendment introduced in 1978 was extremely restrictive, although I do not think people realised at the time that it would be so restrictive. The permanent disability referred to applied only to mobility of limbs and, therefore, other disabilities, such as a coronary disability, which impaired people's mobility, were not an acceptable basis for the purposes of getting a permit under the original Act.

This measure completely broadens that definition, so that any person with a major permanent disability which impairs his or her mobility and any person who is unable, because of that disability, to use public transport is therefore able to obtain a permit. I have spoken to the Secretary of the Totally and Permanently Disabled Soldiers Association of Australia, which is the group that has requested this provision. May I say that I compliment the former Minister (the member for Torrens) on the groundwork that he did in this area. For instance, in his second reading explanation of the Bill, the Minister says that there has been consultation with the Adelaide City Council. In fact, the consultation with the Adelaide City Council took place under the former Government and, on checking, I find that there has been no consultation by the new Government.

I suspect that exactly the same situation applied regarding Sir Charles Bright, who put up the original recommendation, which was then enacted in 1978, and I support it. Speaking to the Secretary of the T.P.D.S.A., I found that that organisation certainly supports this measure. It is happy with the Bill, which meets the requirements that it requested of the member for Torrens when he was Minister of Transport.

I also compliment the present Government on following through that initiative and now introducing the legislation. I think that this measure will help a number of unfortunate people in our community. Our whole community tends to be oriented towards helping those who are fit, well and capable, and in the past we have often ignored or neglected those people with certain disabilities. This is one small way of correcting that anomaly.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): In supporting the Bill, I find it gratifying to know that the new Government has picked up the physical impairment clause rather than the previously very restrictive clause. It is satisfying to me to know that at long last a Government has done this, because some years ago I plagued a previous Minister of Transport (Mr Virgo) with many questions to introduce the original provision and that was partly for disabled persons. In those days it was for handicapped persons.

It surprises me to find that there are 430 persons with permits because I did not believe that there were that many people who would be in a position to drive within the city limits or who would even want to do so. However, in accepting the physical impairment clause I take it that the Minister will accept the definition. I hope that he will, because otherwise we will have more problems. Section 4 of the Handicapped Persons Equal Opportunity Act, 1981 provides:

> 'physical impairment' means—
> *(a)* the total or partial loss of any function of the body;
> *(b)* the loss of a limb, or of part of a limb;
> *(c)* the malfunctioning of any part of the body;
> or
> *(d)* the malformation or disfigurement of any part of the body, but does not include an impairment to the intellect or a mental illness.

There are 118 000 to 120 000 disabled persons in South Australia, and I am not sure of the exact figure of persons who would come into the impairment to the intellect or mental illness category. However, this will certainly widen the scope and the opportunity for some sections of disabled persons. Not all disabled people will even qualify under this legislation simply because they would not hold a driving licence. I do not expect that a great number will really want to benefit under this legislation. One can only make a rough estimate, and it may well be a couple of thousand people.

However, we find that in the metropolitan area and in some local government authorities that two or three parking spaces are set aside for handicapped persons (as they are called). They have not yet got up to date with the International Year of the Disabled in 1981. Some shopping centres have parking spaces for, as they put it, handicapped persons. However, at least there are provisions at major shopping centres. I think that there certainly are two or three parking spaces at Glenelg, and I have seen them in other metropolitan council areas.

I am delighted to think that this is another piece of legislation accepting hidden disabilities. That is really what it is all about, because the original legislation, as it appeared, was discriminatory. I believe that it was never the intention to discriminate against those with hidden disabilities. However, the International Year of the Disabled achieved many things and, if anything, it highlighted that there are other disabilities such as the hidden disabilities. Therefore, one can only highly commend this legislation to both Houses of Parliament because it provides something to which I believe these people are entitled. It treats them as normal persons and, after all, that is what life is all about.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I do not wish to delay the House. However, I would like my support for this legislation to go on record because I believe that many people in the community have really forgotten about the International Year of the Disabled Person. I do not mean to be cruel, but I believe that there are some of these 'goody-

goodies' who get out in this period of time but who, after that 12 months has expired, tend to forget that these people have to continue to live.

I know of the honesty and dedication of the member for Hanson, because I have listened to statements that he has made over a number of years in the House and for other reasons which I will not go into. I certainly support the Bill. However, there is one question that I would like to ask of the Minister. Would he advise the House in his reply how many people he believes will be granted these permits when this Bill is hopefully passed very quickly through both Houses. I certainly support the Bill.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I would like to thank the various speakers from both sides of the House who have supported this Bill. It is true that we have a responsibility to help as much as possible those permanently disabled people within our society, and broadening the eligibility criteria for parking permits is a small step further in that process. It will enable any person who is severely restricted in movement, not only restricted in the use of limbs but also unable to use public transport because of physical impairment, to apply for a disabled persons parking permit.

I appreciate the points that have been made by the various speakers, particularly in regard to whether this applies to other council areas and in the country. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles issues a permit to these eligible people, at a cost of $2, on the presentation of a medical certificate to support their eligibility, and I would expect that to apply throughout South Australia.

I would appreciate members drawing to my attention any problems in any council area within the metropolitan area or in country areas, and I will see what I can do about overcoming them. I get very concerned when I go to large shopping centres on weekends and see delivery vans and delivery people using the spaces provided for disabled people. In fact, on one occasion I noticed someone pull in to one of those spaces and when I spoke to the person about it I was roundly abused for mentioning the matter. I intend to do something about overcoming the problem. It is a problem, because too many people in society are ignoring the necessity to leave spaces reserved specifically for disabled people. I think that the Government should take stronger action in relation to the matter.

In response to the member for Albert Park's request concerning the numbers of permits issued, I think 430 permits have been issued to date, which was fewer than was expected upon the introduction of the Bill. It is not expected that the numbers will increase significantly. However, because of the number of permits issued the Adelaide City Council, which agreed with this measure, indicated that it could cater for a larger number than those qualifying for the permit. I do not think it is necessary for me to say any more. I thank honourable members for their support of the measure, which I commend to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Application for a disabled person's parking permit.'

Mr BLACKER: I thank the Minister for his explanation when replying to the second reading debate. Can he explain how the provisions of the permit will apply and whether applicants will be issued with an identification sticker or something that they can put on their car for recognition, or whether the procedure is carried out at the time of the reported offence, which is waived at that point. I suggest that may be a transfer sticker or something that could be affixed to the corner of the windscreen might be an appropriate means of identification.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I believe that it is only a permit that is issued to eligible people. I am not aware of any car sticker that is issued with a permit. However, it is a valid point and I will be happy to take up that matter with the Registrar of Motor Vehciles.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I commend the Minister and other members of the House for providing at the earliest opportunity this benefit and facility for disabled persons. I hope that in the future the Minister's officers will advise me about whether the term 'physical impairment' has exactly the same interpretation as that outlined in the Handicapped Persons Equality Opportunity Act.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 March. Page 384.)

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): This Bill deals with slight adjustments to the probationary licence scheme. The scheme was introduced by the Liberal Government in 1980, and I think that all honourable members will agree that it has been a great success in achieving what it set out to do; in fact, it was an idea adopted from New South Wales, where it has applied for many years. It meant that a person who wished to have a licence would first apply for a learner's licence and, having successfully passed both a written examination and a practical examination, would be then required for a period of 12 months to drive a vehicle displaying 'P' plates and to adhere to the conditions laid down for holders of probationary licences.

Last year a review of the operation of that scheme was completed by the Government, and a number of recommendations were made to overcome minor and technical problems that have arisen under the probationary licence scheme. The Bill before the House, which was prepared by the previous Government, has now been adopted by the new Government and introduced. I stress that this same Bill was introduced by the previous Government. However, there was not sufficient time available to enable the Bill to pass through all stages. I understand that on that occasion the Upper House passed an amendment, but the Bill did not finally proceed through the Lower House because of lack of time. Therefore, the Minister has re-introduced the old Bill prepared by the former Minister of Transport.

I want to mention a number of points in regard to the Bill. First, there are two basic alterations. If a probationary driver fails to carry out the two requirements under the probationary licence, that is, to adequately display 'P' plates and to not exceed a speed of 80 km/h, under the provisions of the old Act the driver has automatically lost his probationary licence and had to start all over again. The new provision allows the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to extend the period of the probationary licence by up to three months. I believe that that is an adequate treatment for that sort of penalty. I stress the fact that the new provision does not alter the probationary condition that applies in regard to blood alcohol levels. The law as it stands is that a probationary driver can only have a blood alcohol level below

0.05 per cent. If that condition is breached a person will automatically lose his probationary licence.

I support that measure very strongly, and I think that none of us here would want to see any watering down of that imposition on a person who, during the period he holds that probationary licence, takes the very irresponsible step of driving whilst having a blood alcohol level greater than 0.05 per cent. I think that it is an appropriate time to stress the fact that the community has a responsibility to make sure that any driver, and certainly a probationary driver or a learner driver with a learner's permit, does not consume alcohol and then attempt to drive. The two just do not mix. I was concerned to read in the *News* last Friday the headline, 'M.P. doubts value of random testing.' It goes on to say:

A senior M.P. today expressed doubts on the effectiveness of random breath testing in reducing South Australia's road toll.

The M.P. referred to in that article was I, as Opposition spokesman or Shadow Minister of Transport. That headline displayed by the *News* is not an accurate report of what I said to the reporter involved. I was specifically asked by the reporter about an annual report tabled in Parliament on Tuesday of last week by the Minister on the operation of random breath testing. I commented to the reporter that I believed that it was now important that a review of the random breath test system, as promised by the previous Government, be carried out this year, and that I hoped the new Minister and the Government would uphold that undertaking or promise that was made by the former Government and Minister.

I said that one could assess the effectiveness of random breath tests only by carrying out such a review. I said that if need be a select committee from the Legislative Council, of another place, should be called together as part of that review. I said that that committee should look at the extent to which the random breath test was a deterrent to people drinking and driving, and whether it was still as effective as it was when it was first introduced or whether it was more effective. I do not believe that one can take those remarks that I have just passed and then come to a headline like the one the *News* printed last Friday, 'M.P. doubts value of random testing.'

I would be the strongest defender of any system that effectively stops people from drinking and driving, because the greatest curse that we have on the road is the mixing of those two actions. Therefore, I say that I am not opposed to the random breath test but I believe that it needs to be assessed, and any assessment or any value of that needs to be judged only after that assessment has been completed. It might be that that system can be made more effective by altering the operation of the random breath test, and that is why I think that review is so important.

The other point I wish to raise is that the Bill before us has an effect on motor cyclists. There has been a submission made by the Motor Cycle Riders Association of this State concerning the operation of the probationary drivers conditions and how it affects motor cyclists. I touch on that very briefly. That association sees four specific problems at present with the way that system operates. First, requiring a motor cyclist with a probationary licence to drive at no more than 80 km/h means that that motor cyclist will be driving at a different speed from the other vehicles on an open road. The association stresses the enormous dangers that that provision exposes the motor cyclist to, where vehicles will be passing motor cyclists with little regard for the danger involved to those cyclists. One of the basic lessons that any motor cyclist should learn is that he has to keep up with the speed of the general stream of traffic and maintain that speed. The association says, and it needs to be examined very carefully, I am not saying that I will wholeheartedly endorse its recommendations, but I certainly wholeheartedly endorse a close examination of the proposals it is putting forward, and the criticism that it raises on how the law currently operates.

The second point is that the association criticises strongly now that there are certain exemptions for holders of other types of motor licences, and that there should be no such exemptions. I ask the Minister to look at that in detail and come back with a report to this House as to whether the association's requests in that area should be adopted.

The third point the association raised is the removal of the capacity limits for other than learner riders as there never was, and still is not, reliable evidence to support this restriction. The restriction is that no person without a special licence classification can drive a motor cycle of more than 250 ccs. Certainly, a learner driver or a probationary driver could not drive a large motor bike with a capacity of more than 250 ccs.

The fourth point raised is the very point dealt with in this Bill, and that is the requirement of the loss of licence system for probationary licence holders so that those cyclists are not unfairly penalised for minor technical infringements. I think that we are adequately dealing with that criticism. However, the association is asking the Government to look at altering the system and imposing two new conditions. I think it is fair to list what those two conditions are. First, the association suggests new tests for basic riding skills with an optional training programme designed to develop safe riding attitudes as well as operating skills. This new test would be a requirement for the issue of a learners permit. Secondly, a new test is suggested for intermediate riding skills with an optional training programme designed to expand safe riding attitudes as well as more advanced operating skills. This new test would be a requirement for issue of a class 4A licence. Victoria and Tasmania already require such testing, and I understand that the Road Safety Council in South Australia in fact supports the adoption of such a riding skills test before someone should be granted a licence to drive a motor bike.

The argument that the association used to support this is very strong, based on an in-depth accident study taken between 1975 and 1979 by the University of Adelaide. That study found that almost 32 per cent of motor cyclists involved in accidents had held the relevant licence for less than one year. A further 20 per cent involved in accidents had held a licence for less than two years. In other words, 52 per cent of motor cyclists involved in accidents had held a motor cycle licence for less than two years. That suggests that those who are most exposed to motor cycle accidents are the inexperienced riders.

Therefore, the association is stressing the need to make sure that, before a person can even obtain a licence, they should have certain basic fundamental skills to ride a motor cycle. We all know that on a population basis motor cyclists are most at risk in motor accidents, and certainly the reasons for that are obvious, because they are so exposed and vulnerable on their machines and often do not have the protection that an occupant in a motor vehicle would have.

I ask the Minister to look at the matters raised by the Motor Cycle Riders Association as a matter of urgency and to bring back a report to this House as soon as possible as to whether he believes that those recommendations submitted by the association are feasible and, if so, whether we could legislate as quickly as possible to put them into effect.

I support the Bill before the House. I think it contains a great deal of common sense. There is one other point I intend to move an amendment on; I cannot talk about the amendment, but I will talk about the problem that exists. That problem is that at present many drivers, for various reasons, have their drivers licences lapse for a period of

more than three years. It may be that they are overseas and not holding an overseas drivers licence for more than that three-year period. If that does occur, when those non-drivers return to South Australia they need to then apply for a new licence.

They need to go through the practical and written tests to obtain their learner's licence, then they need to go through a 12-month probationary licence period. I believe that many drivers, who have driven for a long time and find that their licence has lapsed for more than three years, should not be required to go through that lengthy procedure. The law should be amended so that those people are not required to go through it. Some power should be given to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles so that, if he believes that some circumstance or condition exists that that driver should undergo a learner's or probationary licence, it could be stipulated. I intend to deal with that when the clauses are before the House. I will support the Bill into the Committee stages and intend to move minor amendments to it.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. As the House knows, it was instigated whilst my Party was in Government. I have claim to some parts of the Bill, as I approached the previous Minister of Transport in relation to some of the problems and hardships that juveniles were having if they had a brush with the law for minor infringements.

Mr Becker: Was the previous Minister sympathetic?

Mr MATHWIN: The previous Minister was very sympathetic after a couple of approaches from me; indeed, he was quite willing to do something about it. Through my recommendations to the Minister, that part of the Bill was produced in this place by the Government.

The main part of the Bill deals with the problem of young people—the L-plate drivers or those who have graduated to P-plates—in committing a minor offence. It gave them sufficient demerit points to lose their licence at that time, putting them in jeopardy in relation to their employment. Indeed, I know of cases where young people have lost their job because they were not able to drive. Some may have had a driving job, and in some situations people had to travel to their place of employment. They cannot all get there by public transport. The buses run only on certain routes and trains cannot be moved off the train lines. If one is not fortunate enough to work near a station, one has a problem with transport. Therefore, it is imperative for some people to have their own transport to get to and from work.

Mr Becker: The beauty of the O'Bahn system is that it is very flexible.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, if we are referring to the O'Bahn, which is not mentioned in the Bill—

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not referring to the O'Bahn.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for getting me back on the track. Some people work in different locations. Some young people may be serving an apprenticeship in the building trade and are not at a fixed place of employment. They would have to travel to many parts of the State and are not on one site throughout their apprenticeship with the firm. It is important that they are able to travel, using their own transport, to and from their place of work. Some of these people travel to wider parts of the State, and in that case they would be travelling to and from home only weekly. Again, they would need their own transport to commute. So, it was impossible for them to continue with their work under those circumstances.

The L-plate people graduate to the P-plate situation. One of my constituents was unfortuante in that the P-plate accidentally fell off the back of his car. He was stopped by the police and had to suffer as a consequence. Fortunately, he was able to use public transport to and from his place of work. He did not lose his job, but he could have under different circumstances. The majority of minor offences attract three demerit points.

A clause in this Bill takes it on further and increases it before they lose their licence. Again, that is an assistance to young people who would have to have two minor breaches before they lose their licence. Indeed, it gives them a second chance. It states that the Registrar would have the power. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

> Where a breach of the conditions relating to carrying P-plates and not exceeding 80 km/h has been committed, the Registrar will have the power to extend re-endorsed probationary conditions for an extra three months.

The Minister went on to say:

> It should be noted that the learner drivers who breach either of those conditions will continue to be liable to have their permits or licences cancelled.

A situation still exists where it does not automatically come about that the licences will be cancelled because the Registrar, according to the Minister and the Act, will have the power to cancel the licences. The Minister continued:

> Cancellation will also be available where either a learner or probationary driver breaches the condition relating to the blood alcohol levels.

That has been canvassed by my colleague, friend and ex-Minister, the member for Davenport. I will not continue with that other than to say that I endorse his remarks in that respect. I believe the Bill is a great improvement on the situation we have at the moment. I have the greatest pleasure in supporting it.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I thank honourable members for their contributions. The Bill gives some leniency in a situation which can cause hardship to a probationary driver. The first amendment is to simply relax the penalty provisions; that is, the cancellation of a licence for committing a breach of conditions or committing a minor traffic offence. That was found necessary because, in many cases, it resulted in hardship. Many young drivers require a licence for their employment or to travel to and from their place of employment where it is not possible to use other forms of transport. I suppose that in these difficult times they are lucky to even have a job.

The second amendment seeks to correct an oversight that occurred in one of the 1981 amending Acts. It was found that section 47e of the Road Traffic Act was omitted in error, and the amendment in this Bill seeks to rectify that omission.

As has been pointed out, the former Government gave an undertaking that the probationary licence scheme which came into operation on 1 June 1980 would be reviewed after a reasonable period. That review found that the probationary licence scheme has been most successful in creating an awareness in a new driver of his own responsibilities, not only in his own behaviour but also in his behaviour towards others. It was also found that the majority of new drivers succeeded in getting through their first year of holding a licence either offence free or with only one minor offence.

Obviously, the scheme is working very well, and I think that that was made clear by the former Government when it introduced the very same Bill in another place last year, just prior to the State elections. Because of the number of minor offences now included in the expiation list, it is possible for probationary drivers to incur suspension by committing two minor offences, and the Bill extends from three to four points the threshold for mandatory suspension of licence.

The extension of probationary conditions for a period is a more appropriate penalty than suspension. It means that

the restrictive conditions continue and this reinforces the learning process. We must remember that we are talking about a learning process, or a process of educating the driver. Suspension, except in serious cases, may introduce a negative reaction. I believe that the amendments are reasonable and will not detract from the overall objectives of the scheme. At the same time it could help people in their employment or with their security of employment, and that ought to be supported. The question of blood-alcohol levels that should apply to probationary drivers is a serious one, but the review found no need to alter this aspect at this time.

Although arguments have been put forward in the past to reduce the present .05 blood-alcohol level that applies to probationary drivers, I believe it is better to consider this matter as part of a general review of the breath test and drink-driving legislation. That point was put strongly by the member for Davenport.

Also, the member for Davenport raised the fact that he had been approached by the Motor Cycle Riders Association, and he would know that I received the same letter from that association. The matters that were raised by the association are being considered now and, if it is believed that further amendments are required to the Motor Vehicle Act or the Road Traffic Act, that will be determined after the matters raised by the association are considered. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move an instruction without notice.

The SPEAKER: Order! There has been some confusion, not the least by me, about the procedure that has to be followed where there is a motion for suspension of Standing Orders. I will now set out clearly how I intend to deal with any such motions. When a member moves a motion for suspension of Standing Orders I propose to immediately count the House and seek a seconder before giving that member an opportunity to explain for 10 minutes, which of course he may not need, his reasons for seeking the suspension.

One other member may similarly speak to that motion. If the motion is agreed to and the Minister indicates that he wishes to move for an allotment of time for debate, then I will call that Minister before allowing the substantive motion to proceed. I hope that this succinctly summarises the position. I have counted the House and there being present a constitutional majority I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Honourable members: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. I hear no dissenting voice and there being present a constitutional majority, the motion for suspension is agreed.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House that it have power to consider a new clause relating to practical driving tests.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 24 March at 2 p.m.