

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, April 14, 1977

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

QUESTIONS

WAGES-PRICES FREEZE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary, as Leader of the Government in this Chamber.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In this morning's *Advertiser* an announcement was made that the Commonwealth and the States had agreed to a wages-prices freeze. Under the byline of Greg Kelton the Premier is quoted as stating:

There was a voluntary price freeze in South Australia as of now. . . . I am certainly prepared to condemn publicly any company which comes out and increases prices in anticipation of what might occur.

Will the Government ensure that valuations made in relation to taxes for water rates, land tax or other forms of taxation will be subject to the wages-prices freeze announced at the Premiers' Conference and supported by the Premier?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This will be a matter of policy of the Government, and I trust that the public will accept a stand-still valuation of their properties, irrespective of whether or not they would normally increase in value, so that when members of the public come to sell property they do not expect a greater price than they would now obtain.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to addressing a follow-up question to the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I, too, noticed the report in today's press indicating that certain steps would be taken to condemn any company that took action to increase prices from today. Further, in today's *News* there is much dissatisfaction expressed amongst certain unions, namely the Australian Workers Union for one, about this policy that has been agreed to by the Premier. Will the Minister guarantee that the Premier will take similar action against any union organisation that attempts to seek wage increases in the intervening three-month period? Will the Chief Secretary also guarantee that during the three-month period there will be no increases in State charges such as water rates, electricity charges or any other charges levied by the Government?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government has already made a policy decision regarding charges. Following the conclusion of an agreement at the Premiers' Conference for voluntary prices and incomes restraint, the Government has determined that no variation of either is to be made until further notice. This applies to all matters not yet in effect, irrespective of whether decisions have been made and/or announced previously.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Does that include Samcor?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It relates to all charges over which the Government has control. Clarification on any of these matters may be sought from the Under Treasurer in respect of taxes, charges for services and prices

of any kind, and from the Chairman of the Public Service Board in respect of salaries, wages or incomes of any kind.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It includes water rates, and so on?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Obviously, the honourable member is not functioning too well. Let me again emphasise that the Government has already taken this step, and I trust that the employers, whom members opposite represent, will also do exactly what the Government has done, and in as speedy a manner. If the honourable member is willing to listen again, I will try to get the message through to him. That is what the Government has already done. The agreement was reached only yesterday, and the Government, having been concerned about this matter for much longer than have members opposite, lost no time in taking action. Of course, it has received no assistance from the Federal Liberal Government, despite that Government's claim that it represents the poor people. That Government has caused much of the inflation that we have seen. I refer, for instance, to a rise of 6 per cent in one hit for Medibank. That is how much the Federal Government cares about inflation and the cost of living.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: And they want to impose a second income tax.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, a surcharge, about which we heard much yesterday. The Government has already indicated that this freeze applies to taxes and charges for services of any kind, as well as to prices, until further notice, in order to see whether everyone co-operates. It is intended that the price-income pause should be effective for a minimum period of three months. Departments and authorities have been instructed that they can have these matters clarified if any problems arise. The Government trusts that everyone in South Australia, irrespective of whether it be employers' organisations or the trade union movement, will enter into the spirit of this voluntary freeze.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: And the unions?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: How many unions are there?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You ought to know.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course I know, but there are too many. However, you fellows opposite do not like amalgamations.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Who said that?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member did.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: When?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member has said it time and time again.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is getting away from the subject matter.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Well, he has asked the same question five times.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the Minister is answering interjections.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: And interjections are not allowed.

The PRESIDENT: I agree.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Which comes first, the egg or the chicken?

The PRESIDENT: I agree that interjections are the primary cause for the Minister's straying from his answer to the question. I am blaming not the Minister but the interjections.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Thank you, Sir.

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

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections must cease during Question Time while questions are being asked or answered.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Chief Secretary has given a full reply to the question that I have asked, but questions on various matters already will be in train and, rather than wait for the information from the Under Treasurer in relation to the increased charges by the South Australian Meat Corporation of 2c—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Question!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: —I ask the Minister—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Question!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Just relax, you juvenile.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster called "Question" and the Hon. Mr. Cameron is asking his question.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He is going the wrong way about it.

The PRESIDENT: Not in my opinion.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I was trained in the Federal Parliament, and I can ask questions all day long if you want that. I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether increased charges by Samcor recently will now take effect, or whether they are included in the price freeze that the Premier has announced.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The statement that the Chief Secretary has made has explained the position clearly.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Give a little detail on that.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It was clearly explained that we would not increase charges not already announced or implemented. That was clearly stated in the statement that was made.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Honourable members have heard a number of questions this afternoon regarding the wage-price freeze, a report on which in today's *News* is headlined "The big wage-price freeze is on". However, when one turns over the page, one sees a smaller report, in which it is stated that the Business and Consumer Affairs Minister, Mr. Howard, who has been given responsibility for the wage-price freeze, was unable today to answer three key questions about the freeze. The report states:

He admitted the Government still hasn't thrashed out how to freeze food prices.

In yet another report on the same page of today's *News*, the following appears:

A leading national economist, Sir Hermann Black, said the voluntary price and incomes freeze was not likely to affect the size of the housewife's shopping bill. He said areas where the freeze would have little effect were the prices of tea and coffee, governed by the world market and not local prices. "I don't see ordinary produce markets being subject to this either," he said.

It seems to me that the person who experiences most problems with inflation is the housewife. It is she, with her weekly shopping bill, who suffers more than anyone else from inflation. The biggest problem in this respect seems to be in the specific area of food prices. I refer this matter to the Minister of Agriculture, because meat prices, for instance, are governed by an auction system, under which

the owner of the livestock tries to get the highest possible price for his product, irrespective of what the consumer can pay. Although I do not like it, that is the system that obtains.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: For many of the things you are talking about there is a world price demand.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I am talking about a prices and incomes freeze, and how it will hurt the housewife, who is the hardest hit. That is what I am referring to.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But what you are saying—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has been given leave to explain his question. However, he is now conducting a debate across the Chamber with another honourable member, who incidentally is responsible, I suppose, for starting it.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: That's right: have a go at me first. I object to this constantly. If you had a go at the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, I would not mind.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am talking to you both at present. It is the duty of any honourable member who is on his feet to ignore interjections.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: And it is the duty of the Chair to shut up these people.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Does the operation of a wage-price freeze apply to the price obtained for stock presented by stockowners at auction, or are primary producers to be put in an advantageous position compared to the rest of the community? Will they, unlike the seller of any other commodity, be able to get for their produce any price that they can obtain and that the market can bear?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I cannot answer the honourable member's question, as I do not know about the problems of auctions, whether it be livestock, land or house auctions.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about the Land Commission?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: No, it has fixed prices. The Government has already made a statement on that. It is the very nature of an auction for one to try to obtain the highest price possible, and I do not see how that matter will be easily resolved and brought within the prices freeze.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is difficult under the auction system.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It seems almost incompatible with the whole principle of an auction for a freeze to be put on it. The whole principle of an auction is to obtain the highest possible price, which is rather in contradiction to the nature of this prices freeze. However, it is particularly difficult for primary producers, because so many of their commodities are sold by auction. It will therefore be difficult to obtain an early solution to this problem. Whether it will involve some sort of change in the selling system, I do not know.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: It seems that the housewife will be getting it in the neck again.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Unless there is a dramatic change in the selling system, this area may well have to be exempted from any prices freeze.

CHARTER WORK

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have noticed recently that the State Transport Authority is engaging in some charter work, and I should like to know whether it is doing a significant proportion of this work, how many buses are used for this purpose, whether the work is being done in conjunction with the Tourist Bureau of South Australia (as I presume it is), and whether the volume of work has increased in recent months.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

GRAPEGROWING INDUSTRY

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: There has been concern in the Riverland this year about a surplus of wine grapes. Earlier this month, the Minister issued a statement making clear that the best way to avoid possible surpluses and instil confidence in the industry would be for the Federal Government to make a quick decision on the report of the temporary assistance authority regarding the protection for Australian brandy. The Minister also indicated that he would write to the Commonwealth Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs, Mr. Howard, asking the Commonwealth Government to make a quick decision on the report and release the report and the Commonwealth Government's recommendations as quickly as possible. In view of growing concern in the Riverland, has the Minister any indication of the Commonwealth Government's attitude on the matter of protection for the Australian brandy industry?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I have not had any official reply from the Federal Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs (Mr. Howard), but I heard on a *Country Hour* broadcast earlier this week that he had received my letter and was giving urgent attention to the temporary assistance report. In fact, he stated that he would be taking the matter to Federal Cabinet as soon as possible to get a speedy decision. He also stated in that interview on *Country Hour* that the report of the temporary assistance authority would be made public and that he was aware of the need for urgency in this matter. I think the matter is extremely important to the industry when there is talk of possible surpluses of grapes, and this talk could be dispelled if there was more confidence in the future of the industry. Brandy sales have declined markedly over the past five years and, if assistance could be given to Australian brandy producers, in competition both with imported brandy and with other spirits, many thousands of tonnes of grapes could go into that form of production. I hope that the Commonwealth Government will give assistance to the brandy industry and resolve any possible surpluses either this year or in the next two or three years, when increased plantings of grapes come into full production.

TORRENS ELECTORATE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary, representing the Attorney-General, in charge of the Electoral Office.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In the electorate of Torrens there is circulating a document entitled "Introducing the new man for Torrens", put out, I believe, by the Liberal Party of South Australia. Among other things, that document states:

There will be a new man in Torrens after the next State election. The new man is Michael Wilson. Why? Because, after 21 years, John Coumbe, M.P., has decided to retire.

Not only does this statement appear in this pamphlet but it also appeared in the *Standard*, which is the Messenger newspaper circulating in that area. Is the Chief Secretary aware of this document, which gives deliberate untruths, indeed lies, about the electorate of Torrens? Of course it is quite clear that John Coumbe did not decide to retire; he was forced out after a bitter preselection fight in the electorate of Torrens.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He could have stood again.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Certainly, Mr. Coumbe had not decided to retire. Is the Minister aware of this document and is there anything in the Electoral Act or regulations which prohibits endorsed candidates distributing literature containing untruths?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: On a point of order, the question is seeking legal opinion from the Chief Secretary, and I think the question should not be allowed.

The PRESIDENT: Yes; I have to rule that questions seeking legal opinions are out of order.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The question was referred through me to the Attorney-General. What will be the position and what are the types of question that a Minister can refer to another Minister? Surely, if there is a document that is clearly, even in layman's language, false advertising, for one thing, and misrepresentation, for another thing, are questions allowed to be asked on these things or are they to be debarred only when they concern the Liberal Party?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Sumner asked a question which, in fact, asked the Chief Secretary to seek a legal opinion from the Attorney-General. That is the way he framed his question, and I have to rule on the way the question is framed.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The first part of my question certainly was not out of order: is the Minister aware that such a pamphlet is circulating—

The PRESIDENT: That is not out of order.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: —and that such a pamphlet contains a deliberate untruth or lie.

The PRESIDENT: An alleged untruth.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That was the first part of the question. The second is: will the Attorney-General investigate this pamphlet with a view to seeing whether it contravenes the Electoral Act or regulations?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Surely that is quite a legitimate question; it shows how concerned are honourable members opposite if a man gets beaten at preselection and the man is like John Coumbe, who has given magnificent service—

The PRESIDENT: I think the Minister can answer "Yes" or "No" without going into too much detail.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It shows how "toey" the Liberals are.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation; indeed, so much that I cannot hear the Hon. Mr. Blevins, whom I can usually hear.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: You, Mr. President, ruled that it was not permissible under Standing Orders to ask for a legal opinion of the Attorney-General. I find this rather odd, as I did precisely that last week, and there was no question of its being out of order. I asked (*Hansard*, page 3095):

Will the Minister ascertain whether the sale of poker machines in that progressive place, Whyalla, or indeed in the whole State, is illegal?

If that is not asking for a legal opinion, what is? I find it odd that suddenly one cannot ask the Attorney-General for a legal opinion. It has been the practice in the past.

The PRESIDENT: All I can say is that the honourable member's question of last week must have escaped my attention.

KANGAROO ISLAND SETTLERS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have correspondence with me from one of the unfortunate seven Kangaroo Island soldier settlers. The Minister has served notice of forfeiture on him; he faces eviction on June 30 and the loss of all that he has worked for while a soldier settler on the island. The correspondence indicates that last February the settler wrote to the Director of Lands asking whether his rent arrears of about \$1 400 could be deducted from his wool cheque, which amounted to about \$7 000, prior to the balance being taken to cover interest and principal moneys owing. The rent arrears apparently were a major factor in the Minister's deciding to serve notice of forfeiture on this settler.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Is that your opinion?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am basing that on the correspondence I have in front of me. If honourable members opposite have any sympathy for these settlers, they will allow me to continue with this explanation.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. The Hon. Mr. Hill clearly stated that he was giving an opinion. I am sure that you would not like that to escape your attention. I am sure that you will not allow him to carry on giving an opinion.

The PRESIDENT: I did not hear what the Hon. Mr. Hill said because I was looking up the whole subject of legal opinions.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not want to cross swords with the Hon. Mr. Blevins on this matter. As he said, I indicated it was an opinion. If he objects, I am happy to withdraw it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Chair objects.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr. Blevins has objected and, without a ruling from the President, I am happy to withdraw.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I am sure *Hansard* will record that I did not object: I merely drew the matter to your attention, Mr. President, because you were busy. I was sure that, so that you could object, you would not have wanted it to escape your attention.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member does not object, why did he take the point of order?

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: To inform the Chair.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am dealing with a serious matter: I am dealing with a man who is faced with a serious problem and holds a notice of eviction from his farm on Kangaroo Island. I am pleading this man's case

with the Minister in this Chamber to see whether any special consideration can be given to this man. The facts are that this man wrote to the Director of Lands asking whether his arrears in rent of about \$1 400 could be taken, in the first instance, from the credit that was coming into his account from the sale of wool, that credit being about \$7 000. However, the Director has advised this settler that the Director cannot take that course of action and that the credit from the sale of wool has been appropriated under other headings and that, therefore, the rental arrears still stand.

The Director knows, as the Minister knows and as I know, that the settler cannot find \$1 400 between now and the end of June and is consequently facing eviction. The objective of my raising this matter in this Chamber is to ask the Minister of Lands whether he would be good enough to look into this matter. Naturally, I am willing to give him the name of the settler and show the Minister the correspondence that I have. I do not like to make that information public because of the embarrassment it would cause but, if I show him the correspondence, will he, please, take up this matter with his department in an effort to readjust the distribution of the proceeds from the sale of wool so that the rent arrears of this settler can be paid off?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be happy to look into the matter and I shall be pleased, if the honourable member supplies me with that information, to maintain the privacy that he seeks.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement and refer to certain documents prior to directing a question to the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: What I have to say relates to the sad position of a soldier settler on Kangaroo Island. This position leaves a stigma with the Minister of Lands which, unless the Premier rescues him in the near future, he will bear for the rest of his life.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Cut it out—you're breaking my heart.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: A settler has received the following letter:

As you have not submitted a satisfactory proposal regarding your indebtedness with respect to the above property, nor taken any action to sell or voluntarily surrender your lease, I now enclose formal demands for payment of rent owing under the lease and the amount secured under your mortgage.

That is part of the letter—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What is its date?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: That is an interesting question. It does not matter on what date it was sent, because I believe the terms of the letter were concocted about 12 months ago, before this episode with which we are now faced really started.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Will you allow that opinion to be expressed, Mr. President?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The letter was dated March 31, 1977. I believe the letter's text was conceived before that date. A proposal was put to the settlers on Kangaroo Island that they would be entitled to their dwellinghouse and about five hectares of land if their lease was cancelled, but nowhere in this letter is there word from the Minister saying that the settler will still be entitled to his dwelling and five hectares of land. The lease will be cancelled and the land will be sold but nothing is stated about the settler receiving the house and land after losing his life's interest. Why was this not spelt out clearly in the letter? What provision has the Minister

made for a settler who is about to be sent from his house and property to uphold the promise he gave concerning the house and five hectares of land?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I wish that the honourable member would go into these matters more fully before he makes a complete fool of himself, because he does not know what he is talking about. The honourable member is trying to create a situation that just does not exist. When Mr. Sinclair and I went to the island some weeks ago this position was explained to the settlers there. They were told that they would be given a parcel of land, which included their house, their sheds and their dam. The land would be surveyed and it would not become part of the original lease, and these people would be given the opportunity to live in their own houses and do whatever they wished on the small parcel of land.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Pay rent?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes, the rental is \$10 a year. In fact, the Commonwealth Government wanted to charge much more, but I suggested \$10 a year and it accepted that. If the Hon. Mr. Whyte wants me to answer the question, he should pay attention instead of arguing with someone across the Chamber. If the people living in the house actually leave that house, that portion of land will revert to the original lease. This has been explained to the settlers. They know the situation, having been told about it by Mr. Sinclair and me when we went to the island, and having been told since by departmental officers who have gone to the island and personally contacted them.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Oh, sure.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: They have.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: With their jackboots on.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is the situation, and I hope it clears up the problem about which the Hon. Mr. Whyte probably knew and on which he is no doubt trying to obtain some political capital.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Hon. Mr. Whyte wish to ask a supplementary question?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I think part of what the Minister said was self-explanatory. However, I set out initially to have the Minister detail exactly what the proposals were. Although he has done that, I find it hard to believe that there is any security for these settlers, when it has been decreed that the whole property shall be sold. Why could not some indication have been given about what the Minister said would happen? Why could not that be written into the terms of the final closure, as dictated by the Lands Department?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is strange that the honourable member should come up with this sort of nonsense, because already two settlers (to my knowledge) of the seven settlers who have so far been affected have approached the department, which has referred the matter to me, asking for an increase in the area of land that was initially suggested. I think the area involved was not five acres but about five hectares. Some of these people have planted pine trees, and so on, and would like those areas incorporated in the block. I have told them that, if it transpires that the Government can incorporate a little more land so as to include the area of pines that they have planted, it will be done.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Very good.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: These people have been told that. I do not know, therefore, what the honourable member is belly-aching about.

COMPANY TAKE-OVERS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, March 22, there was a report "The ogres from the East" by Economics Editor, Edward Nash. The report's sub-heading was, "S.A. businessmen are worried that changes to the Trade Practices Act could make them vulnerable to take-overs." Part of the report is as follows:

The change may involve the scrapping of section 50 of the Act, which prohibits anti-competitive mergers and take-overs. Some S.A. business leaders fear that if the present rules are altered or scrapped, large Eastern States companies will try to acquire local companies, often against their will. This would have the effect, they say, of making S.A. companies merely branch offices or warehouses for national groups. It would allow powerful interstate interests to dominate the industrial development of the State, cut short career opportunities for S.A. executives and, through a degree of rationalisation, reduce employment opportunities here.

The report goes on to deal in more detail with the problem perceived by Edward Nash. Has the Minister seen this report and, if so, does he consider that the complaints made against the Liberal Government's proposals to change the Trade Practices Act have any validity? Thirdly, if so, can he suggest any action that the State Government may take?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the question to the Premier and bring back a reply.

SEX CRIMES

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Blevins asked a question relative to the incidence of the crime of rape. The increased incidence of rape was made clear in a recent report by the Commissioner of Police.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: On a point of order, I said nothing whatsoever about the incidence of rape in asking a question yesterday. What question was it?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It was the question relating to Judge Wilson's reported statement.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: It was about sex crimes.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: All right, it was about sexual offences. My question relates to the increased incidence of rape.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: So, it has nothing to do with my question.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes, it has. Rape is a sex crime. The increased incidence of rape was reported in the *Advertiser* of March 17, under the headline "South Australian Rape Crime Doubles in Five Years." Will the Attorney-General institute an inquiry into the increased incidence of the crime of rape and the causes thereof, and will he investigate whether it appears that it has any connection with the distribution of hard-core pornographic material?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the question to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I ask the Minister whether he agrees that the figures of rape that have been quoted are those for reported rapes and that many people suggest that

changing community attitudes have led to an increased proportion of rapes being reported, without there necessarily being any increase in the incidence of rape as it occurs? Will he also agree that, relevant to the question whether there is any connection between the incidence of reported rapes and the availability of pornographic material, the fact is that in Queensland there is much more censorship of so-called pornographic material than there is in South Australia, yet the incidence of reported rapes and of convictions for rape there is, per capita, much higher than in South Australia?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Obviously, all cases of rape are not reported. It is also true that, because of the publicity that has been given to the subject over many years, more women now are prepared to come forward and report cases of rape. This is one reason why the figures show a higher number of rapes. All cases of rape are not reported, but it is also clear that because of the increased publicity given to the subject more rapes are being reported. The connection between the increased number of rapes and the availability of pornographic material is an academic question. Many people say that rape is caused as a result of the distribution of pornographic material, and many others say, to the contrary, that it is not. This argument will go on and on, and there is no way to prove which point of view is correct. However, the figures in relation to Queensland referred to by the honourable member show one side of the argument forcibly.

NORTH MALAYSIA INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked two weeks ago about the North Malaysia Week activity and about South Australian industries being established in North Malaysia?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We are always pleased to oblige honourable members when they ask questions. We bring the replies forward as quickly as possible. The honourable member knows that his is not the only question that has been asked. Public servants do not "down tools" whenever a question is asked by him.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Don't blame the Public Service.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There is no way that I would blame the Public Service.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the honourable Minister could give the reply. I do not think the Hon. Mr. Hill has criticised the Minister or the Government for any delay.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He did at some other stage.

The PRESIDENT: Not in this case.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: But he did forcibly yesterday, and I think the honourable member should know that his question is one amongst about 400 that have been replied to in the past fortnight. If the honourable member bears with the departments in those circumstances, we will get along well. The reply to the question asked six sitting days ago is that, at this early stage, one South Australian company has opened negotiations with the Malaysian authorities for the establishment of a joint venture operation in that country. In addition to this, quite significant export inquiries are in the course of investigation. The investigations are in a very preliminary stage and, as the honourable member doubtless is aware, they are quite involved and not likely to come to fruition for some time.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member seems to be proud of that. Yesterday he was complaining that employment might be taken away and now he is upset because something is being done about industry in South Australia. That shows a lack of concern for the workers in this State. The Government recognises the need to support such ventures to the mutual benefit of both the Malaysian and South Australian partners.

STUART HIGHWAY

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It is obvious that the route of the Stuart Highway will go west of the Woomera Rocket Range, and the route at present favoured seems to be one that will by-pass the township of Kingoonya by about 18 kilometres. The township of Kingoonya has the only known potable water supply between the end of the Murray River main at Pimba and Marlow Bore, a distance of about 670 kilometres. The fresh water is invaluable for travellers. At present about 100 000 to 150 000 gallons a week is used, mostly by tourists, because those in buses going through know that it is the only source of drinkable water in that area. Apart from that, the township has a modern police station, an automatic telephone exchange, a school, medical centre, reasonable motel accommodation, and all the other usual facilities that go with a small town. It seems that the Highways Department is determined to by-pass this township by some 18 kilometres, claiming that otherwise it would cost another \$800 000. That is a debatable point when we realise that perhaps water will have to be piped to the by-pass route. Highways Department officers said that drilling was about to commence in this by-pass area in order to ascertain whether drinkable water could be found there. Having some knowledge of that country and knowing that many wells have been sunk there with only limited success, I ask the Minister how far the Mines Department has proceeded with drilling for potable water in the by-pass area.

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

INSURANCE

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: On the first day of this part of the current session, I asked the Minister whether he would follow the Federal lead and make the State, when it entered the commercial field, subject to consumer protection laws. I have not yet had a reply to that question and, as the matter has a special relevance to the State Government Insurance Commission Bill, shortly to be brought into this Chamber, I ask the Minister for a reply as soon as possible.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will draw the question to the attention of my colleague.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: About two weeks ago I asked the Minister of Health a question about Modbury Hospital; I understand he now has a reply.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Six sitting days later, I have a reply for the honourable member. Tenders have been called and contracts let for the three projects, and it is expected that the work on the second floor, main building, psychiatric unit, and education block will be completed by February, April, and September, 1978, respectively. Long-term planning for this hospital includes increasing the capacity to 500 beds, with appropriate expansion of the accident and emergency, outpatient, and physical medicine departments, operating theatres, and pharmacy and medical records library, as the need arises.

LAND TRANSFER

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary any information to give me about the recent agreement in this Council to the resolution transferring three sections of land covering 0.6 ha in the north-west corner of the park lands in the township of Bordertown?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The request for the transfer of sections 928, 929, and 930, hundred of Tatiara, to the Aboriginal Lands Trust resulted from an earlier request by a member of an Aboriginal family associated with that land for assistance in obtaining an Aboriginal funded home. Consequently, the Commonwealth Aboriginal Affairs Department sought an assurance that secure tenure of the land was vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust before assistance could be provided. When the land is vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust, it can always be available to the appropriate Aboriginal people, for long-term lease. Arrangements may be made through the Lands Trust for a suitable lease to be granted to the South Australian Housing Trust to enable the erection of Aboriginal funded houses. It is anticipated that one of these houses will be made available to a member of the Aboriginal family associated with that land.

SAMCOR

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Would the Chief Secretary be good enough to extend Question Time to cater for the requirements of the Opposition? I seek leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I notice that, at the time when the Minister of Lands held office as Minister of Agriculture and at the time when the legislation establishing Samcor passed through this Parliament, the Minister gave an assurance or undertaking to the effect that an advisory committee would be established to cater for the many interests that did not have direct representation on the board of Samcor. It has been pointed out to me that at the time the composition of the board was such that some interests were represented.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Question Time to be extended to 3.20 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: However, it was stated that interests of the consumer could be given some voice in the structure of Samcor if such an advisory committee was established. I realise that the present Minister of Agriculture may know of this matter and, because of his present office, he may like to reply, but I do not mind who answers this question. However, my concern is that, if discussions were held along those lines (that an advisory body be established within Samcor for the purpose of assisting the board and to have the voice of all interests heard at that level) and if such assurances were given, has an advisory committee been established; if it has not been, is there any particular reason why action has not been taken along those lines?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yes, the advisory committee has been established, consisting of representation from all sectors of the meat industry and livestock producers themselves. This committee is functioning very well and is able to put forward to Samcor views on many issues of both the producers and the people in the meat trade. Specifically, it has been having discussions and negotiations recently on the allocations for killing at Samcor; these have been very fruitful discussions, resulting in a better working relationship between Samcor and its clients as to how the kill at Samcor can be allocated more equitably for the benefit of people requiring the service and so as to cause the least disruption to their requirements, yet producing a smoother through-put at the works. Those are the particular issues in which the committee has been involved recently, but there are many others as well.

TRAFFIC COUNTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct the following questions to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport. First, what are the most recent traffic counts on the main South Road at Darlington, at or near the bottom of Tapley Hill? Secondly, what has been the rate of increase in traffic volume over the past eight or 10 years in this position on the main South Road? Thirdly, what are the official projections that departmental officers have made as to traffic densities on Tapley Hill in the next five to 10 years, based on this and other necessary information? Fourthly, what density is deemed reasonable, to avoid undue congestion, based on the current paving widths and the present road design of South Road at Tapley Hill? Fifthly, what plans has the Government for alleviating vehicular traffic congestion from suburbs south of Tapley Hill along the main South Road in the future?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's five questions to my colleague and bring down replies.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Local Government Act Amendment,
Supply (No. 1), 1977.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 1977

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from April 13. Page 3374.)

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I support the Bill. I hope that you, Mr. President, will allow me the same latitude that you allowed some honourable members yesterday. Originally, I did not intend to participate in this debate, but I was prompted to do so by a remark of the Hon. Mr. Cameron last evening, when he said, "I think he is going to make some sort of contribution at last." I make clear that I do not often participate in the proceedings of this Council because I consider them almost always to be a sham and a charade. It is clear to anyone who has been here for five minutes that the deals and the action take place outside the Chamber. Most of what goes on inside the Chamber is simply a babble of cant and hypocrisy. After sitting here for two years I have concluded that this is a moribund, anachronistic and disreputable House. One could be excused for thinking that those who walk around in black uniforms are really psychiatric nurses.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Are you insulting the messengers?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am suggesting that, in view of the way things have deteriorated in this Chamber, it is possible that the messengers could really be psychiatric nurses and that the people in the Parliamentary bar and dining-room could really be nurse-aides whose role is to nurse and humour us. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris delivered his diatribe on federalism, stage 2. As usual, he used all the gestures of a learned barrister; for example, the pointed finger and the repetitive phrase. However, the logic was of his natural and traditional role of a horse dealer. He has a pedantic turn of phrase and a puerile mind, but he went in to bat for the Prime Minister. He talked about inflation and unemployment, using the twin shibboleths of States' rights and States' responsibilities. However, it is pertinent for us to examine the real position. Actually, we are in the worst position that we have been in for almost 50 years, and no amount of rhetoric can conceal it.

I refer honourable members to a series of articles in the Melbourne Age last week by that newspaper's economics editor, Kenneth Davidson. Among other things, he makes projections for the remainder of the year; first, he projects higher interest rates. We have heard much carry-on from the other side about stamp duties incurred by people purchasing houses, but nothing makes it more difficult for young couples than the cost of servicing mortgages at current interest rates. If interest rates rise, the situation will deteriorate. Further, Kenneth Davidson projects an unemployment rate of more than 7 per cent by the end of the year, and an inflation rate of between 14 per cent and 15 per cent. In that situation, it is strange that the Leader of the Opposition should go in to bat for the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister's proposals in connection with the federalism debate are simply buck-passing—an abdication of responsibility. His so-called economic policies are in tatters. He now offers electors the prospect of putting trade unionists in gaol if they do not co-operate with his industrial police force, and he offers the chance to pay an extra State income tax.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It could be a rebate.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I will come to that. What a credibility gap honourable members opposite have! Only a few months ago they expressed consternation that State taxes were far too high. Much time was spent debating, fairly uselessly, whether South Australia had

the third highest or fourth highest per capita State taxation in Australia. Actually, in the past 12 months, in broad terms, South Australia has abolished rural land tax and abolished succession duties between spouses. Succession duties on rural estates have been significantly reduced on average family properties, and the amount on which they are payable has been indexed.

On top of all this, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris wants rebates! Yesterday, he was asked several times what areas of spending he would cut back but, significantly, he did not reply. The true role of honourable members of this Council should be clearly stated, for the benefit of South Australian electors. When they are not obstructing legislation on behalf of minority interest groups, they have only one other significant role: apart from the three Ministers, they are, in fact, Party-political organisers (if they have any talent for it) paid for by the taxpayers of South Australia.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You are judging other people by yourself.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Actually, I cannot see any role for the honourable member, because I included the proviso, "If they have any talent for it". Not for us the constituent problems of members of the House of Assembly! Not for us the realities of the real world! Not for us the slings and arrows of electorate responsibilities! Just the cant and hypocrisy and the petty political point-scoring that characterises almost every debate in this Chamber! The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has been dealt with previously. The Hon. Mr. Hill could talk under water. He gives lengthy diatribes, and he has some specialties; for example, the socialist octopus and North Malaysia. He is cynical, repetitive and almost always obstructive. The Hon. Mr. Burdett, the shadow Attorney-General, is a captive of the extreme Right and the Festival of Light. He frequently makes errors not only in logic but also in law. The Hon. Mr. Cameron—Martin the maverick—is an astute, independent person, if ever I saw one. He was formerly a politician with considerable motivation and a person for whom I had considerable respect. Now, of course, he is simply going through the motions.

I have only one other point to make, and I should like to make it briefly, in sharp contrast to the efforts yesterday of honourable members opposite. I refer to the sad position of Her Majesty's Opposition. I remember the comments during the period of Labor Party splits when the great Ming was at his height. At that time it was said consistently by Liberal Party members how sad it was that there was not an effective Opposition, that there could not be effective Government without effective Opposition, and they lamented the fact that the Labor Party in Canberra was then unable to perform at a satisfactory level. Those Liberal Party members were unanimous about that. The unfortunate situation in South Australia in 1977 is that we have no alternative Government.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: You wait and see.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Recently, it was suggested to me by a member of the Liberal Party that if we wanted to win the next State election we could do it on that aspect alone. I do not intend to compare the shadow Ministers with the Government's Ministers, because that would be uncharitable; it would be a cruel exercise, and as a gentleman, a scholar and a Christian, I am not willing to do that. The basic function of State Governments, despite what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said and despite what honourable members opposite have said, is to be sound practical administrators. In this respect the South Australian Government is acknowledged throughout Australia as easily the best in the nation. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I noticed in the Supplementary Estimates for this year under the line "Minister of Education" that a huge sum is allocated for the further provision of salaries and wages and related payments. This situation relates to the beginning of this year when there were about 600 teachers surplus to the department's requirements. I am told there was much concern in the department about what was to be done with the surplus teachers leaving the colleges of advanced education. Finally, I understand a decision was made by the State Government to take these teachers on, and they have been allocated to various schools in South Australia on a basis of providing additional staff to ensure that present staff levels at schools are adequate to allow teachers time off from teaching for lesson preparation and preparation for teaching children.

No honourable member would argue about that purpose, although I believe that in some schools it has created a situation that is slightly unfair. This has arisen because not all schools have the same teacher/student ratio. A situation may develop where a school has a low student/teacher ratio. One secondary school has a ratio of about 10 students to each teacher because there are insufficient students at that school, but the school must provide sufficient teachers to provide a secondary curriculum. Although that situation cannot be resolved, this school was allocated extra staff for the purposes I have outlined. Naturally, other schools have a higher student/teacher ratio and the direction from the department (and I have seen a copy of it) is that in no circumstances are additional staff to be used to reduce the student/teacher ratio.

Additional staff can be used only for the purpose of allowing staff additional time for lesson preparation and the like. There are 600 surplus teachers this year who have been taken off the unemployment market by the Government at a community cost of \$5 300 000. True, if teachers take advantage of their additional free time, they should be able to present better lessons to their students. However, the real problem will arise next year when I understand that 1 500 teachers will be coming from C.A.E.'s surplus to the department's requirements. Next year we will really see the results of bad planning.

I refer to a vociferous campaign undertaken by all sorts of people seeking more funds for education. Throughout that campaign the cry was that South Australia had insufficient teachers, that we needed to reduce the student/teacher ratio because we had insufficient teachers. The net result of that widespread and emotional campaign was that funds (and I say this without any fear of contradiction) were misdirected. If honourable members want to know how funds were misdirected they need look only at the situation that will arise next year when 1 500 teachers will be surplus to the department's requirements. These teachers have directed their lives towards an important role in our community, but they will be unable to carry out that role.

These people are now studying to become teachers, but they will never have the chance to do so. They will never be allocated a position as a teacher in this State because the Government will not be able to find sufficient jobs, as it has done this year to take up that extra number of teachers. I say to the Government that it is as guilty as any Government of any political complexion of the misdirection of funds. This goes right across the board to the Commonwealth Government, whether it be this Government, the previous Government, or the one before that. The Governments were subjected to a clever campaign, which resulted in what I regard as a severe misdirection of funds and which has resulted in a huge number of our young people being led into a career that just does not exist.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No. I say to this Council that I would be interested to know just what the Government intends to do about this—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Who funds C.A.E.'s?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The State Government is as responsible as anyone for the sum spent on the provision of extra C.A.E.'s.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Who funds them?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Who funded them in the previous years when we had a Labor Government, when money was just poured down the sink? Now we are told that there is a report out indicating that certain C.A.E.'s are to be closed. Two are already under threat of the axe. I wonder what the Government is going to do about this. At present, it can hide away from the subject by saying that there is another report coming out for which it must wait. In the long run, the Government will have to face up to the fact that too many people are being trained as teachers. It can be said that this is as much the fault of the Labor Party as it is of anyone else. It has allocated more money for education campaigns than it has to probably any other section of the community.

It is a sad fact of life that people are being led up the garden path. I trust that the Education Department and anyone associated with education in this State are warning students that they do not have a future in their chosen career, and that a job will not be available for them at the end of their training at the colleges of advanced education in this State. It is a direct reflection on this State Government as much as it is on anyone else that this situation has been allowed to arise.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You know that the State Government gives no money to colleges of advanced education: it comes from the Federal Government.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The honourable member can avoid her responsibilities as much as she likes. The fact is that no colleges of advanced education have been built since the Federal Liberal Government has been in office; that happened very much during the term of office of the Federal Labor Government. Certainly, the sum of money that has been spent is a direct result of the emotional campaign that has been conducted in the past. I trust that people will examine carefully the present campaign, following what happened with the previous one, because 1 500 people will not be able to obtain a job next year as a result of the misdirection caused by it.

The next matter that I wish to raise relates to rentals on perpetual lease land in this State. Some people are almost being forced off their land because of the increases being applied by the Lands Department on perpetual lease land. I have before me one example which perhaps highlights this problem to a greater extent than any other example that I have seen. On one property in the Hills, the Lands Department has foreshadowed an increase in the perpetual lease rental from \$20 to \$3 840 a year. The people who own the property, which comprises 80 hectares, have been told that no increase will be imposed provided that the farm remains a dairy farm. However, if there is any change in the way in which the property is run, the rental will be increased. At present the place is being run as a dairy farm but, because of this direction that has been given by the department, these people are being forced to remain in dairy farming, no matter what happens. If they wanted to grow potatoes or anything else, they would be finished; otherwise, their rent would increase in the way to which I have referred.

This is an incredible situation. I did not think that I would live to see the day when a Government would so directly interfere with a person's occupation, particularly that of farming. I look back on the time when I was in New Zealand, when the Government foreshadowed legislation that would enable it to direct farmers what to grow. Of course, that did not come to fruition because of the outcry against it. However, we now have such a situation close to arising here: farmers in this State will be directed, by means of the rental they must pay, what they should grow. It will not matter whether it is economic: they will be stuck with it, because of what the Government is doing through the hidden weapon of rentals. It is a direct indictment of the Government that it is trying to do this.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Wheat quotas were telling farmers what they could not produce.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Minister should not bring up that matter. I think that was a disaster from the moment it was introduced. Certainly, I would not agree to any reintroduction of that. I have a number of examples of this. I am sure that the Minister is aware of them, because I have some of his correspondence here. However, I am not certain about that, because I recall several weeks ago the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's asking a question about the Lands Department's making a charge of \$15 a time for providing information. When the Hon. Mr. DeGaris asked the Minister whether and for what reason such a charge was being levied, he did not even know about it. He had to return to his department to ascertain whether it was being levied. I rather wonder, therefore, whether the Minister is fully aware of what his department is doing to people on the land in this State.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: The question was so unclear.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I should have thought that it was extremely clear. It was merely stated that a \$15 charge was being levied.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: And that is all that was said.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Minister must have only a slight knowledge of his department if he did not know about that charge. It was an enormous sum to be charged for what is, after all, fairly vital information for people who own property that is, obviously, under the direction of the Lands Department. I mean "under the direction" in the fullest sense, because these property holders are being told by the Government in a very snide way what to grow and how to farm their land.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Snide?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is correct: because it is hidden. Few people in the community would be aware of this matter and that people are being told how their farms shall be operated by the rather clever use of a threat of increased rental. Also (and this is probably the most serious point that can be raised), it almost absolutely denies these people the opportunity to sell their land. These people are in a tight situation indeed because, even if they continue with the type of farming that they have carried on for some time, and therefore keep their rental down, that rental will increase when the land is sold. So, it has an automatic effect on the sale price of the land, and will certainly deny a person the right to sell his land. After all, who would buy land with that sort of rental applying to it? No-one in his right mind would do so. I know that the Minister has

indicated in correspondence the reason for this: he says that the Government is trying to stop the spread of hobby farms.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: You don't agree with that?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If that was the reason for it, I would be considering it. However, it could not be the reason in relation to properties on Yorke Peninsula, where the same thing is happening regarding a 2 000 hectare property of scrub. The Minister cannot tell me that people will go over there on dry land to operate hobby farms. That is not the purpose. It is an attempt by the Minister to get out of the difficulty. It is a way to make sure that people are forced off farming property, and these people will not be able to obtain loans. How could they convince a bank that they had a saleable asset, when the bank would know that no-one would buy the land? That is something that the Government ought to consider seriously.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That applies even to land on the low rentals.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, it automatically kills what is called the quick asset situation, which a bank always considers. Although the land is on a low rental and, in theory, worth a reasonable amount, as soon as it changes hands there is little value in it. I listened to the Hon. Mr. Foster's diatribe yesterday about how the Federal Government has increased taxation. It was difficult to follow what he was saying, but I gathered he was accusing the Opposition of not being constructive. He wandered all over the world and he talked from dreams that he had last evening.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How could he do that, when he spoke yesterday?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: He seems to live in a dream world. The Chief Secretary tried to shut him up by whistling.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The whips cracked on you yesterday, and you were quieter.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Knowing that the Chief Secretary has no control over the Hon. Mr. Foster, we will have to continue to listen to such diatribes. The Treasurer went to Canberra to do terrible things to the Federal Government and to tell it how to run the country. He came back and said that inflation would be worse next year and the only thing for the Fraser Government to do was reduce sales tax and all other kinds of tax. That was the most hypocritical statement I have heard for a long time, because, since this Government has been in office, revenue from taxation has been increased. In 1969-70, under a Liberal Government, revenue from State taxes in this State was less than \$60 000 000.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: We had no hospitals, no decent schools, no employment opportunities, and no provision for advice to be given to farmers.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Last year, the return from State taxes was \$300 000 000. This Government is the greatest inflator the country has had. It has ripped-off the people to an extent that has never happened previously. The Government had to do something about rural land tax, because in the previous year it increased that tax by 54 per cent. Rural land tax had not applied in other States for many years, and it was time that the South Australian Government did something about the matter. The reason why it took action was that the railways were taken from it and there was no longer a deficit. The deficit on the railways started at \$3 800 000 and increased to \$50 000 000. The Labor Government was

a disaster in regard to the railways. Further, the figure for the tramways is now up to \$8 000 000, whereas when the Government came into office they were almost breaking even. The buses are in a shambles now, and most of them seem to have been taken over from a free enterprise operator.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: At whose request?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Government gave the operators no choice. It refused them any fair increase so that it could take them over. Now the Government will ask the Commonwealth Government to take the buses over because it cannot run them, either. The Government says in Budgets that it does not intend to increase taxes, but it has slipped in the increase beforehand. At last it may have to be honest this year, because the freeze will apply until the middle of July. The Government will ask the Commonwealth Government to take the buses over because it is inept at financial management. Let us have more efficiency and let us get more people on the buses.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: How are you going to do that?

The Hon. Anne Levy: He is going to conscript people on to them.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: People do not travel on the buses because the Government has been wasting all the money that it has had on Monarto. It has spent \$20 000 000 there. It has not provided an attractive means of transport, but if it had spent, on the buses and trams, the money that it has spent at Monarto, more people would use the services. I refer now to another area of taxation, namely, stamp duties. In the last year receipts from stamp duties went up by 42 per cent, yet the Premier has the hide to say to the Commonwealth Government, "You should reduce taxation." What does he think these are? Of course they are taxes.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris wants double taxation.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That argument is so stupid as to be unworthy of reply. The honourable member knows there is no intention of imposing double taxation; it merely means that the State Government refuses to take any responsibility for its actions and wants to stand up here every time it cannot do something and say, "It is the Commonwealth's fault that we cannot do that."

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I remember you saying that in your maiden speech.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Don't talk nonsense. The Government says, "We cannot do anything about it because we are not given money by the Commonwealth." It should say, "We are not prepared to levy the amount required for these services." I would give the Government credit if it was prepared to say that but it is not prepared to say that. It has gone on, even in a time of the Federal Government's reducing expenditure, increasing expenditure and taxation at a colossal rate; there have been enormous increases in pay-roll tax.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Mr. Street suggested that that be increased further.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That would not be a bad idea, because it is about time you provided something for the people of this community. The Government has misdirected people; it has given people little warning that it will not be able to provide them with the jobs they need when they have finished their training, and that is a direct indictment of this Government. It is the Government that has provided extra funds for education but it cannot now meet its responsibilities in providing for young people, as it has always done in the past. It

has almost been automatic in our society that, if a person went through a teachers college or a college of advanced education, he got a job with the Education Department when he finished his training; but that is no longer the case, because the Government has been persuaded to misdirect its funds. This Government through its Leader, the Premier, is without doubt the most hypocritical Government this State has ever had.

He stands there as Leader and makes direct criticism of the Federal Government for not reducing taxation while, at the same time, the Labor Party here has increased taxes to an unprecedented level in this country, and it shows no sign of being prepared to stop. It is only in the last two days, because of the request by the Premier of Victoria, that the Labor Party has at last agreed to a prices/wages freeze. I shall be interested to see whether this lasts, whether the Premier can persuade the trade unions of this State to agree to this. I shall be surprised if he can. I shall be the first one to take off my hat to him if he can get the unanimous agreement of the unions of this State to a wages freeze. I await with some interest the attitude of the Australian Council of Trade Unions in this matter.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What about the farmers?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The farmers are a very adaptable part of this community; they have to be because their prices fluctuate so much. No doubt, the present Government with its attitude towards farmers will be the first to say, "We will freeze these flaming farmers"—that is what will happen. I have information that all auctions have been cancelled, and that is the situation, that prices for farm produce are already frozen.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Farmers will be playing their role in the recovery of the economy.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I shall be interested to see how this will work out with export prices, because what will happen if there is an increase in the prices of products produced for export by farmers; to whom will the money go? Are we to freeze our prices to oversea countries and, if farmers' prices are already frozen under the auction system and they cannot obtain the benefit of increased prices, who will get it? I trust the Governments concerned in this price freeze will see that any increases in prices will be passed on to the producers. It is difficult for the people in the community who operate under an auction system to operate in a price freeze situation but, if it is required for the sake of the economy, I am sure the farmers will agree to it.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You cannot freeze prices under an auction system.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We did it after the last war.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M. B. Dawkins): Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You keep him quiet, Mr. Acting President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: I will keep you quiet, too. There are far too many interjections. The Hon. Mr. Cameron.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Hon. Mr. Foster has just said that the price freeze will not work.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I do not think it will, either.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is the first indication I have had from a member of the Government that, in fact, Government members are already admitting that it will not work. It is an incredible situation that, two

hours after the Premier officially announced in Parliament that this freeze would apply to the whole of South Australia, an honourable member opposite here gets up and says, "It cannot work." I trust that the people outside Parliament will note this. I assure honourable members that the farmers in the community are prepared to accept whatever is required to bring under control this economy, because they are the ones who, more than anyone else, suffer from inflation. They do not have fixed prices for their goods.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What about the housewife?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The housewife has great problems, and you are not helping her because you will not even let her shop at reasonable hours. The present Government is not interested in the housewife, and that is proved by the fact that it denies her the right to shop at reasonable hours. What will the Government do about it? Do honourable members opposite believe in the freedom they are always claiming they champion, such people as the Council of Civil Liberties? It is a farce for members of the Government to belong to it, for they clearly do not believe in freedom, because the members of the Government have deliberately over the years refused to allow members of the public that freedom which should be theirs—the right to shop when they wish to. It denies the shopowners the right to open when they want to open. It is clear from what the Hon. Mr. Foster has said that this Government does not believe that the prices and wages freeze will work.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting President. What I said was that it would not work because certain business interests were already making public statements that they were bitterly opposed to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M. B. Dawkins): That is not a point of order.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I know.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If *Hansard* picked up the Hon. Mr. Foster's interjection, he will be shown to be guilty of a falsehood. An article in today's *News* states:

Assistant State Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers' and Shipwrights' Union, Mr. L. G. Lean, said in Adelaide today a wages and prices freeze was not possible. "Prices will continue to rise because the Federal Government won't be able to stop manufacturers lifting them," he said.

"The Government cannot give any guarantee prices won't rise, but it is seeking a guarantee from the unions they won't push for wage increases. Wage earners have had a wage freeze since indexation was introduced and it has not worked. In fact, in real terms wages have gone down.

Metal workers are \$20 a week worse off now than they were in September, 1974. That has to be caught up before there can be any talk about a wage freeze."

The Hon. N. K. Foster: They are already four months behind.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Again the honourable member is saying that it will not work. What about the farmers? Can they catch up, too? The Hon. Mr. Foster is already showing evidence of severe dissent.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You opposed the referendum.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The honourable member will find that I did not oppose it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order. The Hon. Mr. Cameron has had a fair amount of liberty, not perhaps as much as the Hon. Mr. Foster had yesterday, but I think the Hon. Mr. Cameron had better come back to the Bill.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting President. It is improper of you, as Acting

President, to suggest that the President allowed liberties beyond Standing Orders; that is a reflection on the occupant of the Chair at the time I spoke. It is a shocking thing to say.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The article continues:

The State Secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, Mr. A. S. Begg, said talk of a voluntary prices freeze was a joke. Without legislation from Canberra there was no way manufacturers would hold the price levels of their products.

Mr. Begg said he felt the "rank and file" trade unionists would find a wages and price freeze acceptable, but in the long run they would be very disappointed. "Wages are frozen now and a price freeze would be very attractive, but you will find that without legislation and a means of policing prices there is no way they will not continue to rise.

This kind of talk is just another indication the Government wants the workers to meet the cost of overcoming the problems in the economy. While a freeze on wages and prices seems a good idea now, those who accept it will be very disappointed when they see it won't work."

That is another clear indication that this prices and wages freeze will not be accepted. The Hon. Mr. Foster has made plain that there is already severe dissension within the Government.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: A serious split.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Clearly. I await with interest what action the Australian Council of Trade Unions will take. I predict that the A.C.T.U. will not accept this.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about the Trades and Labor Council?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I would love to be a fly on the wall when the Premier meets the T.L.C. He will run into a barrage of trouble there. All Labor Premiers will find the same trouble with the A.C.T.U., which I believe will not accept this. This Bill clearly indicates that the rate of Government expenditure is showing no signs of decreasing. The Government is showing no sense of responsibility in this respect. I trust that the people of South Australia, realising that the present Government is irresponsible and has exacerbated inflation, will throw the Government out at the next election.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. Cameron was his usual loud self, but he was considerably more long-winded than he usually is. Actually, his rambling discourse had little basis in fact; it was not in keeping with his usual useful contributions. I do not wish to go over all the inanities and absurdities that the honourable member traversed, but I must refer to the question of State taxation. The Hon. Mr. Cameron, after quoting with some glee the increase in State taxation from \$60 000 000 to \$300 000 000, railed against the Government. Really, that comparison means nothing. The figures must be compared with increases in taxation in the other States. The honourable member is leaving the Chamber now, because he cannot dispute what I am saying. I point out that there has been a general increase in community costs. The real figure we must consider is comparative taxation between South Australia and the other States. While we may not be the lowest taxed State, we are certainly not the highest taxed State. In fact, the last figures debated in this Chamber indicated that New South Wales and Victoria had higher tax rates. They were both under Liberal Governments at that time. There have been no taxation increases in this State in the past 12 months and, as the Hon. Mr. Cornwall pointed out, there have been several reductions in State taxation in that period.

The Hon. Mr. Cameron referred to the deficit in operations of the State Transport Authority saying that when the Liberal Government was in office it ran at a break-even point, whereas there is now an \$8 000 000 loss

attached to the operations of the S.T.A. The Hon. Mr. Cameron referred to more efficient management, which could reduce the deficit, but he did not indicate where inefficiencies were occurring, and he did not indicate what the authority was doing now that it should not have been doing. Also, the honourable member said there should not be an increase in fares. How the honourable member could develop a criticism of the Government from that inconsistent group of facts, I cannot understand. I do not wish to comment on his speech further, other than to say that it speaks for itself; that is, it was a light-weight and ineffectual performance, although long-winded.

I now refer to the urgency motion on North Malaysia Week which the Hon. Mr. Hill intended to move yesterday and which he was unable to do. If you, Mr. President, were in the Chamber at the time the honourable member sought to move that motion, I believe that you would have ruled the motion out of order, because it is impossible to see how it can be considered as a matter of urgency. In another place there was a recent urgency debate dealing with the power dispute at Torrens Island. Clearly, that was an emergency that the Parliament should have discussed immediately. To describe North Malaysia Week as urgent is a distortion of the language. The Hon. Mr. Hill should have moved a motion and had it debated in private members' time yesterday or next Wednesday.

In making that point, I hope that future urgency motions will have some reason behind them and that you, Mr. President, will not accept them unless they do. The Hon. Mr. Hill made several criticisms of North Malaysia Week. I do not wish to refer to the week itself, other than to point out that in terms of cultural exchange it was enormously important for the State and for the Asian region. I was concerned about the honourable member's display of economic parochialism.

He talked about the potential loss of jobs that might occur from the Government's actions in promoting development in Malaysia. From what the honourable member said, one would have thought that South Australia was an economic island, that it had no relationship with the rest of Australia and no relationship with trade in the rest of the world. Although I do not want to get into a free trade or protectionist argument, I am convinced that the economic problems facing the world community will not be solved by the sort of economic parochialism and restrictive trade protectionism that the Hon. Mr. Hill advocated.

He criticised the fact that wages in Malaysia were only about \$11 a week, saying that, because of our higher wage structure, industry in South Australia could not compete. He said that we should not be investing in industries in Malaysia for that reason. First, this is irresponsible so far as the development of third world economies are concerned. We should do what we can to help develop those economies by co-operative investment with the Governments and industries in those countries.

The fact that there are low wages in those countries cannot be a bar to such action. Low wages prevail in all developing countries, and the only way in which wages will be increased is if there is a degree of economic and industrial development that will produce and provide them with goods and services, thereby increasing their level of wages. That method undoubtedly will have an effect on the general world economic community because, with increased wages in these countries, they will be able to buy the goods that we are able to produce, rural goods or raw materials, which will assist in the general trading situation.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What are your views on employment?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The employment situation in Australia is bad, but the unemployment situation in South Australia is the best of any State. However, the unemployment situation in almost every country in the world is bad, and I do not think it will be assisted by this means. General world recovery will not be assisted by countries turning in on themselves in such a parochial approach to economic development, as the honourable member adopted during this speech.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: If one took his argument to its logical conclusion, we would not even export iron ore to Japan, because it manufactures goods there at the expense of our workers.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: True, and that view is short-sighted. I suspect his argument was directed to a political use here rather than to the international economic situation.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It is not political when one worries about employees in this State.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am concerned about unemployed people in South Australia and in Australia just as the honourable member is concerned, but I do not believe that the proposition he advanced will in any way help the unemployed of this State. In fact, in the long-term it will exacerbate the problem. We will then have a trade war when there is not the movement that there ought to be of goods and services through the world, and when there is not the development of third world countries that there ought to be.

If we look at this problem from an international point of view, as I believe we should, the third world countries are much worse off than we are. We will not solve problems by giving direct monetary aid through such organisations as Community Aid Abroad, the United Nations, the Food and Agricultural Organisation or the World Health Organisation. True, we can do things through these organisations, but third world problems will not be solved by such hand-outs: they will be solved by an increase in trade with those countries. This aspect must be handled with discretion and sensitivity, but we could reduce tariffs to provide markets for third world goods and, in turn, we could sell our goods to the third world.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Your disregard for the South Australian worker amazes me.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I have no disregard for the South Australian worker; I am concerned about problems with the unemployed in Australia. However, I do not believe that the argument advanced by the Hon. Mr. Hill will resolve this matter. I support the Government's initiative in these international ventures in Malaysia, as well as the ventures in Libya and Algeria. One must support such initiative, because it is an attempt to provide development in a developing country on a co-operative basis rather than on an exploitive basis, as has previously applied and as still exists to a large extent with multi-national corporations, whose only concern is to get into these countries, put in capital and take out as much as they can in profits, exporting those profits back to their mother country, which in most cases is the United States of America.

That is not the sort of economic co-operation that I support, but I support the venture that the Government has tried to promote. It was a joint venture, which provided employment in Malaysia and permitted manufactured goods to be exported from here and used in that country. Potentially, it would provide a market for our goods and, therefore, would provide our industries with additional markets and thus increase employment in this State. In this case it was South Australian componentry

that could be provided to factories in Malaysia in order to construct houses. I was appalled by the narrow approach adopted by the Hon. Murray Hill. The next matter to which I refer is the contribution of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, who was upset and said that the Treasurer's address on the Appropriation Bill was plain unvarnished politics. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris gave us an unvarnished political justification—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: His wasn't a polished speech.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No, I think it was a tarnished political justification for the Fraser Government's policies. One wonders about the Hon. Mr. DeGaris speaking in this Chamber about the terrible influence of politics that pervades here since the number of honourable members on this side has increased. I am continually bemused: he would rather see himself as a statesman and not as a politician. We are in the business of politics, and to say that a statement was a political statement is really a nothing or nonsense statement, if I have ever heard one. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris is accustomed to making them in this Chamber, and I will continue to be completely bemused by them.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You criticise people for making political statements, too.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No, I criticise them for introducing legislation that is solely designed for headlines and publicity in the community.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Are you sure that that is what it was designed for?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That was the only conclusion I could come to yesterday, as I pointed out to the honourable member. I think I demonstrated (and the President agreed with me) that the Bill was not necessary, because it did not take the law any further than it existed at present. I am referring to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill dealing with child pornography. Opposition members, and especially the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, have hitched themselves to Mr. Fraser's star. In doing so they have failed to take into account the State's interest and failed to realise the problems that will occur with the Fraser Government's new federalism policy. Some of these matters have been adverted to previously and, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, it is true that, when the proposals were announced last year, the Treasurer gave them qualified support, because it seemed that the State's contribution from the Federal Government would not be reduced but, in fact, it was hoped that it would be increased. What has happened since then has caused concern, in that the Federal Government's contribution to the State will be reduced substantially in real terms as well as in relative terms.

Some of the problems that arise and some of the actions that can be taken by the Commonwealth Government to reduce the State's share of funds without consultation are, among others, the imposition of the Medibank levy. That levy is not included in the calculation of income tax to decide what funds State Governments will receive under the percentage formula that has been evolved. The Federal Government can reduce income tax without consultation with the States and, because of the fixed formula of 33.6 per cent, reduce effectively the Federal income tax cake, thereby reducing the funds the States will receive.

The Commonwealth Government could take both those actions without consultation with the States, and has done so. Personal taxation indexation and the Medibank levy

are two examples of actions taken by the Federal Government to reduce the funds the States would receive under the formula. Both those actions were taken without consultation and in the face of opposition, in the case of the Medibank levy, by at least three States. That is not co-operative federalism.

Another problem that the Premier foresees (and it is also foreseen by the other Premiers who oppose the new federalism policy) is that the Fraser Government will reduce funds to the States and will not say precisely what cuts will be made. In the area of specific purpose grants considerable uncertainty exists about precisely what cuts the Federal Government will make. There does not seem to be any doubt that what the Fraser Government is trying to do is to end special purpose grants, to create uncertainty in State finances, and to say to the States, "There you are, it's back into your bag and you can now pick up the tab." The States cannot be sure about what the Federal Government intends to do. Further uncertainty is produced by the railways agreement whereby Mr. Fraser and Mr. Nixon continue to make sniping remarks, saying that they will try to upset the benefits that have accrued to South Australia as a result of the sale of our railways.

Each time the Premier meets the Prime Minister at a Premiers' Conference, he has tried to get from the Prime Minister an assurance that the Federal Government will not interfere with the railways agreement. Although the Premier seems to get such assurances, we hear soon after further sniping remarks from the Prime Minister that indicate that perhaps the agreement will be repudiated, thus forcing the State into a parlous financial situation. I am sure that these are the problems the Premier sees with the new federalism policy. What the three Labor Premiers of Australia are saying deserves to be considered because, until the Fraser Government can indicate where cuts in funds will be made and indicate that it will co-operate further with the States, the States cannot possibly accept the new policies, because of the uncertainties and doubts that exist.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to centralism and federalism. It is a favourite topic of his to criticise the Labor Party for being centralist. When one considers what that means, one must consider generally for the moment the imperatives of economic management or of nations playing a role in the international community, and that must mean an increasing degree of centralism in the government of his country. Even Sir Charles Court, who has supported Mr. Fraser over his new federalism, criticised the Fraser Government for its attempts to centralise power in Canberra.

I will quote this to indicate that centralism is a process that is occurring in our community as a result of actions that have been taken over the years. I refer to the changes in the taxation structure and the financial agreement in 1928. Also, most important is the fact that Australians see themselves as a nation, and the imperatives of economic management and dealing, as a nation, in the world economic community means that the Federal Government will probably gain more power irrespective of what intentions the present Federal Government may have.

In a letter, the contents of which were leaked, from the Western Australian Premier (Sir Charles Court) to the Prime Minister, Sir Charles alleged that there was a concerted plan by the Canberra bureaucracy to ensure Commonwealth dominance over the States. That statement was made after all the comments that Mr. Fraser had uttered about giving the States more say in their economic management. However, the main problem with the surcharge (and certainly Liberal Prime Ministers have

until now always considered this to be an obstacle to the surcharge) is that it will hamper the Federal Government in its economic management policy. So, if we have some States with a surcharge and some with a rebate, and we do not have a consistent taxation system, or progressive taxation throughout the Commonwealth, the Federal Government will find it much more difficult to manage the economy, or to stimulate or reduce demand by means of taxation. It will have increasing problems so that it may, in future years, have to rethink the new federalism.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that the State Government could apply for a rebate. True, as a result of the railways deal, this State has been in a better position than the other States to cope with the difficult financial problems that have occurred over the last two years. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris considers that we should never have had this, and that should certainly be pointed out to South Australians. The situation with this State's Budget is that, although there is a small surplus at present, there is no guarantee, particularly with uncertain Federal policies, that that will continue to be the case. Although the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that this State Government should show responsibility in its financing, he did not say where any cuts should be made. However, if one is talking about financial responsibility, one will see that this is one of the few States that have a balanced Budget: a Budget in surplus. I do not know what could be more responsible than that in terms of economic management.

Although the situation looks reasonably good at present, there seems to be no doubt that, with increasing costs, the State Government will run into trouble in balancing its Budget in perhaps 12 or 18 months. I hope that then the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, having fully supported the Fraser Government's federalism policy, will support the State Government if it finds it necessary to impose a surcharge. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I thank honourable members for their attention to the Bill. I must reply to the Hon. Mr. Hill about his claim that he was frustrated in relation to the urgency matter yesterday. I point out that, possibly, under our Standing Orders, he did not need to notify me officially of the matter. He did not officially notify me, and he did not ask for the courtesy of having time given to him. He did not say that, and he does not deny what I have said.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I told you I was going to raise a matter of urgency.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member told me that in a facetious way. He was going to tell me what to do, when I was running the House. He could have told me that he was going to raise the matter of urgency, and he could have asked for time. I advise him not to tell me what I am going to do. Today, he asked me to extend Question Time, and I had no hesitation in doing that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You changed your ways.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not. Under Standing Orders in another place (and I suggest you might raise this matter with the Standing Orders Committee, Mr. President), a member wishing to move an urgency motion must notify the Speaker one hour previously and the Speaker is obliged to notify a Minister of the Crown that the motion will be debated. This is not the position under our Standing Orders, but I believe that the matter should be considered in regard to this snide way of going about an urgency motion by not

approaching me for time for the discussion and then saying that the Government frustrated him because members on this side had questions of interest to them and the State that they wanted to ask.

Question Time continued up to 3.15 p.m. yesterday. Today, because there was no urgency motion but because the Government wanted to get business off the Notice Paper, the Opposition continued Question Time until 3.20 p.m. If I had tried to frustrate Opposition members in regard to the asking of questions today, there would have been howls of outcry. Members opposite always have received co-operation from this side when they have made a request in a proper and courteous way. I ask them to do that in future, because it is my nature to grant the request. However, I will not allow lies to be told in this House.

A further matter is that under the Standing Orders of another place, the Speaker has to decide whether the motion is one of urgency. I suggest that yesterday, under the Standing Orders of another place, you would have ruled the motion about North Malaysia week out of order, Mr. President, because there was no urgency. The matter could have been debated in another way. No-one was being put out of work yesterday, today, or tomorrow. I do not know whether there was an agreement among the Opposition members.

I think the Hon. Mr. Hill exercises his authority over the supposed Leader in this place. It is traditional that the Leader of the Opposition here leads the debate on an Appropriation Bill. This time, the Leader was told to sit down and to let Murray Hill have a go at it. That shows a weakness in this place. The Hon. Mr. Hill is trying to take over the leadership and he cannot wait until the next election to get rid of his Leader here. The honourable member had the votes yesterday. We all know that there is only a one vote difference. As the Hon. Mr. Geddes was away, the Leader did not have the numbers. The Hon. Mr. Hill was able to jump his claim. It is as simple as that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No. The Leader asked me to do it.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is what happened, and the Opposition knows that that is correct. The urgency motion was a complete flop. The Hon. Mr. Hill said that it was urgent, but he did not even attempt to move it, or to ask for the suspension of Standing Orders. He was not fair dinkum. If he had been fair dinkum yesterday, he should have moved for the suspension of Standing Orders to enable him to move the urgency motion.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You knew I couldn't do that.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member was not dinkum about the urgency motion.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You know the Council's procedures.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member did not show the courtesy of seeking the suspension of Standing Orders to do so. *Hansard* will clearly show the absence of the step the honourable member could and should have taken if he had wanted to move the motion, but he did not attempt to do it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You know why, don't you?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member did not put the Council to the test.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The subject has been practically exhausted by now. This argument might carry on for another half an hour.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It could go on even longer, because I have much to answer.

The PRESIDENT: I am not suggesting that the honourable Minister does not have much to answer, but it is becoming a shouting match.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will be deliberate, and *Hansard* will show that the Hon. Mr. Hill at no stage moved for the suspension of Standing Orders to enable him to move an urgency motion. He knew that that was his right.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: *Hansard* will show why, because I gave the explanation when I spoke.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: But the honourable member did not move it. I would have been the seconder if he had moved it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You're as weak as water.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member is the weak one. Have I the floor, Mr. President, or has the honourable member the floor?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. Mr. Hill to cease interrupting. I think that the Minister has already made his point. I cannot control the way he put his case.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Are you, Mr. President, going to control me, or is the honourable member going to control me?

The PRESIDENT: I ask the Hon. Mr. Hill to cease interrupting, and I ask the Minister to make his point succinctly.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have six more pages of *Hansard* on the topic raised by the honourable member. Have I the right to use them with regard to the Hon. Mr. Hill's question on the urgency motion, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT: I will not stop the Minister.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I suggest to the Hon. Mr. Hill that, in future, he move for the suspension of Standing Orders.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Don't be so stupid.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am being interjected on again.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Hill must cease interjecting.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Name him!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Hill's urgency motion fell down, because he made no attempt to move it. When he did get up it was supposed to be because he claimed to have been barred from moving an urgency motion, which he had made no attempt to put to the House. He did not attempt to get the suspension of Standing Orders. He spoke about North Malaysia Week, and attempted to make some very sweeping statements to the effect that it was going to affect employment in South Australia (detrimentally, he meant), whereas in fact the relationship existing between South Australia and North Malaysia is one that will assist rather than hinder the employment position in this State.

The relationship with Malaysia began more than three years ago with the twinning of Adelaide, South Australia, and Georgetown, Penang. Following this twinning, which encouraged cultural and social ties between the communities, it was obvious that possibilities existed for commercial and industrial development between the two States of Penang and South Australia. The State of Penang, in conjunction with the integrated councils of the State, visited South Australia on a cultural basis in March, 1975. In December of that year, South Australia, in conjunction with the corporation of the city of Adelaide, made a return visit to Georgetown, Penang, to further cement the relationship.

The Hon. Mr. Hill was most upset because he did not go to Penang on that trip.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Absolute rubbish!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: On the return of the delegation from Penang, we had only to read *Hansard* to see how hostile the honourable member was because he was not included in the delegation. We can understand why he was not included; he is not interested in promoting friendship and trade with other States that may assist Australia, especially South Australia. I well remember the Penang Leader of the Opposition. He was more open than is the Hon. Mr. Hill. At a dinner given in Penang, to which the Penang Leader of the Opposition was invited, he had the guts to say, "I was wrong. I now believe that it is in the best interests to have this exchange. I opposed it in Parliament and I opposed a delegation's going to Australia and a delegation coming back to Penang. I know now that I was wrong." The sooner the Hon. Mr. Hill wakes up and has the guts to say the same thing, the better it will be for everyone concerned.

In March of this year, following the success of the two previous visits and consultations with the Federal Government of Malaysia, a visit by the four northern Malaysian States of Perlis, Perak, Kedah and Penang took place. About 100 000 people (not the Hon. Mr. Hill, because he has washed his hands of anyone interested in Penang Week) visited the exhibition at Elder Park, many being from schools and other educational institutions in the State. The Hon. Mr. Hill wanted to deny those 100 000 people the opportunity of doing that. The food demonstrations, particularly, created considerable interest, and it was possible to present to the public foods of various types which are normally available in Malaysia. The cultural aspect (and the Hon. Mr. Hill should have been interested in that, because I understand not only is he the shadow Minister of Arts, but also the leading actor from the other side) enabled many people in South Australia to experience the traditional dances and musical performances of South-East Asian countries, and allowed them to become more aware of the cultural activities of our close neighbours.

The trade exhibition was mainly to allow the northern States of Malaysia to put on display some of their products, not so much to attract buyers but to demonstrate on a national basis what they are able to contribute to the developing countries of the world. Since the South Australian Government became interested in development in Malaysia, it has become possible for various joint ventures to be completed. The South Australian Government's approach to trading in the international sphere is based on the concept of mutual co-operation; in other words, the policy is to cover joint ventures with other countries, and certain criteria exist. I want the Hon. Mr. Hill to listen to this, and not to interject. The first criterion is that the project will help stabilise or improve employment in South Australia. That is No. 1 criterion—not No. 3, No. 4, or No. 5 and, therefore, in those circumstances jobs are not threatened. The Hon. Mr. Hill is biased because he did not get a trip to Penang. He has never got over that, or the fact that he did not go overseas when he was a Minister. We have never heard the last of that. This is what they thought of the Hon. Mr. Hill's international standing: there were sufficient Liberal Ministers in London to hold a Cabinet meeting but the Hon. Mr. Hill was left at home, by his own Government.

The second criterion is that the project fits in with the requirements of the other country's economic plans. The third criterion is that the project is in the public interest, and the fourth criterion is that the products

involved in the project are not a duplication of goods manufactured in South Australia. How does all this interfere with the employment of people in this State? The Hon. Mr. Hill is following your instruction, Sir, and does not interject, and that is good. In other words, the factories are not there to export back to Australia but rather to export to tourist countries as well as provide goods in the country in which the factory is situated. That gives the lie to what the Hon. Mr. Hill has been trying to put over—that it is to the detriment of employment of people in South Australia.

Malaysia, of course, is not one of the least developed countries but rather is a developing country; it certainly cannot be classed as a fully developed country, at this stage. In this respect, the various companies which have been encouraged to develop projects in Malaysia have been encouraged in order to diversify their base and to stabilise or increase the work force in South Australia. It should also be noted that one of the firm policies of the South Australian Government's involvement is to make certain that, whatever industrial development takes place in a developing country, control is left very much in the hands of the people of that country, national interests holding the majority shareholding and consequently the profits from such undertakings. In other words, the State Government's basic philosophy is for Malaysia to reap the industrial benefits of development through control, while at the same time consolidating South Australia's home and oversea markets without colonisation.

It is not possible or practicable to give a list of industries which are going to benefit from the recent North Malaysia Week in South Australia, but I can clearly indicate to honourable members that several companies are currently negotiating to establish industrial structures within Malaysia, to fit within the fourth criterion to which I have referred. This will ultimately stabilise, if not increase, employment in South Australia, and enable the companies concerned to diversify their basis. Jobs are not being threatened; in fact, they are being consolidated. Already in Malaysia there is a rubber company operating a fruit juice canning factory, a cordial factory, and a housing factory, all of which can be directly attributed to the South Australian Government's basic philosophy in its dealings with North Malaysia.

Under the close relationship that exists between South Australia and Malaysia, many other companies have found markets for their goods which were not previously available. While exports have not necessarily increased employment, they are providing, to a degree, economies of scale. One cannot realistically, let alone morally, simply go along to a developing country, exhibit a catalogue, take an order, pocket the money, and then go away. There has to be more than just salesmanship: there has to be close liaison and collaboration. South Australia's operations in South-East Asia are not confined purely to Malaysia: they directly relate also to Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand, and, to a lesser degree, the Philippines. I should like the Hon. Mr. Hill to have a bound copy of that so that he will not go around spreading untruths about the relationship between Malaysia and South Australia.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris in his speech referred to federalism. The Fraser Government's federalism policy means nothing more than shedding the Federal Government's responsibility. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris invited us to consider how much revenue was coming in. Does that kind of point not apply to the Federal Government, too? That Government is now collecting more in income tax than it has ever previously done. Honourable members opposite say that the Federal Government is doing a

good job because they claim that that Government is reducing taxation. When we do the same thing, honourable members say it is wrong.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I did not comment on that at all.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Leader did. During the Hon. Mr. Cornwall's contribution to the debate, the Leader said that the Government had collected much more this year than it did last year. Actually, we would have collected more this year, had we not reduced taxation, and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris knows it. We have provided concessions, such as reduced succession duties, for the people, but the Opposition gives us no credit for that. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris wants us to provide services for the people, but how does he expect us to do that if we do not incur expenditure? He has not said what services he wants us to abolish if we do not get the money. Under the Federal Government's inflationary policy, it is obvious that more money must be found to provide services in this State. When we reduce taxes, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris gives us no credit and, when he claims that our services may be suffering, he asks what we are doing about it. However, when the Federal Government wants to shed responsibilities and wants the States to pick up those responsibilities, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris says that we have no right to have more money to carry out those responsibilities. All he is concerned about is that we should co-operate with the Federal Government so that it can balance the Federal Budget.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You did not listen to what I said.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You have been twisting everything this afternoon.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Hill must have twisted his Leader's arm to get priority to speak. Although he was given the prime position among the speakers yesterday, he did not hit the headlines. He did not get an honourable mention, but what the President said about the Hon. Mr. Burdett's Bill got an honourable mention.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are continuing to talk rot.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member almost sounded dinkum. He does not like the truth. Yesterday he wanted to blame Government members but, when he had the opportunity to test the strength of the other side, he did not try to exercise his right, and he attempted to blame the Government. This afternoon, the Government co-operated with the Opposition in connection with the length of Question Time. The Government would have co-operated yesterday, too. You, Mr. President, should consider the Standing Orders, because the Hon. Mr. Hill is obviously hurt about the matter. Opposition members did not like the answers honourable members on this side were getting to their questions.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is in the same form as a measure that was passed by another place on March 28, 1974, and laid aside in this Chamber. Since that date a general election for the House of Assembly has taken place. In this Parliament, being the Parliament next ensuing after the Parliament in which the Bill was laid aside, this Bill is again introduced. Accordingly, I suggest the constitutional implication of this measure will not escape the attention of honourable members.

In summary, the Bill will facilitate the entry by the State Government Insurance Commission into the field of life assurance. The arguments in support of the entry of the commission into this field were exhaustively canvassed in the debate when this measure was last before this Chamber, and little will be served at this juncture by their reiteration.

However, it is appropriate at this stage that I draw honourable members' attention to the somewhat unusual form of this Bill. First, its short title refers to the year 1974 rather than to the current year and, secondly, clause 4 proposes an amendment to section 16 of the principal Act which has already been effected by Act No. 88 of 1974. The reason that the measure is in this form will be found in the opening passage of paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of section 41 of the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended, that is, "The same Bill . . . has been passed," etc. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

VERTEBRATE PESTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

**LAND COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(No. 2)**

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

MENTAL HEALTH BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from April 13. Page 3378.)

Clauses 4 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Establishment of board."

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

Page 9—

Line 14—Leave out "at least".

Line 19—Leave out "one shall be a person who has" and insert "two shall be persons who have".

The Select Committee recommended a Guardianship Board of five persons, but only four were provided for in the legislation. As one should be a psychiatrist, it was resolved that two should be appointed by the Government to the committee.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I do not object to these amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (21 to 52) passed.

Schedule.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I move:

Page 23—After paragraph (i) insert paragraphs as follows:

(ja) by striking out from paragraph VIII of section 111 the passage "he is committee or administrator, any action, suit or other proceeding concerning the property of" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "he is the administrator, any action, suit or other proceeding on behalf of".

(jb) by inserting after paragraph XX of section 111 the following paragraphs:

XXI. Carry on any trade or business of the said person:

XXII. Expend money (not exceeding \$2 000) in the improvement of any property of the said person by way of building or otherwise:

After paragraph (j) insert paragraphs as follows:

(ja) by inserting in paragraph (v) of section 112 after the word "money" the passage "(exceeding \$2 000)";

(jb) by striking out paragraph (vi) of section 112;

After paragraph (k) insert paragraphs as follows:

(ka) by striking out from subsection (1) of section 114 the passage "the committee under this Act, or which he is authorised by this Act to administer, does not exceed the sum of two thousand dollars" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "the administrator does not exceed the sum of twenty thousand dollars".

(kb) by striking out from subsection (2) of section 114 the passage "two thousand dollars" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "twenty thousand dollars".

Leave out paragraphs (o) and (p) and insert paragraphs as follows:

(o) by striking out section 120 and inserting in lieu thereof the following section:

120. When any person other than the Public Trustee is appointed under the Act as the administrator of an estate, that person shall have, subject to any order of the court, the powers conferred on the Public Trustee by sections 111 to 114 of this Act.

After paragraph (r) insert paragraphs as follows:

(ra) by striking out from subsection (3) of section 123 the passage "the order of the court upon making the appointment or any subsequent order thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "any order of the court";

(rb) by striking out from subsection (2) of section 124 the word "committee" wherever it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof, in each case, the word "administrator";

Page 24—After paragraph (dd) insert paragraph as follows:

(dda) by striking out from subsection (2) of section 131 the passage "or which he is by this Act authorised to administer";

These amendments arise from suggestions made by the Public Trustee. They are designed to overcome difficulties that he has experienced in the administration of the provisions of the existing Mental Health Act setting out his powers as administrator of the estate of a mentally disturbed person. Paragraph (ia) is designed to enable the Public Trustee to take legal proceedings of any kind on behalf of a protected person. At present, he can only take proceedings relating to the property of a protected person. Under the new provision the Public Trustee will be able to take actions in tort and actions under the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act on behalf of protected persons.

Paragraph (ib) is designed to empower the Public Trustee to carry on a trade or business on behalf of a protected person and to expend moneys (not exceeding \$2 000) on improvements to the properties of the protected person. More expensive improvements can be carried out with the sanction of the Supreme Court under section 112. Paragraphs (ja) and (jb) are consequential upon paragraphs (ia) and (ib) which I have previously explained.

Paragraphs (ka) and (kb) are designed to dispense with the necessity of the Public Trustee going to the court for approval where he seeks to exercise the administrative

powers under section 112 in any case where the total value of the protected estate does not exceed \$20 000. The present figure is \$2 000, set in 1934. Paragraph (o) is a consequential amendment. Paragraphs (ra), (rb) and (dda) merely make consequential and drafting amendments to the administration provisions of the present Mental Health Act.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not object to the amendments, but I am surprised that the Minister did not declare paragraph (ib) a money provision.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You disputed it yesterday. Now that I am taking your advice you're going crook.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am pleased that the Chief Secretary has included the clause in the Bill to allow the expenditure of money by the Public Trustee. However, if it was a money clause yesterday, this, too, must be a money clause.

The CHAIRMAN: It is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is my opinion, as we said earlier, that this Bill should have been introduced by the Minister administering the Act. The reason why the Minister, namely, the Hon. Mr. Banfield, claimed that he did not introduce the Bill in this Chamber was that it is a money Bill and therefore must be introduced in another place. As he claims it is a money Bill, he must agree that this amendment deals with money matters, too. What he has said lays bare the fact not that the Bill is a money Bill but that it should have been introduced in this Chamber; and it lays bare the fact that, for some reason the Minister is afraid to disclose, it was introduced in another place. The Minister must buck up his ideas and be more responsible than he is now. That is why Cabinet took the Bill out of his hands and it was introduced in another place. The Minister's conduct yesterday and today in this Chamber simply reinforces my belief that he is slipping in his duty. I hope that he will improve his general approach to his duty and that he will not offer the kind of excuse that the Bill was taken out of his hands by Cabinet. His feeble behaviour yesterday prevented me from moving an urgency motion, and I hope that we will never see the like again of his conduct in this place.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Regardless of how feeble the Minister is, I commend the amendments. The Public Trustee has too little power, but this provision is too little too late. In many instances the Public Trustee could perform greater service to the public than he does now. This amendment goes some way towards extending that necessary power.

Amendments carried; schedule as amended passed.
Title.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the Minister's attention to the title of the Bill. It is a Bill not to repeal the Mental Health Act but to amend that Act. I will make that correction if the Minister wishes.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, Sir.
Title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I draw members' attention to the relatively minor matter that was raised a moment ago regarding "repeal" and "amend". With due respect, Sir, I submit that this is, in fact, a repeal Bill. However, for certain reasons that were explained, some old portions of the existing Act were retained by way of the schedule in this Bill. I hope, therefore, that no difficulties will arise in future as a result of that change.

I agree that it is unique. In fact, I cannot remember a situation like this having arisen previously. The original objective was to repeal the old Act and to introduce a new Bill. However, as a result of the situation in which amendments to the Administration and Probate Act and certain changes to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act could not be introduced at this stage, the total change that the new Bill was intended to introduce could not be implemented.

So, as a transitional measure (and this aspect of its being a transitional measure was referred to at several stages of the Select Committee's taking evidence), and pending the changes to the other Bills, it was necessary to retain some of the provisions of the parent Act, one of which has just been amended by the Chief Secretary's amendment. Basically, I believe that it involves a repeal of the old Act.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NOISE CONTROL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from April 13. Page 3376.)

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I support the second reading. In saying that, I also state that we are supporting a Bill that will prove to be virtually unworkable, just as similar legislation in other States and in other parts of the world has proved to be unworkable.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why are you supporting it, then?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: If the honourable member waits, he will hear in good time. The whole point (and I think the honourable member would admit this) is that New South Wales and Victoria both have noise control legislation. However, that is not to say that the noise level in Melbourne or Sydney is any less than it is in Adelaide. That is what I mean when I say that the Bill will probably prove to be unworkable.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Then why not vote against it?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: If he waits, the honourable member will see why. I said that I would support the second reading because I think this Bill can be improved by the amendments that have been placed on file. The noise problem is far from a new one, although it is certainly growing in the 20th century. Mechanical noise is a problem that has existed since the first steam engine was invented although, as the Hon. Mr. Burdett said, the English were famous for making noise even before that. This problem has existed since the first train started running, and it has grown since the advent of cars, trucks and buses. The growth of all these things has meant that we have had to build high-speed multi-lane highways. Of necessity, these must go through residential areas, and this has compounded the problem of noise. The problem increased with the introduction of the aeroplane and the need for airports reasonably close to major cities. The demands of modern living, to which we all subscribe, mean that we must have factories, and these factories produce such things as motor cars, power saws, and lawnmowers, contributing further to noise. We believe that all these things are for the public good. Often that is questionable, but all the items that I have mentioned create noise.

We must accept that motor cars, buses, trains, aeroplanes, factories, and so on, are here to stay, but they all create noise, and no amount of legislation will affect that. In most cases, there is much noise. A steel mill,

an engineering works or a smelter cannot be conducted quietly. It is impossible to tip-toe a 100-tonne jet aircraft from one place to another. I believe industry already has tried to control noise to the best of its ability. Industrial noise is covered in the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, under which such noise must be controlled to a large extent. If it is controlled in a building for the sake of the workers, it must also be controlled as far as people outside the factories are concerned.

This Bill was introduced in haste last year in response to demands from the public. I am not attacking the Government in this regard, because a Government of any political persuasion would have been in the same position. There was a growing lobby and clamour from the people for noise control legislation. I commend the Government for allowing the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee so that experts and the community at large could have their say.

The question of noise generally is largely emotional. Everyone supports having noise control legislation, but no-one knows what will be the full impact of that legislation. We have been given no idea of the administrative costs and I say, again in fairness to the Government, that the Government probably does not know the costs and that is why we have not been given the information. No-one knows what will be the cost to industry of implementing the Act, but those costs will be passed on to the general community. Both the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw and the Hon. Jessie Cooper have mentioned the cost to a factory that is forced to comply with the Act, and they made the point that this cost could be in excess of capacity to pay. If the requirement was insisted on, the industry could be forced to close.

As I have said, industrial noise in factories is controlled already, and it will be covered now under this Bill. That is not a big problem. We could have a situation where, even though the nearest house could be, say, 100 metres away, noise at the boundary of a factory was of a level that caused the factory to be forced to comply with a regulation that it could not afford to comply with. So, it could be forced to close, thus resulting in unemployment for people who were quite happy with the current situation.

Clause 10 covers the situation to which I have just referred. If members read it thoroughly, they will see that the inspectors to be appointed will have wide powers. The whole matter will be left to an inspector's discretion. Clause 10 (5) provides for a \$5 000 penalty for non-compliance with an inspector's direction and that is a considerable penalty. I believe it inadvisable to place that matter in the hands of only one person, but amendments are on file to cover this matter. I believe that the legislation will be unworkable because it will not result in less industrial noise. Clause 11 deals with exemptions for certain industrial premises, and subclause (1) provides:

The Minister may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, exempt from the application of section 10 of this Act any non-domestic premises, or non-domestic premises of any class, specified in the notice.

Subclause (3) provides:

The Minister shall, in determining whether or not to grant an exemption under this section, have regard to—

- (a) the technical feasibility of reducing the noise emitted from the non-domestic premises;
- (b) the economic cost incidental to reducing the noise;
- (c) any effect of the noise on the health or safety of any persons;
- (d) the number of persons affected by the noise;
- (e) the levels of the noise;
- (f) the times at which the noise is emitted;
- (g) the frequency of the noise;

(h) the frequency of occurrence of the noise;
and

(i) any other matter the Minister considers relevant.

I was pleased to see that, under clause 4, the Act binds the Crown, but I am forced to wonder whether, under the wide grounds for exemption, Government instrumentalities will not be exempted more easily than will private enterprise. Excessive noise is obnoxious, whether it emanates from Government industry or from private industry.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That smacks of some insincerity, doesn't it?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: It does. It is somewhat rare for the Government to provide that an Act binds the Crown, although clause 11 gives the Crown the way out. So, I question the sincerity.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: All Government instrumentalities will be exempt, so what is the point in providing that the Crown is bound?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am compelled to wonder. A case in point mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw was the bus depot at Morphetville. I understand that, if a noise measure were taken at the boundary of the depot, the depot would not comply with the provisions of the Act. Will the depot be one of the first Government instrumentalities exempted under the Bill?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Highways Department depot at Northfield is in the same category.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes. In the metropolitan area, we might find that Highways Department depots, bus depots and other Government establishments would not comply with the Act; so, will they be exempted?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Clause 11 does not apply only to the Government.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: If the honourable member had been listening, he would realise that I did not say that clause 11 applied only to the Government.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You are directing all your attention to it, and saying the Government is going to use it to get out of the situation that the Act binds the Crown.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am forced to wonder whether the Government is serious with the provisions of clause 4, when it says that the Act binds the Crown and then proceeds to make exemptions under clause 11.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is supposition.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Of course it is, but I shall watch the situation with interest. What will the Minister do with the bus depot at Morphetville which, at the moment, will not comply with the provisions of this legislation? Will it be exempt? I should like the Minister to answer that. I believe that in industry, dealing with industry as a whole, it would be easy for most industrial organisations to prove that it would be difficult for them to comply with the technical feasibility of reducing noise or that the economic cost incidental to reducing the noise is beyond their capacity. I am sure that most industrial premises will be able to comply with one or other of those criteria and seek exemption from the provisions of this legislation.

I believe that industry has done almost all it can to reduce the noise level in factories and establishments throughout the State. It has had to do this under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act. Although I believe that the legislation will not be workable as it relates to industry, I think the main effect of the Bill will be that it will allow people to be unpleasant to their neighbours. Once the Bill becomes law, I am sure we

will have people complaining constantly about their neighbours running air-conditioners, mowing lawns, or running power tools.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I will be complaining.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I would venture to say that many of those complaints would be frivolous and would arise in many cases out of unpleasantness.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What do you propose to do about that?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I do not say that people should not be able to complain, but I am saying that in future we will have many frivolous complaints. Clause 18 of the Bill deals with domestic noise. It states, in part:

(1) The occupier of any domestic premises shall not, without reasonable excuse, cause, suffer or permit excessive noise to be emitted from the premises.
Penalty: Five hundred dollars.

(2) Excessive noise is emitted from domestic premises, if—

(a) the noise emitted from the domestic premises is of such a nature that it unreasonably interferes with the peace, comfort or convenience of any person in any other premises;

That is entirely subjective; it is not a measurable thing.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: A court will have to decide.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: To say what unreasonably interferes with the peace, comfort or convenience of one person is not necessarily to say what may interfere with my peace, comfort or convenience. How is this to be decided? I think the Hon. Mr. Sumner can see much litigation, because he has said the courts will have to decide. That is the only body that can decide.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: It is fine for the lawyers.

The Hon. Anne Levy: There are a lot of unemployed lawyers.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am saying that what this gets down to is that the whole Bill is a sop to the public and is basically unworkable. This sort of thing is purely subjective. It is not measurable and we could get frivolous complaints of neighbour against neighbour. The Hon. Mr. Foster has just passed me a note.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Yes, I did indeed.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: It refers to something in which I am personally involved. In my back garden I have a fish pond, in which there are some frogs. Personally, I find the croaking of frogs on a summer's night pleasant and soothing.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What about crickets?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes, we also have a lot of crickets in the garden. My neighbour obviously does not share my love of croaking frogs and there are many complaints—not to me but the Hon. Mr. Foster knows to whom this gentleman complains. The whole point is that what is pleasant for one person may be unpleasant for another, and it is virtually unworkable to try to write that sort of thing into an Act of Parliament.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You are going to have it taken out, are you?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The honourable member appears to be bleating quite a lot over there today. I ask

the Hon. Mr. Sumner if he, as a lawyer, thinks that this Bill is unworkable. Apparently, he can see lots and lots of litigation under it.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I just want to know what you are going to do.

The Hon. Anne Levy: What about getting rid of the frogs?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: It is almost impossible to catch them, short of dismantling a large rockery surrounding the fish pond; I have tried. In conclusion, I say that the most glaring fault in the Bill is the omission of any provision to control noise caused by motor vehicles. All other similar legislation in Australia includes the motor vehicle. Why does not the South Australian Government do the same in this regard and include the motor vehicle?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Some States do not.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: If some States do not include the motor vehicle in their legislation, I shall be glad to hear of that. Before the Select Committee, all the expert witnesses, with one notable exception, recommended that motor vehicles should be included in the Act, that notable exception being the Road Traffic Board, which can hardly be said to be unbiased. The Select Committee's report states that the three major sources of noise in the community are motor vehicles, amplified music and barking dogs, in that order. The last two are covered to some extent by this Bill, although the amplified music in discotheques will need more spelling out, and that is in an amendment that I shall support. As regards motor vehicles, the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw quoted the case of measuring noise outside a factory in which he has an interest, while the motor vehicles going past on the road were making much more noise than the noise emanating from the factory itself. There are many amendments on file and I indicate that I am supporting the second reading so that I can support those amendments; but, if they fail, it will be a different matter on third reading.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Lands): I thank honourable members for the time they have spent in doing their homework on this Bill. It will not be an easy matter to police once it comes into operation. The amount of public opinion on noise itself has been an encouragement to the Government to take steps to introduce legislation of this kind. Whether or not it is workable at this stage remains to be seen, because it is really a matter of trial and error. I do not want to canvass all that was said during the second reading debate, because it will all be covered during the debate on the amendments on file. So, for that reason, I do not want to take up the time of the Council in this way except to thank honourable members again for the time they have spent on the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.52 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, April 19, at 2.15 p.m.