

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 3, 1977

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. R. A. Geddes) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

ADOPTION

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, concerning the adoption of children.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I refer to a report on page 3 of last Monday's *Advertiser*, headed "Register of adoptions planned to aid reunions". This report refers to activities in the Community Welfare Department scheme for establishing a register of the names of those persons who have had their children adopted and of the names of those adopted children who have expressed a wish to contact the natural parents, or the brother or sister, in appropriate cases. The report states:

If, for example, a natural parent wanted to make contact with a child she had adopted out some years before, she would put her name on the register. If the child wanted to contact the natural parent, his name would also be on the register, and the pair would be reunited. But if one party was not interested in making contact, his or her name would not be on the register and no reunion would occur. The scheme is voluntary.

Can the Minister tell me whether the apparently estimable situation was correctly described in that report? Further, can the Minister assure this Council that the system will be entirely voluntary and that none of the parties concerned, including the adopting parents, will be urged, pressured, or in any way coerced by officers of the department?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the question to my colleague.

S.G.I.C.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary concerning superannuation in the State Government Insurance Commission.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Minister will remember the undertaking given to this Council, not only by himself but also by the previous Chief Secretary (Hon. A. J. Shard), in relation to the question of reasonable competition being maintained between the Commission and the private sector. We did write into the legislation, when it was considered last time, certain provisions to try to maintain equal competition. As I said, Government undertakings were given. In the reply given yesterday by the Minister, he said that commission employees were enjoying Public Service superannuation, which means that 70 per cent of the pensions scheme is being funded by the taxpayer. This really amounts to a direct subsidy by the taxpayer on the operation of S.G.I.C. If I may digress for a moment—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I think that the Leader is debating the point to a certain degree, and I ask him to try to restrict his comments. Further, we desire in this Council to have short explanations to questions—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It's about—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! It would be proper for the Leader to put his question.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Government take the necessary action to have the S.G.I.C. fund its superannuation scheme from its own resources, in the same way as its commercial competitors have to fund their superannuation schemes?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the Leader's question to my colleague in charge of this matter.

GRAPES

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I saw in Monday's *Australian* that thousands of tonnes of red grapes were withering on the vine in South Australia's Barossa Valley. Considering the time of the year, can the Minister explain to the Council this phenomenon of nature and the reasons for it?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I, too, saw the news report on the front page of the *Australian* on Monday. I was surprised to see in the second or third paragraph the suggestion that there were thousands of tonnes of grapes on the vine in the Barossa Valley at this time of the year. I think we can put that report down to a bit of poetic licence. Really, the situation concerning grapegrowers is desperate, not so much now as at the next vintage. At the Agricultural Council meeting yesterday in Alice Springs, I instanced the plight of grapegrowers, pointing out that, whereas we had a surplus of about 5 000 tonnes of grapes in the last vintage, the indications from various winemakers are that the situation next year could be even more desperate. Over the past 12 or 18 months we have seen a strengthening of the trend away from red-wine consumption to white-wine consumption, but we have also seen a decline in the growth rate of wine consumption overall. These factors have depressed the grapegrowers' outlook severely, and the situation next year could be bad indeed. I suggested to the Federal Minister for Primary Industry that the Federal Government should take some action in reducing the tax on brandy, that being the most immediate way of trying to provide relief for grapegrowers. I pointed out that, while this move had been suggested on several past occasions, the Federal Government had justifiably rejected the suggestion because, I think, of the general buoyancy of the wine industry, when it could easily have pointed out that, whilst brandy sales might be depressed, other wine sales were doing well and the industry overall was prosperous. That situation does not exist now, and there is no other outlet. It is urgent that something should be done to stimulate the demand for brandy. The Federal Minister said that he would investigate the matter and he agreed that the situation was critical but, obviously, he was not willing to make any statement so close to the Federal Budget. The Ministers from New South Wales and Victoria, who also have responsibility for grapegrowing areas, have supported the move to have some reduction in taxation on brandy.

ALFALFA APHID

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture about the spotted alfalfa aphid.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Honourable members would be well aware that the spotted alfalfa aphid is causing immense concern to lucerne growers in South Australia. This pest has come into the State from northern New South Wales, and there is reliable scientific evidence to show that we can expect to lose our lucerne stands and possibly our medic pastures when spring weather encourages the aphid activity in this State. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has just returned from a meeting of the Agricultural Council. Could he tell the Council whether any approach has been made to the Commonwealth for assistance, what this assistance could mean to South Australia, and the likelihood of our receiving such assistance?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The immediate move by the South Australian Government is to launch a programme to build up a supply of parasites which will attack the spotted alfalfa aphid. This programme is expected to cost about \$100 000 overall, with a special grant of \$35 000 being made for capital equipment. The remainder of the funds will come from within the resources of the Agriculture Department. This is an emergency programme to build up the supply of parasites very quickly. Realising that there is a need for a much longer-term plan, we have made proposals to the Federal Government for a three-year programme, costing probably \$450 000. We have sought a cost-sharing basis with the Commonwealth Government in relation to this programme. The Commonwealth Government is quite receptive to this arrangement because it is aware that New South Wales and Victoria are able to get much benefit from the presence of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation in those States. The C.S.I.R.O. is building up supplies of parasites and distributing them. Because the resources of the C.S.I.R.O. here are stretched to the limit, it is unable to do very much more than supply us with basic cultures, and we have to develop a series of aphid parasite factories and a number of release sites. This is an expensive and extensive programme. An important point not always realised by some farming groups is that the parasite control method is the one most efficient in South Australia. We have many dry land stands of lucerne which, if wiped out, could not be replaced by resistant varieties; the costs involved would be too great, and the amount of soil erosion that would occur in the interim would also be too great. So, we are trying desperately through the parasite programme to save the lucerne stands that we already have in South Australia.

ROOFING CONTRACTOR

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary supplementary to a question I asked yesterday about the report of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yesterday, when I asked a question regarding a firm, the Chief Secretary undertook to get a reply from the Attorney-General. The question was based on a report of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs. This morning, I received some form of communication from the firm concerned and, although I named nobody yesterday, apart from the firm itself, it has seen fit this morning to inform me that it had paid a sum of money to a previous client but it had not undertaken to reply to the communications I had directed to that firm by telephone and in writing earlier

and more recently this year. To continue my explanation, with the indulgence of the Council, the person in the company informed me that they are willing, and indeed anxious, to settle their account with other aggrieved members of the public. Far be it from me to tell this Council who those members of the public are but, in order to assist the company, which is showing some principle, will the Chief Secretary prevail upon the Attorney-General to table in the House or to make known through the appropriate department the names of the members of the public who have been so aggrieved and at least allow the company the opportunity of settling its differences (financially and otherwise) with the people concerned?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

PORT ADELAIDE SPORTING COMPLEX

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I direct a question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport about a sporting complex. Has the Minister received representations from the Mayor of the Port Adelaide council or the Town Clerk regarding the possibility of having built within the Port Adelaide council area a sporting complex similar to the one the Minister outlined in this Council yesterday? If he has, did he think that in those discussions the Mayor, the Town Clerk, or Port Adelaide council members were speaking with the authority of the council or did the Minister feel that the council had knowledge of the fact that representations were being made for such a complex to be built in that municipality?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: For some time now, I have been concerned about sporting facilities, as mentioned by the honourable member, of the type that will be erected at Noarlunga or Christies Beach being available in the western suburbs. On one occasion I happened to talk with the Mayor of the Port Adelaide council. The conversation did not specifically concern the actual erection of a sporting complex but it was mentioned during the course of the conversation that the old Zinc Corporation camp site, which is now redundant in the Port Adelaide district, would be an ideal site for a caravan park. I suggested to the Mayor on that occasion that perhaps he should be looking at the possibility of erecting a sporting complex on that site rather than providing a caravan park. I understand the latter project had been discussed but had been defeated in council. I have had no communication since that time from the Mayor, the Town Clerk, or members of the council but I know that my officers have been out to look at the site at Port Adelaide. If the Mayor or the council generally would like to discuss this proposition with my department, I would be only too happy to comply with their wishes.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I ask a supplementary question following the very good reply that the Minister has just given. It would be quite wrong, would it not, for any member of the council to assume that discussions on this matter had reached such a point that the Minister's department would no longer entertain any thought of helping the Port Adelaide council in relation to any project coming within the ambit of that department?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The decision that was taken by the Port Adelaide council regarding the caravan park has altered to some extent because there has been a change in the membership of the Port Adelaide council. If representatives of that council wish to discuss the feasibility of erecting a sporting complex in the council area, I shall

be pleased to speak to them. I believe that there are areas in the council district that should be set aside for a sport and recreation complex such as that which is being built at Noarlunga, although perhaps one not quite so large. If the council believes that officers of my department can help it in relation to, say, the design and size of such a complex, they will be pleased to co-operate.

ETHNIC CHILDREN

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education. In view of the Hon. Mr. Hill's confused criticism, expressed in the Address in Reply debate last Thursday, of the bilingual education programme currently being conducted as a pilot programme in two primary schools, will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Minister of Education to clarify his policy on ethnic children and, in particular, say what is the bilingual programme being conducted in the schools?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You'd better get it straightened out pretty quickly.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He's confused, Mr. Deputy President.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Although I thank the Hon. Mr. Foster for his advice, I call him to order.

LIBEL ACTION

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Minister of Health ask the Attorney-General to ascertain whether the Hon. Mr. Dunford has grounds for a libel suit against Advertiser Newspapers Limited?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I understand that the Hon. Mr. Foster is seeking a legal opinion, and that is out of order.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No, I am seeking an opinion of a member of the Lower House, because the *Advertiser* newspaper this morning—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Why can't Mr. Dunford speak for himself?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Oh, shut up!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. Mr. Foster to use decent Parliamentary language.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I did, towards that gentleman. I ask whether or not the aggrieved member of this Council, who asked a question in this place yesterday and whose comments were wrongfully reported in the *Advertiser*, has grounds for a libel suit.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT laid on the table the following interim reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Wallaroo Hospital (Geriatric and Rehabilitation Unit),
Whyalla Hospital Redevelopment (Phase I).

LONG SERVICE LEAVE REGULATIONS

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I move:

That the general regulations, 1977, under the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975-76, made on March 24, 1977, and laid upon the table of this Council on March 29, 1977, be disallowed.

I have taken this action because the definition of "worker" in regulation 2 (2) includes such vague terms as electrical worker, machinist, plant operator, and shop hand. These categories, which are in addition to the types of worker defined in the Act, are too general and should be either omitted or defined more precisely. The public and employees are confused by these regulations, and part of this confusion can be traced back to the second reading explanation of the original Bill given by the Minister of Health on February 5, 1976. In the explanation, the Minister stated:

The Labor Government believes it to be essential to provide long service leave for workers in industries where the nature of employment precludes the accrual of entitlements to long service leave . . . This Bill that I now introduce is in the form that was unanimously recommended by that committee. It is confined to granting long service leave benefits to casual workers in the building industry and does not apply to other industries as the Government had originally intended.

The Minister stressed that the Bill applied only to casual workers. In my understanding, a casual worker means a person who is paid a premium above the rate for weekly hire but who can be laid off without one week's notice and who receives no sick, long service, or annual leave entitlements.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is your interpretation.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: That is what I understand.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: In the old days, what you said was true. That went out about 1957.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Builders' labourers get annual leave now.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: There is much confusion among workers in Adelaide at present who are now being told they come under the casual workers' long service leave provisions and they believe that, as weekly-hire employees, they should not be called casual workers. A stream of inquiries is being made of the Labour and Industry Department. It was clear, however, from perusing the Bill that the Government intended to include persons on weekly hire, as well as casuals working in the building industry.

Members will recall that this Bill was amended in this Chamber and that, after a conference, introduction of the Act was delayed for about 15 months, until April 1 this year. Section 4 defines "industry" for the purposes of the Act as covering far more than buildings. It includes, in addition, construction of roads, breakwaters, wharves, irrigation, drainage and sewerage schemes, bridges, tunnels, gasholders and silos, pipelines, and transmission lines.

That section defines a worker for the purposes of the Act as a person who is engaged in work usually performed by a builder's labourer, an asbestos cement fixer, a bricklayer, a plasterer, a plumber, a terrazzo worker, a gasfitter, and so on. These are the types of workman that one expects to see on building sites and to be included within the Act.

Section 4 does, however, exclude employees of a firm where work for the industry is subsidiary to its principal activity and, although this is not stated in the Act, employees engaged under Federal awards where these awards incorporate long service leave provisions also are excluded. It will be seen that a worker is defined quite particularly

in the Act. When the regulations appeared, the additional categories of worker were added to those already in section 4 of the Act, and the regulations included such general descriptions as shop hand, plant operator, machinist, and electrical worker.

Who is a shop hand? I have been informed that the Long Service Leave (Casual Employment) Board, which was established under the Act and which advises the Minister, probably will refer to the National Building Trades Construction Award in order to interpret the meaning of a shop hand. The Federal Award defines a shop hand as an employee who interprets plans and detailing of any work in preparation of work for the modeller, the making of all plaster or cement piece moulds, wax moulds, fibreglass mounts, or moulds of any description used for the purpose of making and/or casting fibrous plaster, plaster glass, plaster plastic, fibreglass, or pressed cement work. That may be the board's intention, but I doubt that the Government intended to include shop hands of any type within the ambit of the Act.

Who is a machinist? Is he the operator of a metal-working lathe, drill or mill in a maintenance section of a factory supplying goods to the industry or is he simply a wood turner in a timber joinery works? I find it hard to believe that any type of machinist does site work.

Who is an electrical worker? Is he an electrical fitter who rewires burnt-out motors and repairs wiring as an essential part of the maintenance section of a factory supplying the industry, or does he install wires and switches on a new building site?

Who is a plant operator? Does the inclusion of this term mean that every permanent operator on weekly hire in a timber joinery works or a hot-mix bitumen plant must come within the ambit of this Act which, in the words of the Minister in his second reading explanation, is confined to granting long service leave benefits to casual workers in the building industry?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Surely the Government was thinking of building workers on the site, wasn't it?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I believe it was and I think the regulations are far too general. I have been informed that the board will probably interpret the term "Plant Operator" in a narrow sense to cover those persons who work on building sites and operate a winch, hoist, crane, dump cart, concrete pump, brick hoist, vibrating roller, soil whacker, pile driver, front-end loader, bulldozer or scraper. If it is the intention of the board to apply a narrow interpretation to the term "Plant Operator", then the regulations should be more specific and say as much.

I remind honourable members that this is an issue of financial significance to many employers and it comes at a time of economic recession in this State. An employer must pay 2½ per cent of the ordinary wage of each worker covered by this Act to the trust fund set up under the Act, and this applies also to past years of service, although service prior to 1971 bears a lesser rate than 2½ per cent. For example, for each man who has averaged, say, \$120 a week over the past five years the employer must pay \$780 to the trust fund. Under the South Australian Long Service Leave Act a worker is entitled to 13 weeks leave on current rates after 10 years continuous service with one employer, with *pro rata* pay after 7 years. Under this new Act a worker will receive the same entitlements after 10 years of service in the industry irrespective of the times that he has changed employment. An employer will normally make provision for long service leave after

seven years of service, but under this building industry legislation he must start paying to the fund in the first year of employment.

For the reasons outlined above I have moved for the disallowance of these regulations. I hope that the Minister will take heed of my objection, because I have attempted to be constructive. I hope he will introduce new regulations specifying that a worker, for the purposes of this Act, is a person who actually works on sites of a type defined in section 4 of the Act.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the regulations under the Beverage Container Act, 1975-1976, relating to collection depots and refunds, made on June 2, 1977, and laid upon the table of this Council on July 19, 1977, be disallowed.

First, I refer to page 1383 of *Hansard* (October 16, 1975) to recall the history of this matter. When this legislation was first introduced there was a difficulty in agreeing to the size of the deposit. The original deposit, as introduced by the Government in the legislation, was 10c. Of course, this would have completely annihilated the can industry in South Australia; there is not much question about that if one looks at the record of deposit legislation around the world.

When the Bill was passed, after much argument, it was amended to provide a 5c maximum deposit, as agreed at the conference. When some of the managers reported back to this Chamber, it was stated clearly that the maximum would be 5c and that, if the 5c maximum were introduced by regulation when the regulations first came before this Chamber, there would be opposition to those regulations. To illustrate that point, I refer to page 1383 of *Hansard*—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Is that in accordance with the decision of the conference?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am saying that the conference agreed.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Can you prove that?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: In writing?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. The Leader, in response to my out of order remark, has said that he can prove his point to the Council in writing. My point is that he should be able to produce it in a form not dissimilar to *Hansard*, but I do not think he can do that.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: That's not a point of order.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Never mind what you think—I am talking to the responsible Deputy President.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The honourable member should allude to the Standing Order on which he bases his objection.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Standing Order No. 1.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That would assist the Council in deciding whether or not it is a point of order.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It's Standing Order No. 1.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: What the honourable member is doing is interjecting, and using the ploy of a point of order to make the honourable member speaking sit down. The honourable member has no point of order. I think we ought to clear this up as time goes on.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Standing Order No. 1—it covers everything.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Give us the proof in writing. You cannot do it, so do not mislead the Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: When the Hon. Mr. Foster has discontinued his drivel, I will continue.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Put your proof where your mouth is.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I refer the honourable member to the legislation. The Bill, as introduced, provided for a 10c deposit. After the conference, the Bill was accepted in this Chamber with a maximum 5c deposit and, if that is not proof in writing, I do not know what is such proof. The *Hansard* report (page 1383, October 16, 1975) of my comments, in part, is as follows:

I draw to the attention of all members that beer bottles actually carry a 10c a dozen deposit, yet the problem is well handled in the community. Therefore, I come down strongly with the viewpoint that a 2c deposit on cans would have been the advisable course to take. Because this is the second time around for this Bill after an election, I believe the statement I made was a reasonable one. At the same time, I shall be examining the regulations extremely closely and, if I believe that a 5c deposit is beyond what industry can carry, beyond what it should be to cater for the problem that has been outlined to the Committee, I will reserve my right to have my say on the regulation when it comes down.

I think that explains the position. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to reach a compromise, and I reserve my rights until the regulations are presented. The Government has said it will not proclaim the Bill until June, 1977, and no doubt the regulations will come down some time after that date. I am still convinced in my own mind that a 5c deposit on cans could be too much for the industry to bear. This is one point the Government will have to watch most carefully in framing the regulations.

The point was made clearly by the managers on this side that, if the regulation provided for the maximum deposit to begin with, the regulations would clearly be subject to disallowance. If there has been a piece of disastrous legislation which the Government has had to handle, it has concerned the deposit on cans. A report in this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Minor problems on cans—Minister", states:

There had been some "minor difficulties" with the new beverage-container deposit legislation, the Minister for the Environment (Mr. Simmons) told the Assembly yesterday. The legislation, which came into force on July 1, provides for a 5c deposit on soft-drink cans and for collection depots where the deposit can be refunded. Mr. Simmons told Mr. Evans (Liberal, Fisher) there were now 20 collection depots in the metropolitan area and 40 or 50 in the country but there were still gaps. He told Mr. Wardle (Liberal, Murray) it would not be possible to give a further extension for the sale of prohibited cans. Mr. Wardle said several "summer" sporting clubs in his electorate would not have a chance to sell the old cans unless there was an extension. He said one club had 150-dozen cans to sell. The Government has told retailers the sale of non-deposit cans will be banned from September 1.

For the Minister to claim that there are minor difficulties in the legislation is a gross understatement and, as all honourable members know, this legislation and its regulations fall into the category of a legislative disaster. It is not characteristic—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You voted for it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: And I made clear what I would do when the regulations came down.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You didn't make that clear to the conference.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I did.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You came back here and had a dollar each way.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My attitude was made clear to the conference and I came back to this Chamber and read the results to this Chamber. I point out that it is not characteristic of this Government to make understatements. However, it is already clear that there are glaring gaps in relation to establishing collection depots, and there are some problems that the Government does not even realise it has got.

For example, section 6 of the principal Act deals with collection depots and provides that there must be one collection depot in each local government area. Where there is no collection depot, cans cannot be sold. Recently a woman appeared on *This Day Tonight* pointing out that her shop was in the Mallala council area, whilst the shop over the road was in the Munno Para council area. One woman could sell cans because there was a collection depot established under the regulations in her council area, but the woman in the shop opposite could not sell the cans because no depot had been established in that council area. If that is not administrative incompetence and legislative stupidity I do not know what is.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: If you thought that there was legislative incompetence, why did you not move amendments?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Amendments were moved.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You were negligent in your duties as Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members will allow the Leader to continue the debate in reasonable silence.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We were opposed to the legislation from the beginning, but the occasion to which I am referring was the second time around, and there is a constitutional provision of which this Council rightly takes notice in this kind of situation.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You were scared.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. Statements are being made about an area that will be exempted in South Australia because of the great difficulty in establishing collection depots there. They have three depots in the North. As northern South Australia is outside the local government area, is it possible for cans to be sold there? I am very doubtful whether, even under these regulations, cans can be sold in the North. Who will pay 5c extra for a can in Oodnadatta when the collection depot is at Cockburn or some similar place? The position is administratively ridiculous, and the Government knows it. The Minister has said that there are minor difficulties. They are extremely minor! Cans will certainly be off the market in northern South Australia. There is much talk about the Government's having a zone north of a certain parallel where the regulations would not apply, but there is nothing in the regulations to cover that question. As Mr. Wardle has said, there are many difficulties in connection with social clubs. I have received calls from some social club representatives pointing out such difficulties. The social club associated with the paper mills in the South-East has a large stock of cans which, after September 1, the club cannot sell.

Cans never leave the canteens of some industrial premises. Will it be necessary to pay an extra 5c to dispensing machines, and will it be necessary for the can to be left there so that the management can return it to the collection depot? One person has telephoned me saying that

the dispensing machines will not take an extra 5c for the deposit. At Cockburn, there is a South Australian hotel on one side of the road, with the border gate on the other side. What will happen to the can trade of the South Australian hotel? The publican there will be in grave financial difficulties because of the administrative stupidity of this Government and the Minister. The second schedule raises the question of receptacles for beverages marketed by Diverse Products Limited, Cadbury-Schweppes Proprietary Limited, and the Pub Squash Company Proprietary Limited, but there is no mention of the breweries; perhaps the Hon. Mrs. Cooper can help me in this connection.

Local government has refused permission for the establishment of a whole range of collection depots. In other words, there is no local government approval. For example, I think the Salisbury and Elizabeth depot is supposed to be established at Anderson Walk, Smithfield, but I have been told that a local government permit has been refused for that depot. I could go on with anomaly after anomaly in regard to establishing these depots. It is an administrative disaster for the Government. Regarding sales tax on the actual deposit, I wish to quote the following extract from a letter from Mr. R. I. Viner, the Minister Assisting the Federal Treasurer:

The Commissioner of Taxation informs me that sales tax would not be payable on the refunds, as such, but it could be payable on amounts included in the price of canned drinks to cover the cost of the refunds. In its impact on sales by drink manufacturers the South Australian legislation operates in an indirect way. It does not require drink manufacturers to make any refunds on empty cans; it prohibits the sale of canned drinks by a retailer unless there is a collection depot in the retailer's area and each can bears a statement that a refund of 5c will be paid upon delivery of the empty can to a collection depot. It apparently envisages that drink manufacturers will have to finance the cost of making this statutory refund. Drink manufacturers will in turn have to recover these costs in the charges made for sales of the canned drinks.

The sales tax Acts require that tax be paid on wholesale sales by manufacturers and wholesale merchants and that it be paid upon the amount for which the goods are then sold. I am advised that drink manufacturers normally sell the cans with the drinks and sales tax is payable on the full amount charged. If the drink manufacturer were to charge an amount to cover the cost of the statutory refunds on the empty cans, this amount, whether charged separately or as part of the overall price for the cans of drink, would form part of the total amount payable by the retailer for the cans of drink. Under the provisions of the sales tax Acts, sales tax is payable on this total amount. In this situation the law does not permit the cost of the statutory refunds to be deducted from the value on which sales tax is levied. As the law stands, the Commissioner does not see any way by which drink manufacturers could avoid liability for payment of sales tax on the cost of the statutory refund where they recover that cost in the amounts charged for the canned drinks which they sell.

I am certain that the Government has failed to take notice of the whole question of sales tax in connection with refunds. A deposit of 5c on cans could easily lead to the loss to this State of the can-making industry. The exemptions make a joke of the can deposit legislation. The publicity says, "The stubbie is out, and the Echo is in." Perhaps that slogan may even apply to the Hon. Mr. Foster.

Country people who for years put up with broken glass in their gateways have over the last few years been relatively pleased that they have had to clear up a heap of cans, rather than broken glass, where people have stopped for a drink and thrown away the container or used it as a shooting target. These people are anything but pleased that in the pastoral areas of this State the can will disappear. The whole of this can legislation was a botch right from the beginning, and this Council did its best to help the

Government avoid any stupid moves. We should now continue to help the Government for as long as possible, to save it from its own stupidity. If the Government varied this regulation to 2c, I would reluctantly withdraw my motion for disallowance but not until such time as all the other stupid administrative anomalies, other than the amount of the deposit, had been remedied. The Government would be well advised to accept the disallowance of this regulation. It should attempt to make all the emotional political capital it can out of it, then accept the disallowance, and forget about its reintroduction. That has been the usual track record of the Government when this Council has made some attempt to save it from its own stupidity. If the Government accepted the disallowance in that way, it would help the consumer and the retail trade, and it would save the manufacturing industry from a considerable reduction in its sales, thus allowing reduced costs to the consumers of its product in South Australia.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

WAR SERVICE HOUSING LOAN

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition):
I move:

That, in the opinion of this Council, Colin James Berryman of American River, Kangaroo Island, should be granted a clearance from the Lands Department so that he may qualify for a Commonwealth war service housing loan.

I move this motion to draw to the attention of the Council a situation that I believe deserves to be corrected. In doing so, I am not placing any blame on the Minister here or the Minister in Canberra; I merely believe it is an illustration of some administrative difficulty, something wrong somewhere, when a man who has served his country is unable to get his just rights in regard an application for a Commonwealth war service housing loan.

First, I draw the Council's attention to a letter written by the member for Alexandra (Mr. Chapman) on June 14, 1974, to the then Minister of Lands, the Hon. A. F. Kneebone. It reads:

C. J. BERRYMAN

Following removal from their soldier settler home, hundred of Gosse, Kangaroo Island, in 1972, Mr. and Mrs. Berryman have lived in a small cottage on my farm, section 19, hundred of Duncan, Kangaroo Island. While enjoying a pension and limited income from seasonal work, Mr. Berryman has been able to stabilise his personal position. He has bought and paid for a small area on the banks of American River, Kangaroo Island, where he hopes with the assistance of a home loan, he can build a cottage. As you know, I have supported this couple during a long and tortuous period, and now seek your personal support in his matter of obtaining a defence home loan.

I have no desire, at this stage, to refer to the reasons why there is a debt outstanding with your department. However, it seems that, while that particular debt exists, Mr. and Mrs. Berryman are denied the opportunity of proceeding with their building. Would you kindly investigate the matter with a view to seeking some way around this particular problem thus enabling this couple to qualify with the Defence Homes Loan Department and ultimately enjoy in their latter years the dignity and comfort they surely deserve.

On July 26, 1974, Mr. Chapman received a reply to that letter from the Acting Minister of Lands, the Hon. T. M. Casey, as follows:

I received your letter of June 14, on behalf of Mr. C. J. Berryman who wishes to obtain a defence service loan for the purpose of building a residence. I note your comments that it appears that, whilst the debt outstanding

to the Department of Lands in respect of the war service property which he formerly held exists, Mr. and Mrs. Berryman's application to the Department of Housing is unlikely to be approved. It would not be in order for me to actively support Mr. Berryman's case but I have taken the necessary action to have the debt to this department written off so that his application for a defence service home loan can proceed.

The next letter, which is dated August 15, 1975, is addressed to Mr. Chapman, Parliament House, Adelaide, and is signed by Mr. G. P. Roe, Acting Director of Lands. It states:

I refer to your verbal inquiry regarding defence service home loans and advise that, of cancelled or surrendered war service leases, only seven of the settlers have applied for home loans from the Defence Services Homes Branch. In each case, information was sought from this department regarding the applicant's dealings under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme and all replies were written in accordance with the reasons for cancellation or surrender, pointing out any amounts written off the settler's account.

It is understood that one of the requirements for an ex-war service settler to be considered for a defence service home loan is a certificate from the department of lands indicating whether or not cancellation of the lease was a result of unreasonable negligence or dishonesty. However, as a matter of policy, the department has declined, in any cases of cancellation, to specify that cancellation was on account of either of these factors, nor has it stated the reverse. Referring to your inquiry regarding Mr. F. C. Siebert, I have to advise that all files relating to him have been examined and no record of any type of certificate to the Defence Service Homes Branch can be located.

Then, on February 19, 1976, there is a letter to Mr. Berryman from Mr. I. R. Collins, Regional Director of the Australian Housing Corporation, reading as follows:

I refer to your recent letter and advise that whilst your debt to the Lands Department may have been "cleared up" this alone does not permit us to reconsider your case. You will recall from earlier discussions that, when an application for assistance under the Defence Service Homes Act is received from a person who has previously received assistance under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme, it is a requirement that the State Lands Department provide a letter which states that the applicant's dealings under the scheme were satisfactory and that if any loss had resulted such loss was not due to the fault or negligence of the applicant. Until such a letter is received in this office I am unable to provide you with any further assistance.

On March 17, 1976, the member of Alexandra wrote the following letter to the Director of Lands:

From the enclosed correspondence it will be noted that, in order to qualify for a home loan under the War Service Homes Act, Mr. C. J. Berryman must produce a "clearance letter" from the State Lands Department. You will recall my previous efforts to obtain this and accordingly I recognise the possible repercussion and/or claims which may be lodged against your department should this be supplied ("without condition"). If Mr. Berryman were to sign a statutory declaration stating that he would not lodge any claims on the Lands Department of South Australia in future accepting removal from his lease property without prejudice, etc., would you reconsider the issue of the required formality letter?

Both Mr. and Mrs. Berryman have experienced an extremely worrying time during recent years not having any security of a home and indeed suffered considerably as a result. From their respective meagre pensions and other minor income, they have saved very little. However, I understand that from the sale of some personal belongings, they have been able to buy a building block at American River, purchase the material and erect a small shed thereon. The need for assistance is urgent and I therefore seek your reconsideration in the light of the above proposal. It is only a thought and, naturally at this stage, I have no confirmation of the Berrymans' acceptance. However, as there seems to be no other workable alternative I do not consider their acceptance would be all that difficult to obtain.

The final letter I will quote was written by the Director on March 26, 1976, and is as follows:

I refer to your letter of March 17, 1976, and other correspondence which has passed between us in respect of Mr. C. J. Berryman's application for a home loan under the Defence Services Homes Act. I am aware of the position in which Mr. and Mrs. Berryman find themselves. However, referring to the copy of the letter dated February 19, 1976, from the Australian Housing Corporation to Mr. Berryman, it is a requirement that this department provides "a letter which states that the applicant's dealings under the scheme were satisfactory and that, if any loss had resulted, such loss was not due to the fault, or negligence, of the applicant" before Mr. Berryman's application can be considered. Whilst not wishing to appear unsympathetic, this department could not provide a letter in terms of the abovementioned requirement.

Having examined that correspondence, I then began right back at the beginning, where Mr. Ted Chapman began, and, after going through exactly the same process, I came to the same dead end: the Australian Housing Corporation will not consider, under the terms of its Act, a housing loan to Mr. Berryman until the letter to which I have referred is received from the Lands Department. The last word that I received on this matter was when I telephoned Mr. I. R. Collins, the Regional Director of the Australian Housing Corporation, who restated his department's decision not to reconsider this case. That gentleman stated that, until a letter was received from the State Lands Department stating that the applicant's dealings under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme were satisfactory, the Housing Corporation would not act.

On July 20, 1977, when I again telephoned Mr. Collins, I found that the same criteria applied, for exactly the same reasons. If one examines this question, one sees that a position exists whereby the required clearance cannot be given. If it was given, I believe that a loan could be made available to Mr. and Mrs. Berryman; it seems that this was the position. Mr. Berryman is indeed critical of the Lands Department, because he considers that it was that department's decision that forced him off his block.

That may or may not be so. I am not taking any sides in this matter but am merely looking at it from Mr. Berryman's point of view. He moved into cattle farming against the advice of the Lands Department. Mr. Berryman had a problem on his property with the so-called Yarloop disease, decided to make the move to cattle, got himself into financial difficulty, and was finally sold up and his property auctioned. It is clear that, if Mr. Berryman had not been sold up but had been given a little more time, high cattle prices would have taken him out of his difficulties. That is a possibility, although Mr. Berryman says that it is definitely correct.

We therefore have the situation of a soldier settler on Kangaroo Island who, whether or not because of his own fault or bad management, but certainly not because of dishonesty or for any purpose that one could say was illegal, lost his property. Mr. Berryman is living in a tin shed on Kangaroo Island. All he requires is a clearance from the Lands Department, and then he can qualify for a housing loan.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Are you sure of that?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am certain that he can qualify for a housing loan. Whether or not Mr. Berryman gets the housing loan, I am not at liberty to say. However, I believe that he would. At least he could qualify and apply for a loan, and his case could be heard.

I understand that at present the Commonwealth department will take no action until a clearance has been received from the Lands Department. In arguing this case, I am not criticising the Minister in this place or the Federal Minister; I am merely trying to state the facts as I see

them, in the hope that something may be done to help this couple, who are 63 years of age and living in a tin shed on Kangaroo Island. These people, who have lived on the island since the settlement scheme began, deserve some sympathy in the position in which they find themselves.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I support the motion. Having raised this matter in the Council some time ago, I was rather surprised, when I saw the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's motion on the Notice Paper, that it had not been resolved.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: When was it raised?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I raised it during the last session.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What, Mr. Berryman's case?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You referred to it in general remarks and in a general debate.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I referred to the exact situation facing Mr. Berryman, as I knew it, as well as to his past history and his present unfortunate circumstances. I appealed to the Minister to try to assist Mr. Berryman.

This is not a matter on which honourable members should take sides. Any reasonable legislator in this Council cannot but have sympathy and compassion for Mr. Berryman. This is not a political matter in any way at all and, indeed, it is not a matter on which I intend to make any criticism of the Minister of Lands.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Well, how did you raise it last time? Which debate did you raise it in last time?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Speaking from memory, it was the Kangaroo Island debate.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: But you aren't quite sure.

The Hon. Anne Levy: That was a criticism of the Minister of Lands.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Yes, it was a motion of no-confidence in the Minister.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I repeat that, from memory, it was raised during the Kangaroo Island debate.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That was a no-confidence motion against the Minister.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the Hon. Mr. Sumner believes that it was a no-confidence motion, he must have checked it out in *Hansard*.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: No, I haven't.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In any event, I accept what the honourable member says.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I am just asking you.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: What bearing that has on the subject, I do not know.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You said that it was not a criticism of the Minister.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He's telling lies again.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, I am not. The Hon. Mr. Foster should not judge other people by himself.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You're the first real estate agent that has never told a lie.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Let the honourable member produce evidence of where I have told a lie. I return to the matter which the Council is debating, and which involves an individual in South Australia who has paid his price for any negligence of which he might have been guilty on his farm or for any lack of farm management that he might have displayed during his lifetime. We are talking about a South Australian who has gone through the human indignity of standing by and seeing the mortgagee come in and sell up his property.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You never worried about that when—

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr. Foster should either produce any evidence that he has, or shut up. I ask honourable members to consider the situation of this gentleman, who has passed through all the circumstances to which I have referred and who now, at 63 years of age, having paid the penalty for any errors that he might have made, and having had everything taken from him, has this most amazing restriction placed in his path to a better life during his twilight years, being unable to obtain a defence service loan from this Commonwealth department. Therefore, he cannot provide for himself and his wife reasonable accommodation (of course, far better accommodation than the tin shed in which I understand he is living now).

This restriction, as I call it, arises from the most amazing situation that the correspondence that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has read indicates. In that correspondence, the Minister states that he has waived the debt that Mr. Berryman owed, and I understand that that has been done. The problem now is that this gentleman cannot obtain the defence services loan until he is given a clearance, not by the Minister, I point out, but by the Lands Department. That department claims in this correspondence that it cannot issue such a clearance if it believes that any unreasonable negligence or dishonesty is involved, and there the whole matter has come to a stop. I appeal to the Hon. Mr. Foster in this matter.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Why appeal to me? Appeal to your Federals. You have neglected any mention of them.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Appeals have been made, and no further appeals can be made to the authority. I am saying that the problem lies in the Lands Department, which has been requested by the local member of Parliament and the man himself to give the clearance. This man has paid the price for this unreasonable negligence. Will anyone opposite question that? Of course he has paid the price. All he asks is that the department issue this clearance so that he can obtain the loan, but the department says it cannot issue the clearance where unreasonable negligence or dishonesty has occurred. I leave aside totally the question of dishonesty: I think we can do that in fairness to all concerned. If there was any unreasonable negligence, I ask honourable members whether he has paid the price for that. Most assuredly, the answer is that he has. All that is needed is a notice giving this clearance.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: People don't always get their full reward. You would ask for your full pound of flesh!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know that this man is seeking any reward. In the Hon. Mr. Dunford's language, Mr. Berryman is seeking only a fair go. The Minister has done certain things to help him. The Minister has waived his debt, and I commend him for that. It seems to me that the Minister is not now responsible for the impasse that has occurred. As I read the correspondence, the matter is not between the Minister or the local member and the man concerned, but between that man and the departmental head. The problem is in the department.

I do not want on this occasion to be over-critical of the department but, if an individual of this kind who deserves a fair go cannot get it, he must appeal to Parliament, and he is doing that through this motion.

Parliament ought to have the right to say that this waiver ought to be given. Otherwise, who is running the State? The matter is as simple as that.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I thought the unions were! Have you changed to the Lands Department now?

The Hon. Anne Levy: You usually say it is the unions.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Why do you not listen to the debate? I do not want the Minister to put his back to the wall and defend his department, simply saying that he cannot do anything about the matter. I hope that the Council will hear a co-operative reply from the Minister and that we will be given at least some indication that he will further examine the situation to find out whether Mr. Berryman can be helped.

Years have passed since the Lands Department sold him up. In that time, he has seen other unfortunate settlers on Kangaroo Island in trouble and being offered certain parcels of land, lifetime occupation of their existing houses, or, in some instances, rent-free housing on the mainland. These people have been in the same circumstances as he has been in, but when he has encountered his difficulty the same attitudes and offers have not applied. That must make his wound sore.

A waiver of this kind ought to be given as a last gesture that will not cost the Government one cent but will put the Minister and the Government where they ought to be, namely, in command of the Public Service. Such an action would bring comfort in every sense of the word to these elderly people and help to bring some dignity back to them. As this man has paid the price, surely the Council ought to try to have the department issue this waiver so that he can obtain financial help and, thereby, obtain accommodation so that he can live in comfort.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I briefly support the motion and what the previous speakers have said. Through no fault of his own, this gentleman is condemned to a situation of poverty regarding a home. Perhaps there was one omission from what the Hon. Mr. Hill has said. It is a moot point whether, if Mr. Berryman could raise the finance elsewhere, he may be bound to the Lands Department regarding any other finance that he may be able to raise. It seems ludicrous that a man of this age cannot have the imposition waived, just for the entitlement to borrow Commonwealth money at a reasonable rate of interest towards building a home. It is time that the Minister took it upon himself to have this matter cleared, and to have the option waived for Mr. Berryman.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Lands): I thank honourable members for raising this matter concerning Mr. Berryman, because it has been a running sore in the Lands Department since 1971, and probably even prior to that, too. Mr. Berryman's interests were originally sold up in 1971, and that is going back over six years. Subsequently, applications have been made to the Ombudsman and information has been conveyed to him from the department on all aspects of Mr. Berryman's case. We have to face the fact that this gentleman was in financial difficulties on the island at that time.

I was not Minister of Lands when his cancellation of lease came through but, nevertheless, when one looks at the documents in the case, one sees that there was no other alternative. This gentleman has already received one war service land settlement grant. He now wants to apply for another loan under the scheme. That is not a decision that I take: it is a decision that the Federal

Minister takes, and all the Federal department wants from me is information relating to Mr. Berryman's situation on the island prior to the cancellation of his lease.

I am pleased to inform the Council that I have had discussions with Mr. Collins (Regional Director, Defence Services Homes Branch) and the facts relating to Mr. Berryman's dealings under the war service land settlement scheme have been supplied to him by Mr. Jack Dunsford, then Director of Lands, in response to a request made in March, 1974. I sent a letter in greater detail to the Regional Director last week. It is the responsibility of the appropriate Commonwealth Minister on the basis of the relevant information available (including the information supplied by me), to make any decision on any application Mr. Berryman may have made for a war service loan.

I can do no more than outline the whole history of the Berryman case to the Regional Director, who forwards that information to the appropriate authorities in Canberra. As I have said, any such loan has to be decided by the Commonwealth authorities. Although I have no information on this in writing, I understand that an application for a loan by Mr. Berryman was taken up by the Regional Director some time ago but was refused by the previous Federal Minister. I am only hoping that the information I have supplied to the Regional Director will perhaps in some way reverse the previous decision that was taken. However, in those circumstances I can do no more than what I have already done.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister said that he had done everything possible, yet on July 20, the State Director of the Federal Housing Corporation told me that the position was still exactly the same: that until such time as a clearance was given in regard to Mr. Berryman the application could not further proceed. Although I do not intend to move away from this motion, I am pleased with what the Minister has said, namely, that he will vote for the motion, and I thank him for his support in this regard.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I put the question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You've been playing politics right from the word "go". I've told you exactly what I've done and, if you had taken any notice of that, you would have withdrawn your motion.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Would the Minister care to make a personal explanation rather than talk across the floor?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes. It is incredible that the Leader can say that he is pleased that I am going to support the motion. At no time did I say I was going to support the motion. I told him exactly what I had done. I had hoped that the Leader would see the significance of what I had done within the department, fulfilling my obligations as regards the Regional Director. Further, I do not believe that it is my responsibility as Minister, or that of my departmental officers, to make a judgment on a person when that judgment has to be made by another authority, in this case the Federal authority.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Rubbish! That's totally wrong.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I have supplied the facts, and that is what the Leader is crooked about. He has raised the matter in this Chamber because Mr. Millhouse raised it recently in another place. This is a political move to counter what Mr. Millhouse has done.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Whilst the Minister was interjecting previously I had announced that the motion had been carried.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Divide!

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (9)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (9)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey (teller), J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There are 9 Ayes and 9 Noes. So that this notice of motion can be further considered, I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 27. Page 168.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: This Bill is being considered by this Council for a second time because it was not considered by the other place at the end of last session. It is remarkable that such a relatively small and reasonable Bill should have been the subject of so many misleading and misguided statements, particularly by the Premier. It is incredible that a man in such a high office could have issued so many misleading and misguided statements to the press and the media generally.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Rubbish!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If it is rubbish, the honourable member should get legal advice, because any lawyer would tell him that this Bill in no way reduces the age of consent, yet time and time again the Premier has dealt with the subject in this way. He has done so because it is, after all, a subject that fills most people with disgust. People want child pornography prohibited. The Premier also said that none of this material was on sale and, according to him, there was no need for any further action or for further penalties. His statement was unequivocal but, to my amazement, I saw some contradictory information on the television programme *This Day Tonight*. I have since taken the trouble to get a transcript, which I intend to read for the benefit of Government members, who can relate the details to the Premier.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Where did you get the transcript?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: From a recording made by a section of the Party. The honourable member will be aware that tape recorders are now freely available to all members of the community. It is not difficult to tape a programme. If the honourable member has not done this kind of thing, he does not take much interest in his duties as a member of Parliament. I do it regularly because I wish to have certain items at my disposal.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Your personal media monitoring unit!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My tape recorder.
Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest that the Hon. Mr. Cameron should get on with his speech.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Deputy President.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: It is not protection; it is a desire to get the job done.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The transcript is as follows:

"Playing porn politics"—that's how Premier Don Dunstan yesterday reacted to Liberal M.L.C. Mr. John Burdett's private member's Bill on child pornography. The Bill was one that Mr. Burdett introduced last session and no doubt it is hoped this one will be even more of an embarrassment to the Government. The last one was passed in the Legislative Council but then lapsed in the House of Assembly. The reintroduction of the Bill has once again raised the question of whether or not existing provisions in South Australia are adequate to prevent the manufacture, the publication or the sale of such material in the State. The Premier is adamant that no problem exists. But there is at least some room for doubt, as Mike Drewer reports.

Mr. Burdett, the Opposition shadow Attorney-General, certainly received a broadside from the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, yesterday in relation to his Bill dealing with child pornography. Mr. Dunstan slammed the Bill as being poorly drafted and claimed that measures suggested by Mr. Burdett would weaken existing laws relating to children in pornographic situations. The shadow Attorney-General disputes Mr. Dunstan's allegations and so the political wrangle continues, but rather than dwell on that aspect let's have a look at part of the Premier's media conference.

Q. Mr. Dunstan, why is the Government against Mr. Burdett's arrangements to change the law on child pornography?

A. Well for several reasons. In the first place the Government has already taken action in relation to child pornography—that is pornography that includes any children in it. It is prohibited in South Australia and that prohibition is effective. We've had the police check if there is any pornography involving children on sale in South Australia and the answer is "No there isn't".

But nothing could be clearer than that; according to the Premier, the information supplied by the Police Force says child pornography is not available in this State, or is it? Today I visited five Adelaide adult book and sex shops. In four of them the only material that could be said to be dealing with children was this publication titled *Fifteen*. On the front cover a small screed that reads "*Fifteen* is a new pornographic magazine for you who like very young girls." But elsewhere in the book it states that all so-called models are 18 years or older, and perhaps that's a case of misleading advertising. Up to that stage it appeared that Mr. Dunstan's claim that child pornography was not available was correct. That was until I visited the fifth shop. I spoke to the person behind the counter and asked him what material he had available and after he told me that strict laws prevented the sale of child pornography he produced this publication. He told me it wasn't classified and that such material was now difficult to obtain—the price \$10. I don't think that many people would dispute that this book does contain pornographic photographs of very young children. Mr. Dunstan may have been able to state such material was not available in Adelaide yesterday, but that is certainly not the story today. The front cover of the book was shown on television, and any person who saw it would undoubtedly be aware that it was child pornography. That is one point. The next point is that the Premier has stated time and time again that the Hon. Mr. Burdett is trying to lower the age of consent. If the Premier truly believes that, I suggest he sticks to his present job as Premier—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He will.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: —because, if he had to go back to the law, he would not exist, because he is incompetent. He either has not read the Bill or does not know his law. I say to the Premier that perhaps before he rejects the Bill this time he should read it and not make a snap judgment just because it happens to come from the Opposition. If he has been misleading the public, that is a grievous thing to do to the people of this State, because they like to respect their leaders. However, this is the Premier's tactic in politics.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He is misleading the people all the time.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Every day we find further evidence of it. Every time we look at any particular item, either it is something to do with this matter or it is something else that the super-salesmen in the Premier's Department have dreamt up for him to try to put over the public. If the Government believes that this Bill is not designed to assist the people of the State, it should vote against it; but it should examine it seriously and give it proper attention this time and pass it, because the present penalties, in my opinion and in the opinion of many of my colleagues, are not adequate to prevent the sale of this material. If we make the penalty sufficient, this material will cease to be sold as it is being sold at the moment. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NARCOTIC AND
PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS AND JUSTICES)
BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 2. Page 287.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This is the Bill that came before this Council previously, when there were arguments supporting queries that honourable members on this side of the Chamber raised at that time. The second reading explanation of the Bill yesterday indicated its importance to the Government, which wants it to be treated urgently. For that reason, we accept the need to continue the debate now prior to resuming the Address in Reply debate. I point out, however, that members on this side of the Chamber do not take lightly to legislation in the Government's programme being given precedence over the debate on the Address in Reply; that is contrary to custom—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: So is private members' business.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: —unless there are particular urgent reasons for raising a matter. However, on this occasion, as has occurred in the past, the utmost co-operation is being offered by the Opposition to the Government to treat this matter as expeditiously as possible. I know that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Carnie wish to speak at some length on the Bill and that our programme this afternoon, according to the information I have received from my Whip, is rather tight. Therefore, without saying anything further, I support the Bill.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I, too, support this Bill. As stated by the Chief Secretary in his second reading explanation, this Bill provides basically for technical amendments, following the finding of the Supreme Court that magistrates have very limited powers concerning serious drug offences. Looking at the Act in connection with this Bill was an extremely difficult task because of the number and complexity of the many amendments there have been to the Act over the years.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The House of Review fell down again.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: That is a particularly stupid remark: the honourable member said that the House of Review fell down. The drug scene is constantly changing over the years, necessitating rapid amendments to the Act.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: That is no excuse for falling down on the job.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: It shows how vital it is that there be a new drugs Act as soon as possible. I realise that the Government has set up a Royal Commission into the non-medical use of drugs in South Australia. It would be rather foolish to try to do anything about a new Act until the findings of the Royal Commission were made known. Nevertheless, I hope that as soon as this happens the Attorney-General will treat revision of the Act as a matter of urgency. This is borne out by a statement of the Chief Justice, Dr. Bray, in his ruling on the particular test case that caused this Bill to be framed. The press report concerning what he said at that time states:

"This case presents the wearisomely familiar picture of an original Act with no more than the normal difficulties of construction overlaid with successive piecemeal and ill-harmonised amendments," he said. "It is an understatement to compare the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act 1934-74 to a patchwork quilt." "It is more like a repatched patchwork quilt. The subject dealt with is of vast importance to the life of the community. I venture to suggest that the time has come for a completely new and coherent enactment."

It is obvious to people in Australia that the war on drugs has become a major battle, and it is not surprising when we see the amount of money involved in the drug scene in Australia. In support of that remark, I quote from the *Australian* of July 28, under the heading "\$44 000 000 spent on heroin and marihuana a year":

Australians paid \$44 000 000 last year to buy the country's two most popular illegal drugs—cannabis and heroin. The figure comes from statistics provided by doctors, police, customs officials and drug referral centres throughout Australia.

In view of this, I am pleased that South Australia has set up the Royal Commission into the non-medical use of drugs but, because of the widespread implications in the drug scene in South Australia, I am even more pleased to see last week that the Prime Minister has recommended a national inquiry.

Mr. Fraser said:

My Government is of the view that, because of the national issues involved, it would be more appropriate that a form of national inquiry be held rather than one confined to the limits of a particular State.

Mr. Fraser then called for the co-operation of State Premiers in this matter. I was pleased to see that our Premier said that the Government had kept Mr. Fraser informed of the South Australian inquiry's terms of reference. He also said, "We will allow them to have whatever information we get." Because of the gravity of the whole situation, I am pleased that our Premier and his counterparts in other States will take the same responsible attitude.

I support the Bill, as I will always support Bills that are designed to close loopholes in the drug laws. However, one matter which is not covered by the Bill but which I believe should be covered is the one that I raised by way of a question last week. I refer to the releasing for sale of books that contain advice on illegal drug activities. Although I will not canvass that matter now, I have on file amendments which I will move in Committee and which will make it illegal for one to possess or sell such material. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Prohibition of certain advertisements."

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I move:

Page 2, lines 28 to 30—Leave out all words in these lines after “amended” in line 28 and insert:

(a) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage ‘subsection (3) of’;

(b) by striking out subsections (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:

(2) Subsection (1) of this section does not apply in respect of an advertisement in a publication, circular or paper circulated only amongst legally qualified medical practitioners, registered dentists or veterinary surgeons.

(3) No person shall have in his possession any publication, circular or paper containing—

(a) advice as to the manner in which any prohibited plant may be cultivated; or

(b) advice as to the manner in which any drug to which this Act applies may be manufactured, prepared or administered.

(4) A person who contravenes a provision of this section shall be guilty of a minor indictable offence.

(5) The Minister may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, grant an exemption from all or any of the provisions of this section in respect of—

(a) any person or class of persons;

or

(b) any publication, circular or paper or any class of publications, circulars or papers.

Last week I was shocked to read that the Classification of Publications Board had classified for sale publications that appeared to give advice on what are in this State illegal activities. The titles of the publications were: *The Australian Weed*, *Drug Manufacturing for Fun and Profit*, *A Guide to Growing Cannabis under Fluorescents*, *Herbal Highs*, *The Marijuana Consumer's and Dealer's Guide*, *The Complete Cannabis Cultivator*, and *The Super Grass*. At that time I said that it was well known that the possession and growing of cannabis was illegal in South Australia.

I asked the Chief Secretary how it was that publications advising how to carry on illegal activities were allowed to be sold. It seems to be a ridiculous situation. On the one hand we are considering a Bill to close a loophole in the principal Act to ensure that more people can be punished for drug offences, while on the other hand the Classification of Publications Board has released for sale a publication advising how to carry out the very illegal activities that this Bill seeks to stop. A portion of an article on page 25 of *The Australian Weed*, headed “Carting the stuff around is the next hassle”, states:

Cops often stop cars in the street for routine checks, especially at night. “You’d be surprised what we find in the boots of cars, sonny.” Definitely your car must be unmodified (no G.T. stripes or fatties), unpretentious (no Jags), road-worthy, registered and driven carefully. It helps to have a dog or a kid or a baby-basket with you so you look domesticated and innocent. Preferably hide the commodity even if it involves some effort, such as removing panelling or reaching under the car—so that routine checks wouldn’t uncover it.

On page 24 of *The Australian Weed* an article, headed “Ze fine art of dope cooking”, provides recipes for chocolate hash brownies, marjun, olde original bhang milk shake, and pot tea. It is stated that this kind of feature will be regularly provided in the magazine. On page 6 an article, headed “Methadone madness”, describes how a person can get a prescription for methadone by saying that he is an addict who cannot gain admittance to a State-run clinic. The article states:

The methadone tablets cost only \$4.50 per prescription of 25 and can easily be sold at \$5 per tab, earning the

seller a potential \$125 for every prescription that can be obtained. A very profitable day can be had driving around and scoring a dozen or so prescriptions.

I have not seen the other publications that I named, but their titles indicate that they all appear to do the same sort of thing. If this Bill is to have any teeth at all, the sale of publications such as these should be made illegal.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I agree that the amendment has some merit, but it also has very wide implications. New subsection (5) allows exemptions to be granted in relation to some publications, but some people may already have gardening books that have been in the household for years; for example, books on botany. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* shows how opium can be extracted from the opium poppy. We might exempt these books but others might not be exempted. The Government may agree that there is merit in what the honourable member is trying to get at and it would be prepared to give an undertaking to refer this matter to the Royal Commission that is looking into the non-medical use of drugs. However, the Government cannot accept the amendment, if only for the reason stated.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I support the amendment. In answer to the Chief Secretary, I point out that all that is prohibited in regard to the growing of these plants is advice as to the manner in which any prohibited plant may be cultivated, and there is already a list of prohibited plants in the regulations under the Act. All this amendment does is to make it an offence to have in one’s possession a publication containing advice as to the manner in which any prohibited plant may be cultivated. That does not seem to me to be too wide and I see no serious problem about that. If it were that any serious publication or gardening book contained information about growing marijuana, which I doubt very much, an exemption could specifically apply to publications released before a certain date, or to certain plants that may be prohibited. It is clear that the second part of the amendment would not cover some general advice as to the manner in which, say, opium is extracted from poppies: it would have to be detailed advice as to the way in which any drug to which the legislation applies is actually manufactured. It is not a very far-reaching amendment; it applies only to prohibited plants, of which there is a list, and in regard to the manufacture it applies only to prohibited drugs under this Act. There is power to exempt, but I cannot see that it goes too far. I support the amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I, too, support the amendment, although I agree that the Chief Secretary may have a point. I direct honourable members’ attention to the fact that, although in new subsection (5) there is power to grant an exemption to any person or class of persons or any publication, etc., the point made by the Chief Secretary has some validity, that in many encyclopaedias information is given as to how to extract opium from a poppy. That is easily overcome by the exemption but, if the Chief Secretary would examine this matter, he might find that a further amendment would overcome this problem. For example, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is not designed particularly to increase interest in the drug scene, but the paper referred to is published for the specific purpose of increasing interest in drugs. Some small amendment may overcome the problem raised by the Chief Secretary. At this stage, because of the activities of certain people in this area, some strengthening of section 14a is necessary to give the Government the power to act immediately. Obviously, in section 14a there is a disability that precludes the Government from

taking action against certain publications in this State that should be stopped, and it should be an offence to have them circulated. That is an urgent matter. If papers are circulating, particularly amongst young people, on how to grow marihuana and the opium poppy, where to get seeds and how to grow them, and how to extract the drug when the plant is grown, the person peddling that sort of information is just as dangerous as the pedlar of drugs himself and should be liable to severe penalties. I advise the Chief Secretary to accept the amendment and to get on with the job of getting rid of this material. If there are any problems in regard to these other publications, I am certain the police, for example, will not prosecute the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No, but they could under this provision.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, they could.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And they could prosecute people for owning such a book.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: They could prosecute people for owning publications referred to by the Hon. Mr. Carnie.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think the present Act is wide enough for the Government to act in that regard. I may be wrong, but I believe that under section 14a (3) there is sufficient power for the Government to prosecute people publishing and selling these publications. This amendment makes it crystal clear that the Government can act. It is an important matter and the Government should accept that power and get on with the job of getting rid of the material in the community.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I appreciate the reasonable way in which the Chief Secretary has approached my amendment, but I must agree with what the Hon. Mr. Burdett and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris have said: drug trafficking and the drug scene today are reaching epidemic proportions and action must be taken now. I mentioned earlier that the Government has stated it intends totally to rewrite the drugs Act after the Royal Commission has come down with its recommendations, but that could be months away, probably 12 months or so.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In the meantime, there could be a change of Government.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes. In the meantime, this amendment would enable the Government to act. I still maintain that the exemption provision in new subsection (5) is wide enough. It is possible to exempt *en masse* things like gardening books. As the Hon. Mr. Burdett said, I do not think gardening books would give instructions on how to grow marihuana, but I accept the point made by the Chief Secretary about the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and other encyclopaedias: it would be easy to exempt them. However, I want this sort of thing banned now, not in 12 months time. New subsection (3) (b) deals with the advice about the manner in which any drug may be manufactured, prepared or administered. I did not go on and read about methadone tablets, but in the next paragraph in this publication we read:

Methadone in tablet form is favoured by addicts because the tablets can be crushed, mixed with water and shot up. This results in a high that's not present with methadone syrup.

These are explicit instructions on how to get the most pleasure (if that is the word to use) out of it.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Is methadone available in tablet form in this State?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Quite readily, under prescription. They are commonly prescribed. Indeed, I have dispensed many hundreds of methadone tablets. I hope that those which I dispensed were *bona fide* ones. Publications such as the one that has been referred to should be withdrawn from sale now. At present, however, the Government does not have power to do so. My amendment, which I ask the Government to support, will give it that power.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is not often that I agree with the bush lawyer, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, but perhaps he may have something in this respect. Had the Royal Commission not been appointed, there might have been some merit in what the Hon. Mr. Carnie has been getting at. However, the implications of the amendment are too wide. Because the Royal Commission is sitting, and because of what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said, the Government cannot accept the amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have examined this matter closely. I wondered why the Government had not taken action in relation to this sort of material, such a great interest having been taken in the shop that has been selling it. Although I thought that there was power in the Act for the Government to act, on second examination I do not think the power that exists is quite wide enough. That is why the amendment has been moved.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (9)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie (teller), Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (9)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield (teller), F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are 9 Ayes and 9 Noes. I give my casting vote for the Ayes. Amendment carried; clause as amended passed. Remaining clauses (12 to 14) and title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from August 2. Page 286.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, for which I thank him. The Speech was notable for what was not in it. As someone else said, it was a pre-election speech containing no greatly contentious matters. I noticed towards the end of the Speech that his Excellency referred to Government legislation on a multiplicity of small matters—in fact, nearly every inconsequential thing except how one should tie up one's shoe laces. I reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and express regret at the premature retirement of Sir Douglas Nicholls as Governor of this State. I wish the former Governor and Lady Nicholls a long and happy retirement. I pay a tribute to deceased members of the House of Assembly. I refer to the late Hon. Sir Glen Pearson, the Hon. T. C. Stott, C.B.E., Mr. H. H. Shannon, C.M.G., and Mr. G. Clarke. I was privileged to know all four of those gentlemen and to serve in the same Parliament with three of them: I served for six years with Mr. Howard Huntley Shannon, and for eight years with the

Hon. Sir Glen Pearson and the Hon. T. C. Stott. The Hon. Sir Glen Pearson was successively Minister of Works, Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and Treasurer in another place during my term in the Parliament. He discharged his duties with great credit to himself and to the benefit of the State and, regardless of politics, he was well liked and respected by all members.

The Hon. Tom Stott made a significant contribution to primary production in this State as Secretary of the Wheat and Woolgrowers Federation over a long period. He was a member of another place for 37 years, for five years of which he was Speaker. Mr. Shannon was also a member of another place for a long time, for many years being Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee. Although Mr. Geoffrey Clarke was not in Parliament during my period here, I know that he served the State with distinction and that he was Government Whip during part of his Parliamentary term. To the relatives of these deceased gentlemen, I extend my condolences.

In the third paragraph of his Speech, the Lieutenant-Governor drew attention to the agricultural situation, saying:

As a result of a very dry summer which followed a poor season, stock numbers in the State have been reduced by some 12 per cent. The opening season in the cereal growing areas of the State has not been accompanied by sufficient rains to provide an appropriate degree of subsoil moisture.

There is very little subsoil moisture in South Australia today, except in the wettest areas. We are at present experiencing a second year of drought conditions, in which we get weather maps such as the one we had last night, but then we get only 20 or 30 points of rain. The State is suffering severely from a second successive year of low rainfall. The situation was only partially and temporarily relieved by the modest falls that we experienced a week or two ago. The falls that we have had to date are insufficient, because there is no subsoil moisture. I believe that the position today in that respect is worse than it was last year. Water storages are low, and a really soaking rain of much more than modest proportions, followed by good spring rains, is needed to restore the present bad situation. The feed situation is also critical.

As further evidence of that, I indicate that, in the course of my duties as a member of the Public Works Standing Committee, I flew to Mount Gambier and Whyalla, when I was able to see South Australia's serious agricultural position. In some areas, crops could still be satisfactory if we got the late rains to which I have referred. However, the feed situation is nothing short of desperate. In some areas, late rains could save the situation; in other areas, it is already nearly too late. The Government will have to be prepared for a substantial amount of drought relief finance being required. As if that is not enough for the primary producing industry, I should briefly like to quote from a report in last Wednesday's *Australian* as follows:

Farmers are headed for a disastrous year, although the nation will reap record returns from agriculture this financial year.

How anyone other than an economist could work that out in advance, I do not know. The report continues:

Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures released last night show that real income per farm will drop by 14 per cent if inflation holds at 10 per cent . . . The bureau's estimates for this financial year also carry a warning for the nation's housewives—most goods produced on the farm will be dearer. While the estimates at first glance look good for farmers, they show that in real terms—because of rises and falls in demand and production—the man on the land is in for a grim time.

Later, the report continues:

The gloomy farm forecast by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics means that the farmer will earn only \$9 a week more than the man in the street—

of course, many will not do that—

and this is despite the farmer's capital investment of at least \$100 000 in his land, livestock and machinery. If he invested his capital in 10 per cent interest bonds, he would be better off than working an 80-hour week—

which many of them must do—

for this season's estimated average income of \$10 352. Yesterday's bureau projection for 1977-78 puts the weekly farm income at \$199—a drop of \$13 on last year's average. Even allowing for eating his home-grown food the farmer is worse off than the average Australian male earning \$190. The fall in farmers' earnings is in line with an 8 per cent drop in net farm income.

That is highlighted by the drought situation in which we now find ourselves. We are indeed faced with a serious situation in relation to agriculture in this State and Australia generally. I note that His Excellency refers to water resources and the increasing salinity in the Murray River. In paragraph 6, His Excellency mentions the broadening of the powers of the River Murray Commission so that the commission will have power to take into account questions of water quality as well as water quantity. The Speech states:

Following the enactment of the Water Resources Act by this Parliament, steps are being taken to ensure that all water resources administration is properly co-ordinated.

I must agree that this is a step in the right direction, because it is essential that we have water of good quality as well as an adequate quantity of it. We certainly do not want the left-overs from New South Wales and Victoria that we are prone to get now. I agree with the concept of giving the River Murray Commission more teeth to ensure that the quality of water from the other two States is better.

The Lieutenant-Governor also refers to the water treatment works at Hope Valley and Anstey Hill, which are in the course of construction. The works at Hope Valley are nearing completion and, as a consequence, a filtered water supply will be available this year in the north-eastern parts of Adelaide. In 1979, the Anstey Hill facility is due to be completed, so an increasing proportion of the city will receive filtered water. I commend these projects. However, I wonder whether it may have been better to provide a subsidy for each person to have a small filter in his own house, rather than the large filtration plants which are now under construction or which are contemplated because much of the water filtered under the present scheme will go into gardens, sewage plants, and the like, and will not be used for drinking, so that much filtered water will be wasted by being used for purposes that do not require filtration.

I noted with approval His Excellency's reference to the container terminal. His Excellency stated that Port Adelaide's first container berth and terminal were completed, and that this facility was of world standard and capable of accommodating the largest container ships. This is good but I wonder whether it is too late, because shipping companies generally have become used to their container ships by-passing Adelaide. I also note with interest (and I deal with this matter only in passing, because the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has dealt with it at length) the reference in paragraph 10 of the Speech, as follows:

An important copper and uranium discovery by the Western Mining Corporation in an area 25 km west of Andamooka and 80 km north of Woomera has encouraged a resurgence of exploration activity in that region.

I wonder what this Government will do about that matter. We have heard in this debate about the former enthusiasm of the Premier, Dr. Hoggood and Mr. Hudson for a uranium treatment works, and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has given us complete details of that. However, what is the position now, after the Australian Labor Party conference in Perth? I ask that because this copper is mixed with uranium, and how will this Government allow the mining of copper when uranium is mixed with it? The A.L.P. has reversed its policy on uranium.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You must have been early in the Party room this morning to get that red tie.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not usually take notice of the Hon. Mr. Foster's interjections, but he should remember that the colours for Australia and Great Britain are red, white and blue, and red is a good colour. I have no objection to it, and it is wrong to assume that red has to do only with a communist country. I cannot find anything in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech about the arts. Nevertheless, I commend the Premier on what he has tried to do for them. I have a list of the amounts spent, and I do not criticise that. However, I believe that the priorities need considerable review. The amount of \$6 216 022 spent in 1975-76 is not very excessive, in view of the large amount that the Government has to allocate in a year.

I refer now to some amounts that this Government has spent. As I say, by and large I am commending the Government, although I do not agree with some of the priorities. Last year the Government allocated nearly \$1 727 400 for grants and provisions for the arts, and of that amount a little more than \$1 700 000 was spent. This sum was spent on major continuing projects, amounting to just over \$1 500 000, and minor grants amounted to about \$200 000. Of the major grants, I noted particularly the grant to the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra of \$80 000, which I understand has been increased to \$90 000. I believe that that amount is inadequate. The grant to the State Opera, formerly the New Opera, was increased from \$104 500 to \$226 000. I do not criticise that increase.

The grant to the South Australian Theatre Company has been increased from \$466 800 to nearly \$500 000. I wonder whether the balance is out of proportion regarding that facility, and I believe that a rearrangement of that money should be made. There are many other grants to which I do not intend to refer in detail. In addition to the annual grants of slightly more than \$1 700 000, other grants were made, and I will list them accordingly. They are in addition to the ones to which I have referred, and are as follows:

Authority	Grant \$
Festival Centre Trust	2 608 000
South Australian Film Corporation	1 238 000
Art Gallery	668 460

The total grant was \$6 216 022. I do not criticise that amount unduly, because I believe that the Premier has tried to do something constructive for the arts, but I think considerable review of the priorities could be made. I refer particularly to music. At page 11, the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts, makes the following comment about the provision of a second orchestra in South Australia:

The South Australian Government is planning to establish a second professional orchestra in Adelaide to complement the activities of the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra. At first, the orchestra would mainly serve the State Opera of South Australia. Its functions ultimately would include the serving of the State Opera of South Australia, the

serving of visiting performing arts bodies including commercially sponsored ones and the Australian Ballet and the Australian Opera, the performance of school concerts, the touring of country centres in South Australia, and the provision of an educational training service. Some of these activities would overlap a little with those of the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra.

The words "a little" should be omitted from that statement, because those activities would overlap considerably with those of the present orchestra. I suggested to the Premier in the last session that this second orchestra could be used to supplement the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, which presently comprises 65 permanent musicians whose strength is augmented to about 73 musicians for symphony concerts held in the Adelaide Festival Theatre. Such concerts occupy about 25 per cent of the orchestra's time, that is, about 10 weeks out of 40-odd weeks that the orchestra works.

It would be a great improvement if, instead of augmenting somewhat indiscriminately the present 65 players by eight or 10 players, the second orchestra were used as a regular augmenting orchestra for the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra. This would still leave the second orchestra with 75 per cent of its time left to do the things contained in the list I have just read to the Council, and it would also mean that it would bring the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra up to an adequate number of 95 musicians for major concerts during the year. Moreover, this would allow certain professional people engaged in other professions who are good musicians and who happen to be employed elsewhere (I mention one person on the Parliamentary staff) to be used in this orchestra, even though they cannot give their full time to orchestral playing. They might be able to give a couple of periods a week, as envisaged by the Government, to this activity. Certainly, a great improvement would obtain if there were a regular second orchestra used to augment and bring the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra to a strength of about 95 musicians, which is the approximate strength of the Melbourne and Sydney orchestras.

While dealing with this subject I point out that the Australian Broadcasting Commission's priorities also need adjustment. The A.B.C. has an unfortunate tendency (and the Premier has referred to this) of talking about Sydney and Melbourne, and then referring to Brisbane, Adelaide, Perth and Hobart as the B.A.P.H. cities. It should, at least, refer to Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide and then to Brisbane, Perth and Hobart (B.P.H.). I am reliably informed from the best authority I know that the strength of musicianship in Adelaide, owing to the long history of musical training in South Australia (I refer to the music school at the Elder Conservatorium, the oldest institution in Australia), has helped to create a situation where the number of first-class artists in Adelaide is almost the same as the number in Melbourne, and proportionately compares favourably with the number in Sydney. Certainly, the number is many more than in Brisbane, Perth and Hobart. For example, the number of artists graded by the A.B.C. as first class in Sydney is about 120, in Melbourne it is 65, in Adelaide it is 61, and in Brisbane it is 26.

These approximate figures indicate the real situation and why Adelaide should not be by-passed. It indicates also that our orchestra, in comparison with the position elsewhere, should be looked at much more carefully by the A.B.C. than has been the case in the past, and it is all the more reason why the South Australian Government should make the second orchestra available for 25 per cent of its time to augment the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra for major concerts.

The Hon. Anne Levy: What about the Adelaide Singers being axed by Fraser?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That was most unfortunate. However, to say that the Adelaide Singers were axed by Mr. Fraser is absolute nonsense, as the honourable member knows. The overall payments of \$6 250 000 to the arts in 1975-76 may not have been excessive, and I do not criticise that expenditure unduly except in one context, and I will refer to primary industry to do so. I refer now to a subject which I dealt with last year and which still concerns me greatly—the most economical and cheapest supply of vegetables to Adelaide, and the proper use (rather than the wastage) of our water resources. I refer to portion of paragraph 6 of His Excellency's opening Speech in regard to water resources, as follows:

Following the enactment of the Water Resources Act by this Parliament, steps are being taken to ensure that all water resources administration is properly co-ordinated. At present, every day large quantities of recycled water are going to waste out into the gulf. I do not believe this water should be wasted, and I refer the Council to the situation that exists. Last year the Government came up with a comforting conclusion after an oversea visit by certain staff of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is suggested that the Adelaide Plains basin could last from 10 years to 20 years or even 30 years, although what it will be like at the end of that time I do not know.

That is a comforting conclusion if one wants to pass the buck. First, I want to see the Bolivar treatment works water being used. Secondly, I make no apology for referring to some of the matters I raised 12 months ago on this subject. I refer to *Hansard* of August 3, 1976 (page 331), where the report of my speech is as follows:

I come now to water resources. I am concerned with the statement made by the Minister of Works (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) the other day about the situation on the Northern Adelaide Plains. I will repeat some of the statement. I know most honourable members know it fairly well but it is of sufficient moment for it to have further consideration now. The Minister said:

The annual intake of the basin is of the order of 7 500 megalitres a year. At the present time the water extracted is 21 000 megalitres a year—or approximately three times the natural intake. With this state of imbalance, the Mines Department estimated that localised salinity problems would occur within 10 years and would be widespread in 30 years. The Government was therefore most concerned for the long term viability of the market-gardening industry in the Northern Adelaide Plains and the consequent socio-economic problems.

I believe the Government is rightly concerned about that. The Minister went on:

A study of possible alternative water resources was carried out which demonstrated that effluent from the Bolivar sewage treatment works offered the most attractive and least uneconomical supplementary supply.

I believe that to be true. I, too, had a report, which the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries was good enough to give me. It was a report from the Agriculture Department, and that study showed that the effluent could be used on free-draining soils and for salt-tolerant crops such as lucerne, potatoes, flood-irrigated tomatoes and cucumbers, onions and possibly cabbages, cauliflowers and wine grapes. That report was available not in June, 1976, but in June, 1974—over two years ago. The further report that the Government got, an in-depth report, consolidating all the previous work on this matter has now been completed, and the Minister tabled it the other day.

That was a year ago today. The report continues:

Briefly, the report finds that there is sufficient effluent that could be used in conjunction with ground water to maintain the major part of the agricultural industry and the aquifer. It is very important, because it is essential, in my view, to maintain that underground basin and the vegetable-growing industry in the Virginia and Angle Vale areas, for if we are to maintain and develop horticulture in the area this land must be reserved for this use. I

am prompted to ask whether the Government is thinking that the building up of housing in the Virginia and Angle Vale areas will get it off the hook. If it builds up that area it will build up an area that should be preserved, just as the space around the abattoir has been preserved.

As I raised that matter 12 months ago, and have not received a reply, I hope I will get a reply soon. I am concerned about the Government's statement that the revenue from a scheme of irrigation using the effluent would produce only \$727 000 a year and involve a loss of more than \$2 000 000 a year. The Minister concluded that statement as follows:

The scheme is therefore most unattractive economically and could not be financed by the State.

That scheme would mean the economic supply of vegetables to a large proportion of the people of South Australia, particularly Adelaide, from a suitable source close to the markets, yet the Government says that it could not provide about \$2 000 000 a year. The Government can provide \$6 250 000 for the arts (and I am not criticising it for that), and it is absolutely ridiculous that it cannot provide \$2 000 000 a year for a practical necessity for Adelaide people for many years to come.

The Government got a comforting conclusion from some top departmental officers, and it has not tried to do more about the problem. In such a dry State, the water to which I have referred ought to be used. This Government whimpers about the lack of Federal funds, but really it should castigate itself for its profligate use of funds. This year it receives \$508 000 000 in connection with income tax sharing arrangements, \$186 000 000 in Loan moneys, and more than \$300 000 000 in connection with local State tax rip-offs. These sums total about \$1 000 000 000! This total should be compared with the total of \$600 000 000 that applied some years ago. The Government should stop whingeing, grow up, do its own thing, and stop running to Canberra like a spoilt child. I support the motion.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in doing so, reaffirm my allegiance to the Crown. The tour of Australia earlier this year by Her Majesty and the Duke of Edinburgh showed the deep love and affection that the majority of Australians have for their own monarch.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You couldn't use the term "Queen"; that's sexist.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It is, Mr. Deputy President.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I support this Council's thanks to his Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor for so graciously opening this session of Parliament. I join with other honourable members in expressing my sympathy to Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls, and wish them well. To the families of those members who died during the past year—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What about—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I call the Hon. Mr. Foster to order. It is hard for *Hansard* to hear when continual interjections are made. It is only fair that the *Hansard* staff be able to hear what is being said.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I refer particularly to the passing of Mr. G. T. Clarke, who was my representative in Parliament for many years, and who was untiring in his efforts to look after the people of his electorate. We have been saddened this week by the passing of that giant among Parliamentary Draftsmen, Sir Edgar Bean, who

drafted many Acts that became models throughout Australia. I extend my deep sympathy to Lady Bean and her family.

There are several items in the Speech upon which I should like to comment. The first is paragraph 9, part of which states:

My Government's intention to bring together all aspects of housing and urban planning has manifested itself in the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. This new administrative structure will permit a proper evaluation of present housing and planning policies and encourage the formulation of future policies in these areas that will enhance efficiency and minimise social inequity.

The last sentence of the paragraph states:

The Government has established an inquiry into the objectives and methods of controlling private development in the State with a view to implementing desirable changes in the planning controls generally.

This sounds to me like another sinister proposition to introduce more controls for the sake of controls and to get another meal to feed the gaping mouth of petty bureaucracy. It would barely seem necessary to have any further controls on private development. After all, private development has practically come to a halt in this State. When a horse in a race is slowing down and losing ground, the rider usually loosens the reins: he does not draw them in to give tighter control. I suggest that the controls that we already have are the factors responsible for destroying about 50 per cent of the private initiative in this State. However, having referred to this outstanding example of planning for the planners' sake, I do not wish to spotlight all the shortcomings in the Government's proposals. This is being done most volubly around the State generally at present. I will refer only to one other item that reveals an extraordinary attitude on the part of the South Australian Government. Part of paragraph 6 states:

The rate at which my Government's comprehensive water treatment programme to enhance the quality of the Adelaide water supply proceeds will, to a large extent, depend upon the future levels of Federal Government assistance.

We are indebted to the Hon. Mr. Dawkins for his full discussion of this statement, but I should like to itemise it. It is a somewhat surprising statement. One wonders how the vastly increased water rates being collected this financial year are to be used and by whom. Surely the local water reticulation system is purely a State Government responsibility.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It began it.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: That is right. Most South Australians are interested in the future potential of this State in the matter of population growth. Most of us hope to see a greater population in South Australia than we have at present. However, there are difficulties to be faced and overcome if we are to succeed in population growth. First, we are conscious of the fact that the earth in South Australia does not appear to hold much more in the way of rare minerals and commercially mineable substances than has already been tapped.

Again, that portion of South Australian land suitable for primary production in the growing of cereals and the grazing of beasts seems to have been largely developed already. Further, in respect of secondary industry, South Australian centres are a long way from the biggest market points in Australia, let alone elsewhere in the world. Moreover, secondary industry in the State in the heavy industry and hardware areas labours under considerable disadvantages, largely because of its expensive distances from sources of raw materials, as well as markets for its products.

On present indications, it is not reasonable to expect secondary industry in South Australia to support many

more people in the future. The processing of primary products and foodstuffs generally is something that can more certainly be expanded successfully. These matters that I have mentioned being as they are, I would say that most South Australians who are interested in the future of this State, either as thoughtful inhabitants or as those of us who are responsible for making the laws and facilitating new works, are searching for some amelioration of the problem. Is South Australia to expand, or must it stagnate?

I believe that, if South Australia is to increase its population (which means finding more work of a reasonable nature for people to do and providing further employment), we must closely re-examine the possibility of carrying more people in the agricultural spheres of activity, and I use the word "agricultural" in its broadest sense. We have a State that is very dry. Parts of it are as dry as North Africa and the Sahara region, but the climate varies from that to the cool, damp areas of the South-East.

However, every prospect of closer settlement and of new types of plant growth for the feeding of a world running short of food comes up against the proposition that the State is short on water, and in years of poor rainfall or drought there is not enough water for existing operations. It is sometimes overlooked that there is not one watershed in South Australia or one heavy rainfall area providing a large river or even a permanent flow of water. The Murray River, the only major river in South Australia, does not collect its water in this State but brings it from Eastern Australia through a channel in South Australia to the sea. We receive only what we can manage to catch from it, including, of course, the clay and the salt gratuitously supplied by our Eastern neighbours. I commend the Hon. Mr. Dawkins for his suggestions in the matter.

The point I propose to make is that under various parts of South Australia lie basins of water, both artesian water and water nearer the surface that is not under pressure. Most of the artesian systems are salty water and of very little use. Under large areas, however, there are supplies such as the Murray Basin, which are largely fresh water. There are smaller areas, of course, such as the Adelaide Plains basin, containing reasonably fresh water, but these already have been over-used. These basins have been tapped by bores in many places and their waters are being used for many purposes. In some areas, country towns virtually live on bore water, but this use has been haphazard and, of course, irregular.

This is all well known to the Mines Department and has been studied by that department. However, there has never been any large-scale assessment of the quantity of water available from these basins or a commercial assessment of their future worth to the more extensive development of South Australia. I suggest that we need not a commission, a committee of inquiry, or a special department, all to come up with answers in about seven years: rather, the existing Government departments, such as the Agriculture Department, the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which have the knowledge, skills and equipment, should be asked immediately to put together a summary of the known water sources and their possible use to augment our limited surface water facilities. Further, these departments should pursue forthwith an intensive examination both by boring and by general geological research with a view to continually updating the information available to the State Government.

We must discover a wider range of plants, trees and fruits, which will grow in parts of our State that

have been used only sparsely hitherto. We need new products creating an Australia-wide demand. We must search the world imaginatively for products that will grow in our difficult hot climatic conditions when supplied with available water, whether fresh water or slightly salty water.

For example, can it be said that there is not some area in the heat of South Australia that will grow all the dates that Australian markets need? California has done this successfully, so why cannot South Australia do it? For the past two years Australian housewives have not been able to buy dates regularly—there is a shortage of dates at present—and there is a consistent demand for this palliative and nutritious fruit. Again, only recently, I discovered that there is a tea estate at Innisfail, North Queensland. That is an imaginative project. I realise it is not applicable to the South Australian scene, but what a boon for the Australian housewife, who can buy this fragrant tea at about half the price of imported teas. Incidentally, I think that South Australians should ask for that tea, known as Nerada tea, to be made available in our stores.

The Hon. Mr. Geddes, wearing his other hat, made an excellent speech on the future of solar energy. Honourable members should not forget that, with the world becoming short of fuel and with the vast amount of research under way into the use of the sun's heat for water heating and distillation, there is every possibility that the conversion of large quantities of saltish water may become possible, thus maintaining agricultural activity during otherwise arid periods.

The success of such planning will facilitate the establishment of more people on the land. After all, it is not only the arid lands but also the marginal lands and areas of heavier rainfall that are all hampered in their development because of the ever-present fear of droughts and the complete inability to maintain whatever commerce is established in such areas.

In short, I believe that, despite the intense interest and the thorough knowledge possessed by our Government departments, they have not had the opportunity or the facilities placed at their disposal or, indeed, the encouragement to pursue on a wide scale such matters as I have referred to, matters, I believe, of life or death for this State.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Along with other honourable members who have already spoken in this debate, I, too, express my sympathy to the members of the families of those former members of Parliament who died during the past 12 months. Although I did not know any of those members personally, I am sure that they served very well the interests of the people who sent them to this Parliament. Also, I wish to express my regret about the early retirement of Sir Douglas Nicholls owing to ill health. There is no doubt that his appointment represented a milestone in his own life and it was certainly some belated recognition for Australia's Aboriginal population who have been over the 200 years and, indeed, who still are being cruelly treated by white Australians. I hope that Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls have a long and happy retirement; they certainly deserve it.

One other early retirement that I feel is worthy of comment is the announced early retirement of the Governor-General, John Kerr, to take effect from December, 1977. Incidentally, in case any honourable members think I mean any disrespect in mentioning Sir John Kerr, I will give the Council his full title, which is: His Excellency The Right Honourable Sir John Kerr, A.K. (Knight

of the Order of Australia), G.C.M.G. (Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St. Michael and St. George), G.C.V.O. (Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order), A.St.J. (Knight of the Order of St. John), Q.C., and a member of Her Majesty's honourable Privy Council. Apart from being very busy collecting titles for himself, Sir John Kerr's term has been notable for the action of dismissing a Government that had a majority in the people's house of Parliament, an action that struck at the very heart of what Parliamentary democracy is supposed to be all about.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That's nonsense.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I concede that the Leader actually believes that it is nonsense. However, no-one, including the Liberals, will be sorry about Sir John Kerr's departure, for he has become as much an embarrassment to them as he has to the office of the Governor-General. In a way, I suppose it is a pity that an arrangement has been made for him to retire before the next Federal election, as it has deprived Gough Whitlam of the pleasure of giving Sir John Kerr something he richly deserves—the sack. However, Sir John will no doubt find his forced retirement not too unpleasant; the \$500 a week pension should be sufficient to keep him in the style he so obviously enjoys.

Having got the pleasantries of the Address in Reply debate out of the way, I wish to address the Council on several topics of interest to me and the State of South Australia. The Hon. J. C. Burdett (a rather inspired choice of initials by his parents, I think) is currently heading the Liberal Party in a thoroughly dishonest campaign on the hoary old theme of law and order. The Liberal Party obviously believes that what has worked in Queensland for Bjelke-Petersen will work for it in South Australia. However, I think it only fair to point out that, even in Queensland, law and order as an election gimmick has just about had its day. At the recent Country Party conference in Queensland, Mr. Anthony, the National Country Party Leader, described Mr. Bjelke-Petersen as "unreasonable, selfish and unchristian".

The Hon. Anne Levy: He was right for once.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: True, and Mr. Sparkes, the real power behind the Country Party in Queensland, said that the most serious danger facing the Party was its "ultra-conservative, almost fascist" image. I hope that the more enlightened members of the Liberal Party in this State will take heed of those remarks by Mr. Anthony and Mr. Sparkes, and persuade the Liberal Party here to discontinue its crude law and order campaign in favour of issues and policies that advocate a real alternative to the present Government.

If they do that I believe the Liberal Party will be doing both itself and South Australia a service. Anyway, that is its problem. What I want to do today is put in perspective the problems of community safety in South Australia. Let me say from the outset that this Government is aware of the problem of crime in South Australia, and it is taking all possible steps to protect the citizens of this State from the very small percentage of people who breach the law. There is no doubt that crime is on the increase in most countries of the world, and this State cannot expect to avoid the problem entirely. What this Government is particularly proud of is the way in which we have been able to keep the rate of growth in crime less than that in other mainland States, and also the police "clear-up rate" after a crime has been committed. Before dealing with the growth rate in crime and the clear-up rate,

I want to give some attention to the causes of increased offences.

It is a fact that most crimes are committed by young people, and the reason for this can be closely related to unemployment figures. For example, in the year 1975-76 approximately 71 per cent of juvenile offenders in the 14 to 18 years age group (who had left school) were unemployed. This compares with 43 per cent in 1972-73. I do not believe figures like that can be explained in any other way than by directly relating them to unemployment, and we can quite clearly lay the blame for unemployment at the door of Mr. Fraser and his Federal Government. Rather than go on a "youth bashing" exercise, as the Liberal Party does, I suggest that Liberal members use their good offices with their Canberra colleagues to get young people into the work force, and give them the dignity of having their own money and not being classed as lazy and dole bludging, as the Liberals constantly do. A change in the Federal Liberal Government's economic policies, that gets people back to work, particularly young people, would do more than anything else to halt the ever-increasing crime rate in all Australian States.

What is the position in this State compared to the other States? The figures show that there is significantly less crime on average in this State than the rest of Australia, and the police clear-up rate is significantly higher. For example, police statistics of reported major crime over the period 1965 to 1976 show that South Australia had a reported major crime rate below the national average. In 1976, South Australia had 39 armed robberies (3.1 per 100 000 of population) compared with 282 in Victoria (7.5 per 100 000 of population) and 492 in New South Wales (10 per 100 000 of population). In South Australia, the clear-up rate was 47.4 per cent in 1975, and 53.8 per cent in 1976, compared with 40.7 per cent in 1975 and 39 per cent in 1976 in Victoria, and 28.5 per cent in 1975 and 25 per cent in 1976 in New South Wales. So not only do we have significantly fewer armed robberies in this State per head of population than Victoria and New South Wales, but the clear-up rate here is higher, and improving, whilst in New South Wales and Victoria it is lower and deteriorating.

Likewise with the rate of serious assaults; from 1971 to 1976 the serious assault rate in this State was 30 per cent below the national average. Even though the figures for this State are much better than those for other States, the Government is taking, and will continue to take, all possible steps consistent with civil liberties to ensure that crime is kept to an absolute minimum, and that when a crime does occur the criminals are caught and punished suitably.

The first point to note about this Government's policy on law enforcement is that we have more police per head of population than New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia. This makes South Australia the best protected mainland State. Further, this Government gives the police the back-up required to do the job, and the police do that job extremely well indeed, so well in fact that the people of this State have a higher regard for the police than people have in any other State.

This Government has taken many initiatives to assist the police and protect the people of this State, and I want to mention just a few. New legislation in 1977 tightened considerably the control over gun ownership. Statistics in countries where crime is much higher than in South Australia show that the rate of murders, muggings, and that type of offence is directly related to the easy availability of firearms. We have attempted to keep

firearms out of the hands of anybody who does not have a legitimate reason for owning them. Another area that is giving the police an increased number of problems is drug trafficking and, again, last year this Government introduced amendments to the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act which dramatically increased the penalties for drug offences. Maximum penalties for the sale or possession of hard drugs are now 25 years imprisonment or a \$100 000 fine. Maximum penalties for the sale or possession of soft drugs are four years imprisonment or a \$10 000 fine. Also, in what I think was an excellent move by this Government, we established a Royal Commission into the non-medical use of drugs which will be recommending further changes to the law in relation to the use and abuse of drugs.

Street violence and vandalism are crimes that are particularly concerning people, and rightly so, but I think this is an area where the Opposition could perhaps be a bit more helpful to the South Australian community, rather than trying to make political capital out of it. I say this because the latest figures show that street violence, vandalism, and juvenile crime are directly related to unemployment, and increasing unemployment is the direct result of the Fraser Liberal Government's economic policy.

The Dunstan Labor Government in this State has expanded the State unemployment relief scheme, established job hunters' clubs, and provided other youth services, to help keep our young people from despair and disillusion. All that Mr. Tonkin and the Liberals say is that spending to help the young and the unemployed is a waste of money. Why cannot the Opposition be more constructive and assist unemployed South Australians by putting a bit of pressure on their Federal colleagues to do something about the unemployed instead of saying that we are wasting money when we set up schemes to assist them? Mr. Fraser at the moment is making money out of the assistance this Government gives to the unemployed through our unemployment relief scheme. When we make work available to unemployed people through this Government's limited resources, Mr. Fraser gets out of paying unemployment benefits and will not assist us even to the extent of a lousy \$1 for \$1 subsidy for job-creating programmes. What the Liberals should be doing is attacking their Federal colleagues, and the fact that they are not doing so will cost them dearly at the next State election. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 5.37 to 7.43 p.m.]

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Before the dinner adjournment, I was outlining my concern at the Liberal Party's law and order campaign, and I was also outlining some of the real problems that the Government and I see. I wish to continue in that vein on a matter that is quite rightly of particular concern to the community—the question of rape.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Mr. Deputy President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Perhaps one of the most vicious crimes that anyone can commit is rape, and this Government was the first in Australia to pass legislation aimed at reducing the shock and trauma suffered by victims of rape and other sexual offences. Rape is a shocking crime, and the law provides for a possible life sentence for an offender. That penalty is certainly not too high, but,

apart from the very severe penalty available for rapists, this Government has tried to do everything possible to reduce, as I have said, the trauma and shock of rape victims. Under the Evidence Act amendment of last year, evidence of the past sexual experiences or the sexual morality of the alleged victim of a sexual offence is inadmissible as evidence except by leave of the judge, and the reporting of proceedings relating to sexual offences is restricted. Besides what the Government has done in this area, the police themselves have set up a special rape squad, and are being trained to assist rape victims.

All this, of course, means that more and more women are going to report rapes, and this Government encourages them to do so. It makes a mess of the rape statistics, and the Police Commissioner has acknowledged this, but this Government is more concerned with getting women to report rapes and getting more rapists caught than in keeping the figures artificially low. Of course, certain types in the Opposition will try to make political capital out of the increase in the reported rape figures—that is about the level of their mentality. But, in the interest of rape victims, and catching the offenders, we will live with that.

Another aspect of the protection of citizens is how easily they have access to the law when they feel that they need its protection. This Government has again done more than any other State Government to see that people do have easy access to the law. For example, we have legislated to enable the establishment of a Legal Services Commission, which will provide legal aid and advice to those in need. This Government has also decentralised the court system by appointing magistrates in country areas so that serious matters can be heard in the local areas rather than in Adelaide. These and other initiatives taken by the Government have improved considerably the access that South Australians have to the law, and we are very proud of our achievements in this area.

As I have said, the clear-up rate for major crime in South Australia is significantly better than the national average, so criminals are being caught and sentenced in this State and they are receiving appropriate sentences. It is argued by some that sentences are too light and that this Government is somehow soft on criminals, thus encouraging crime. This is absolute nonsense, because the Government, of course, does not impose the sentences. In our system, judges and magistrates are independent of the Government, and I have every confidence that the sentences they impose, after hearing all the facts of the case, are appropriate. It is quite improper to say that the sentence in a particular case is too lenient, if you are only relying on a newspaper report of a case. In the interest of brevity, not all the mitigating circumstances may be published. If they were, perhaps there would not be this ill-informed criticism of sentences. All the Government can do regarding sentences is legislate for maximum and minimum sentences. Already the maximum sentences that are available to judges and magistrates in this State are very high. For example, the sentence of life imprisonment is available for murder, manslaughter, rape, armed robbery, aggravated assault and burglary. What penalty is imposed after a conviction is up to the judge or magistrate, but those are the kind of sentences that are available, and the Opposition must admit that those are heavy sentences indeed. The question of minimum sentences is much more difficult to deal with.

What legislating for minimum sentences means is that Parliament limits the discretion of judges in sentencing. I do not believe that this is desirable, because it is not

possible for Parliament to anticipate all the circumstances relating to a particular crime. I should like to give one example that was given to me. If Parliament decides that a minimum of one year in gaol is mandatory for theft, then a deserted wife who is suffering financial hardship and who steals a 50c can of baby food from a supermarket would have to go to gaol for that time, on conviction. That sentence would be far too harsh in those circumstances, but the judge would have no discretion. It is possible to go through most offences in that light, and I am sure any reasonable person would have to agree that limiting the judge's or magistrate's discretion in this way would be quite wrong. Another argument that can be advanced against minimum sentences is that juries knowing that a minimum sentence will be applied if they convict, may refuse to convict because they feel that the sentence would be too high after hearing all the circumstances.

I am not convinced that minimum sentences are necessary or desirable. I have every confidence in the good sense and professionalism of our judges and magistrates. Incidentally, I would like to hear the Hon. Mr. Burdett on the question of minimum sentences. I admit I have not heard him yet criticise a particular sentence, when that sentence was less than the maximum prescribed. However, some of his colleagues have done so, quite improperly in my opinion. I would welcome his views on minimum sentences.

I have attempted to show the real position in this State regarding crime, the law, and this Government. To sum up, we have less serious crime in this State than does the rest of Australia; we have a higher clear-up rate than the rest of Australia; we have more police per head of population than any other mainland State; and the police are doing their job well indeed. Criminals are being caught and being punished according to their crime. The Government has altered the law when necessary and has penalties constantly under review.

For the Opposition to attempt to frighten the people of South Australia into voting for it by saying, contrary to the facts, that South Australia is no longer a safe place to live in is just about the lowest form of politics one can get. That one newspaper in this State goes along with the Opposition in generating fear about people's safety is quite immoral, and it is no wonder that newspapers, as a whole, have little credibility with the public, and that the newspaper in question has none. I have lived in and visited many places throughout the world and, without doubt, South Australia is the best place to live in that I have found. For the Opposition to continually knock this State, as it does, does this State a great disservice. I had always assumed that the role of the Opposition, any Opposition, was to present alternative policies to the electors that would attract them. This Opposition appears to be incapable of doing that. Until the Liberal Party rids itself of some of its spokesmen and does some basic work on policies that are relevant to this State, instead of concentrating on fear and smear tactics, it will always be an Opposition and rightly so.

Another issue that I want to give some attention to is the destruction of the shipbuilding industry in Australia by the Federal Liberal Government. Having been a maritime worker most of my life, I have a particular interest in this topic. For me to witness the destruction of this industry in my home city of Whyalla is painful, to say the least. It cannot be argued that there are not a number of problems connected with shipbuilding in Australia, and I do not propose to understate them, but surely

the aim of any Government should be to assist in overcoming the problems and not to destroy such a vital industry in the interests of overseas shipbuilders.

What I find particularly hypocritical in this Fraser Government's attitude to the industry is the way it lied to people before the 1975 Federal election. For example, Mr. Nixon, the present Federal Minister, said on June 3, 1975:

Australia is the world's only island continent. We are one of the great trading nations of the world. Our prosperity depends upon our ability to export our own products and resources and to import the goods which are produced in other parts of the world. It is incomprehensible that a nation such as ours should not be one of the world's leading maritime powers. The annual cost to Australia of freight is of the order of \$1 000 000 000. The savings in foreign exchange and the acquisition of skills and resources would more than offset the cost involved in creating a national fleet. A large proportion of the real profits that we should obtain from the export of natural resources is lost to this country because of the costs involved in shipping.

The Opposition believes that Australia is not only capable of becoming a large-scale maritime nation but also that one of the functions of the national Government is to encourage this development. What needs to be done in shipbuilding is to give the Australian shipbuilding yards terms that are at least equal to those of overseas yards. Give them a chance to compete.

That is a first-class statement of the position with which I have no argument. Again, in its transport policy for 1975, the Liberal-Country Party stated:

We recognise that Australian coastal shipping and the Australian shipbuilding industries are important to Australia. Our high priority for these areas will lead us to ensure the continuing viability of our shipbuilding and ship repair industries.

Yet, within eight months of being elected to office that Party has virtually sealed the fate of all Australia's ship repair and shipbuilding yards, not for any realistic economic reasons but because Australia's largest shipbuilder, the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, in its submissions to the Industries Assistance Commission, stated that it believed Australian large-scale commercial shipbuilding should be abandoned. Other evidence submitted by B.H.P. was as follows:

If the Government blocked the acquisition of overseas vessels and required that replacement tonnage be built in Australia, the largest vessel that could be built would be a vessel of about 70 000 dead weight tons. We have discounted the possibility of Australian shipyards being expanded to accommodate vessels of 100 000 D.W.T. as the cost of expansion could not be justified.

However, I believe that the expansion of a nation, its work force, and an urgently needed national export fleet is ample justification. The invisible benefits lost by not expanding our own shipping, ship repair and shipbuilding industry runs into thousands of millions of dollars. The outgoing of money to foreign yards will add substantially to the balance-of-payments deficit.

Total invisible debits against Australia's account for the year 1975-76 reached a staggering \$4 575 000 000. Freight on imports alone represented a debit of \$818 000 000. Freight on exports, normally paid by overseas buyers, is not listed in the invisibles account. Nevertheless, they represent a deduction from export income accruing to Australia. Therefore, the freight levies imposed on Australian trade constitute the highest loss to the Australian economy in the invisibles account. Australia, one of the major trading nations of the world, is unable to move a single export or import commodity by rail, river or canal across a frontier, and it is totally dependent on ocean highways. Carrying only 1 per cent of its import and export cargoes under its national flag Australia has obviously to look more closely at its entire shipping policy.

Shipbuilding being an international industry, it is worth looking at what is happening to the industry internationally, because it has a direct bearing on what is happening here in Australia. At the end of March, 1976, a "gentlemen's agreement" between the world's major shipbuilding nations was forged under the auspices of the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (O.E.C.D.). Its aim was to lay down guidelines for an orderly reduction in the world's shipbuilding over-capacity. Nearly all the nations involved have bowed reverently in its direction, including, it seems, the Australian Government and B.H.P.

The Japanese yards currently building giant tankers are trying to capture the market for smaller dry cargo ships and high specification vessels dominated by Europe so far. This strategy is already well under way. Japanese yards are quoting low prices, up to 50 per cent less than European yards, for cargo and bulk carriers, and have cornered most of the world's market for such ships. This has led to accusations of dumping and building at a loss, which the Japanese strenuously deny. However, a comparison shows a Japanese-built bulk carrier is 50 per cent of the European price, yet the Japanese claim that their costs are only 20 per cent lower than European costs.

The reason Japan received two-thirds of the shipbuilding from overseas O.E.C.D. nations (it gets normally only 50 per cent) is what is called soft financing. Deferred payments accompanied more than 70 per cent of contracts in 1975, compared to 27 per cent in 1974. There has been indiscriminate price cutting, promises of freight business and assistance in raising the down-payments necessary to qualify for the export-import bank funds.

It is often said that the Australian shipbuilding industry is too highly subsidised. I deny this emphatically. No shipbuilding industry in the world continues without subsidies of one kind or another. I will not detail all the subsidies available in other countries. Anyone interested can refer to a speech I made on October 3 last year (page 1485 of *Hansard*). Ample detail to prove my point was given to the house then, but I do want briefly to restate the position.

No modern shipbuilding industry, least of all the mighty Japanese industry, could have got off the ground without Government incentives. There is no doubt that incentives of varying sorts are supplied by Governments to shipbuilding industries in all major producing countries of the world. The Japanese Government is presently acting on its shipbuilding and shipping rationalisation report. It recommends, in addition to subsidies, a framework for spinning out the existing work load and the scrapping of older yards and mergers.

In America, the Maritime Administration expects to spend over \$700 000 000 in fiscal 1977 to subsidise American shipowners and shipbuilders. Last year's subsidies were \$403 000 000 in operating differentials wage comparison, and \$247 000 000 for shipbuilding, which is 35 per cent of costs and which is expected to rise to 45 per cent this year, yet this Fraser coalition states that it can no longer prop up the shipbuilding industry with its subsidies, which amounted to \$8 000 an employee a year.

In Australia, subsidies have been paid not to protect shipowners but to help develop the important shipbuilding industry. Yet the consortium which controls the Australian shipbuilding, ship repair and shipping industry, has not seen fit to invest in the industry, but expects to be able to compete with its outdated and obsolete equipment. Obviously the Fraser Government and the shipbuilders and owners must take a closer look at their own inadequacies and inefficiencies, rather than take the easy and publicly

accepted way out by blaming high wages and industry disputes for the destruction of the shipping industry. B.H.P.'s technical agreement since 1965 with the Japanese shipbuilding company Ishikawajima-Harima also rules out the lack of Australian technical knowledge. And they cannot say that they were not forewarned. As early as 1957 *The Ship Building, Ship Repair and Services Journal* stated:

The business issue is clear; Australia needs her own fleet in the oversea trade to protect exports. If no Australian investment in tonnage is made, none can blame the 22 foreign shipping lines for charging any conceivable rate for their services.

On January 21, 1961, the *Sydney Morning Herald* editorial stated:

National anxiety is occasioned by the fact that so little Australian capital and enterprise are devoted to carrying goods and people to and from our shores. Shipping freights are a mounting burden or invisible deficits in the balance of international payments. Surely Government and local shipping interests should become more sea-minded and prepare a plan whereby more Australian built and manned ships carry the Australian flag into the ports of the world.

Then of course there are the unions, which at this present time are bearing the brunt of Fraser's and the shipping consortium's attacks. Unions such as the Painters and Dockers Union, Seamen, Firemen and Deckhands Union, Waterside Workers Federation, etc., have for 30 years made submissions, regarding the critical state of the industry, to the Government, the shipping consortium, and the mass media, as well as making public protests. These people, whose motives are often misunderstood, appear to be the only ones concerned about the welfare and future of the Australian nation and the Australian community.

I believe it is worth giving a brief history of the shipbuilding industry in this country. The First World War saw the beginning of naval shipbuilding, which commenced at Cockatoo in 1911 with the assembly of the *Warrago* which had been shipped from Britain to be re-erected. In 1917, the Commonwealth Government reached a decision to build and run its own shipping line, now called the Australian National Line. The fleet consisted mainly of the "D" and "E" class cargo ships, 330ft. long and about 6 000 tons, at a cost of \$271 000 and \$260 000 and they were subsequently sold to B.H.P., which used them as the foundation of its ore carrying fleet for the nominal price of \$84 000 and \$38 000 respectively.

Between 1919 and 1924 a total of 21 vessels was built by Walkers Limited, Walsh Island, Williamstown, Poole and Steel and Cockatoo. However, once the Commonwealth vessels were completed most of the yards went into decline. At this stage the industry could virtually be written off. The skilled and experienced dock workers, though scattered into other occupations, were the nation's greatest asset at the outbreak of the Second World War, and were only too willing to return to their unique love of ships and shipbuilding. During the war, 120 large vessels were launched ranging from 180ft. corvettes to 9 000 ton cargo ships. The average was one launching every two weeks. There were 36 000 vessels up to 120ft., plus 12 000 merchant ships that underwent repairs or refits. Later, I will deal with the matter of the need for a shipbuilding industry during a time of war.

By 1946, seven major yards were in existence, but even though subsidies ranging from 25 per cent to 45 per cent have been paid since 1947 and ships to the value of \$234 000 000 have been arranged by the shipbuilding board up to 1967, only three remain today—Whyalla, Newcastle State Dockyard (both about to close) and Cockatoo, existing almost entirely on naval contracts. All these yards have had substantial assistance from the Australian

taxpayers: Cockatoo was built in 1858 by the New South Wales Government and is now leased to Vickers of England at a nominal rental. Whyalla was built in 1939 by B.H.P., provided that the Commonwealth Government built a million-dollar electric steel furnace, forge shop and engineering workshop in Whyalla. Newcastle State Dockyard commenced in 1914 and is presently administered by the New South Wales Government.

The shipping consortium in no way can justify the declined state of the Australian shipping industry over the past 10 years, a time when shipbuilding on a world basis was thriving to meet the needs of an expanding international trade, and the need for building container vessels and tankers, and when there was a boom in off-shore oil exploration providing new opportunities for shipbuilding. While our Government and the shippers have been discussing the chronic ailment within our industry for the past six years, blaming the economy, dock workers and each other, countries throughout the world have been investing and continue to invest in shipping and shipbuilding.

In Indonesia, \$1 000 000 000 is envisaged in the next five years, and in Malaysia, \$100 000 000, with 51 per cent Government contribution. Oil-rig Construction in Singapore has secured orders worth \$75 000 000 for the construction of 23 oil rigs by 1977, and a potential market of \$20 000 000 000. When South-East Asian off-shore oil and gas exploration began, the rigs had to be brought from the United States at a cost of \$1 000 000. They soon realised that the region's shipyards could build rigs as efficiently and much more cheaply, even though half the steel weight and equipment, such as engines, pumps and derricks, have to be imported.

In mid-1975, a \$12 000 000 bond was issued to finance the Government-owned Keppel shipyard's new 150 000-ton dry dock. Keppel already has an integrated ship repair yard with six dry docks capable of servicing ships up to 40 000 D.W.T. The merchant fleet of the state-owned Pertamina Oil Corporation is expected to increase progressively over the next five years to cope with the growth in oil and related cargoes. Thus the fleet was scheduled to exceed 3 000 000 D.W.T. by 1976 and reach 3 500 000 tons by 1979.

Hong Kong shipbuilders entered a new field when construction of a drilling ship began in 1975 at the Hong Kong United Dockyard. The Government has also received proposals for two new shipyards. The first for a ship repair yard operated by Tungs Overseas Shipyard Co. has been approved and will operate in conjunction with a 100 000-ton floating dock. The second proposal is for a 20-acre, \$3 500 000 shipbuilding yard where Chung Wah would build vessels of less than 30 000 tons. This venture hopes to exploit the boom experienced by Hong Kong's small shipyards because of the need for smaller vessels; this is only a small part of the increased shipbuilding activity going on in our part of the world.

I would have thought that if for no other reason the question of defence would ensure that Australia retained the capacity to build large vessels. As I said earlier, the B.H.P. yard at Whyalla was built in 1939 precisely because of this nation's need to have its own ships. In time of war, it is stupid to rely on the goodwill of any other nation for such a basic item of equipment as a ship to transport men and materials. This necessary independence is recognised today by no less a group than the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence, a committee of the Australian Parliament and with a majority

of Liberals on it. In other words, Liberal members of Parliament themselves investigated the shipbuilding industry and its relationship to the defence of this nation. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them marked passages from the interim report of the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence.

Leave granted.

EXTRACT FROM REPORT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE COMMITTEE

Ship Construction: The committee has concluded that, from the viewpoint of national security in the most serious of the postulated high level conflict scenarios, there would be a very real need for an ability to produce medium and large merchant ships in Australia. It is concerned that if there were no existing shipyards, time would not permit sufficient construction of new vessels to take place should it be necessary to create and man new shipyards before any ship construction could commence. It considers therefore that steps should be taken urgently to ensure the retention of large shipbuilding facilities in Australia which in the normal course would appear to be almost certain to cease operating in the near future.

The committee doubts the feasibility of putting the existing facilities at Whyalla and Newcastle on a care and maintenance basis and believes quite strongly that every endeavour should be made to keep the large shipbuilding facilities in existence as an economically acceptable industry. It is of the opinion that poor productivity and high costs in the past have stemmed primarily from inadequate workload, outdated plant and bad industrial relations. An important contributory factor has been the inability of the industry to offer shipbuyers terms of payment as attractive as those on offer from overseas.

Although recognising that substantial sums would be involved in modernising the facilities, the committee proposes that consideration be given to the following interdependent actions directed towards the achievement of improved performance, as a possible basis for converting this generally uneconomic but nationally important industry into an economically acceptable industry:

- the industry to be rationalised;
- the existing ship construction facilities at Whyalla and Newcastle be retained;
- there be an injection of capital at both yards on a shared basis, sharing being between the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments in the case of Newcastle, and between the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments and B.H.P. in the case of Whyalla, the amount of capital to be that needed to bring the physical capability of each of the yards to a standard matching that of overseas shipyards of similar capacity;
- there be work load on a continuing basis for the rationalised industry resulting from a "build in Australia" policy for Australian ships; a policy to build vessels which to the maximum feasible extent are of standard design; and, subject to a suitable manning/productivity understanding with the maritime unions, an Australian flag policy for a proportion of oversea trade;
- there be a guarantee of improved industrial relations, particularly in respect of measures to improve productivity for ship construction and repair and an accepted objective of working towards a single shipbuilding union through a process of amalgamations;
- there be a system by which potential buyers of Australian-built ships can be offered financial terms that are generally competitive on the world scene.

The committee emphasises that this proposal must be viewed as "a package deal"—the elements are interdependent and the package stands or falls on acceptance of all elements.

The committee recommends that the Government set up an expert group comprising representatives of the Commonwealth, New South Wales and South Australian Governments, managements of the shipyards and the A.C.T.U. to examine these proposals as a matter of urgency and report on the cost and practicality of their implementation as an integrated package and whether the industry could then be reasonably expected to be economically acceptable.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I stress that that was a quote not from a Labor Party or trade union

document but from an expert committee comprising a majority of Liberals. Anyone can see that the committee is correct; We do need a shipbuilding industry for the defence of this nation, and in my mind to destroy the industry as the Fraser Government is doing is tantamount to treason. The destruction of this industry, besides being against the economic and defence needs of Australia, is a personal tragedy for the workers, who have in many instances given the whole of their working lives to this industry. In Whyalla, to remove 2 000 jobs out of the city, as the closure of the shipyard will do, represents a human problem of enormous proportions. Already, the shipyard work force is down to about 1 000 employees from a high of 1 800. Apart from the personal hardship involved, the entire city is feeling the financial and social strain of such a large (and increasing) drop in the number of employees. For example, the level of business activity in the city is declining, staff is not being replaced when they leave, building activity in the housing industry has almost ceased, and even the Housing Trust, which has done such a remarkable job in building up Whyalla, has virtually ceased new construction. The whole city is winding down to a lower level of activity, and, in the process, people are being hurt.

I suppose that Whyalla could not expect to escape completely the effects of the mismanagement of the Australian economy by Mr. Fraser, and we are feeling those effects. One of our two blast furnaces has closed down, and there have been reductions in the amount of steel made and iron ore mined. On top of this general run-down, to have the complete closure of our only other major industry, the shipyard, is a disaster of major proportions for Whyalla. Nothing has been done by the Federal Government to cushion the blow that it has dealt out to Whyalla. Representation has been made to Mr. Fraser from all sections of the Whyalla community, but the response to date has been nil.

I urge the Opposition in this State to get behind this Government and its proposals in order to help solve the problems involving the Whyalla shipyard. Mr. Fraser has not even had the courtesy to reply to this Government's very sensible proposals. So far, the Liberals in this State have not said one word in supporting the shipyard, and I find it appalling that the Liberal Party should be so callous as to ignore the death of this very vital industry.

When the Federal Liberal Party was in Opposition, the statements and promises it made regarding shipbuilding were correct, and I congratulate it for that. What Whyalla desperately needs is for the Federal Liberal Government to match its words with deeds.

The Hon. Mr. Carnie, in his contribution to the debate, condemned the Government for not introducing a Bill relating to compulsory unionism. I assure him that the Government never intended to do so, anyway. I presume the honourable member meant to say that he failed to see in His Excellency's Opening Speech any reference to preference to unionists. He used a quotation from the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights (I believe he referred to Convention 20). However, the honourable member's research was indeed shallow, as much more has been said by the United Nations, and particularly by the International Labor Organisation, which is a part of the United Nations, on this matter.

One sees when one reads Convention 98 that it deals in large measure with unionism and one's right to join or not to join an association. It is important when anyone quotes statements or papers emanating from the United Nations or the I.L.O. that he carries his quotation right through.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: In other words, don't distort by omission.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: That is so. Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Carnie, by omission, distorted the entire United Nations position.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Yes, and he knows it.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I will expel the Hon. Mr. Foster if he continues to interject from outside the Chamber.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: United Nations Convention 98 deals with the matter of compulsory unionism and, when one reads it, one must also quote from the I.L.O. document. I refer now to page 2055 of *Hansard* of November 10, 1976, where the Minister of Labour and Industry referred to page 37 of the United Nations Convention, as follows:

Lastly, there are a good many countries, including some economically advanced ones, where trade union membership is often voluntary only in that the law does not require a worker to join or forbid him to do so and often does not define the rights of the individual respecting freedom of association. Yet practices which make employment dependent on whether or not he belongs to a union may impair his right to work and to equality of opportunity. Suffice it to say that as regards the vexed question of "union security" clauses and practices, which vary greatly from country to country, it was agreed, when Convention No. 98 was adopted, that this instrument could not be interpreted as authorising or forbidding such clauses, and that such matters were to be settled by national regulation or in accordance with national practice.

The Hon. Mr. Burdett frowns at that. He may not like it, but I could not care less whether he does or not. If members opposite intend to quote from United Nations papers, I suggest that they carry out their research thoroughly. I have read what the I.L.O. has said on the question of compulsory unionism. I suggest that honourable members opposite read *Hansard* tomorrow so that perhaps the next time they refer to Convention No. 20 they can do so with a little more authority. I support the motion.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I extend my sympathy to the families of those members who have passed away since the last session of Parliament. Looking back over the past seven years of this Government's term of office one must acknowledge the paucity of what that Government has put before the Government and what it has done for the State. A further example of this was the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, which was empty and hollow and almost a repeat of the last goodness knows how many speeches that we have heard emanating from Government members. They are the greatest bunch of confidence tricksters that this State has seen in the political sphere.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: It's got the public's support.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The honourable member has a shock coming to him. This is a sham of a Government, because it has for years used the media to sell the false story of what it has intended to do for the State. But what has it done? Every time one looks at something that has been promised over the last seven years, one finds that it has not happened.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Such as?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will tell the honourable member in a minute. We have evidenced the empty shell of this Government, making hollow promises one after another. That is because the Government has nothing to say. The only thing missing from the Opening Speeches was what the Government wanted to duck away from, because

it did not have community support for them. There was a time when a special Bill was to be introduced, but it disappeared. When the press approached the Premier about the matter, he said it was not an important issue and there was no pressure for it. Of course, I am talking about preference to unionists. The Government brought that in by the back door. It is a sneaky Government, bringing this in slowly but surely and denying Parliament the right to debate it. What happened to the Bill about civil actions? What happened to the Bill that would be introduced especially to make sure that we did not have to pay Mr. Dunford's costs in future? We will not hear about that until after the election, but I hope the people are aware of what they will face soon.

I refer now to some things that this Party in Government talked about before it gained office. I do not think that many people need reminding of the greatest fiasco of all time, namely, Chowilla dam. The Government was going to give that to South Australia, but it disappeared. More serious than that was the matter of the standard-gauge rail link. The Premier's policy speech in 1970, when he was putting it over the people for the first time, contained this statement:

Standardisation of the line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook: A Labor Government will fight to obtain immediate Commonwealth action on standardising the rail gauge.

We heard about that matter next just after the Government gained office. The Premier said it was not going ahead, because certain areas would be isolated, and the Government was going to fix that up. The next time we heard about it was in September, 1970, when Mr. Virgo said that he would go to Port Moresby and push for the shelving of the Maunsell report on rail standardisation. The report was shelved. Mr. Virgo persuaded the Federal Government to delay this vital rail link pending further investigation of a scheme that had been submitted in 1966.

However, it was important to Mr. Virgo to be seen to be doing what was stated in the policy speech, even though he knew that what he was doing was wrong and that South Australia would end up with no rail link. Statements went on and on, and about election time they became like confetti. It just so happened that in 1974 we were approaching the election of the Labor Government in Canberra. At that time, Mr. Whitlam said:

The Federal Government gave the go-ahead last night for a standard-gauge railway from Adelaide to Crystal Brook. Mr. Whitlam said: "My Government would pay the whole of the initial cost of \$80 000 000. The South Australian Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) and the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) signed an agreement in Adelaide yesterday to build the railway. Mr. Whitlam announced agreement between the two Labor Governments at a political meeting in the Norwood Town Hall. Planning will begin immediately and construction will begin in January, he told more than 1 200 people.

He told about 1 200 South Australian suckers that they were being taken in again by Labor spokesmen. That statement went on:

The railway would mean that passengers and products would be able to move without impediment to the eastern seaboard with its great markets, he said.

The most disastrous thing that has happened to this State was the shelving of that project. It has almost denied South Australia a connection with the rest of Australia. When we were passing the Bill dealing with the railway transfer, I thought that the Government would make certain that we got that connection, but that did not happen, despite Mr. Whitlam's statement about a commencement date.

How can we believe anything a spokesman for this Government says about that matter in future, because the Government flagrantly has put it over the people by denying them a standard rail link for about eight years? Not a sod has been turned, and this an indictment of this Government. No wonder we are not getting industrial growth.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Where are your own members while you are talking such rubbish?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It does not matter a damn what you on that side say. Whatever you have said on this issue has been an empty shell of a statement.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: You are a confidence mob.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. Sit him down when I am on my feet to take a point of order. Just because you are a mate of his—

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I rise on a point of order.

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. J. A. Carnie): Let us have one point of order at a time.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: He is your previous colleague and a member of the Liberal Party. I draw attention to the fact that last week—

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: What is your point of order?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I can quote Standing Order No. 1, if I want to. I am drawing the attention of the Acting Deputy President to the fact that three times last week the elected President of this place pulled me up for saying "damn", but the member has done that in a most derogatory way regarding us and you sit there as though you are in limbo.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not think I should say anything about what the Hon. Mr. Foster said. The next matter to which I refer concerns the portfolio of the Hon. G. T. Virgo, Minister of Transport in another place. After having looked at the various statements he has made, I believe a good name for him would be "Texas Virgo". I refer to his statement published in the *Advertiser* in 1973. He said that we were going to have the world's biggest dial-a-bus system—not just dial-a-bus system, but the world's biggest.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: When did he say that?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: March 24, 1973. The report states:

The world's biggest dial-a-bus system—
this is Mr. Virgo speaking—
will begin operating in June this year. Initially the service will have 14 buses.

I do not know where it went, but the "world's biggest dial-a-bus system" was indeed an extraordinary statement. Again, I refer to another statement reported in the *Sunday Mail* in June, 1977. Someone in the Minister's department is looking at the potential of cactus juice to power the dial-a-bus. If the person making those statements is not worthy of the name "Texas Virgo" I should like to know who is. We might have the world's biggest dial-a-bus system running on cactus juice! Obviously, the Minister cannot help himself. He has to have the biggest, the best or the fastest.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I rise—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Dunford.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Will the honourable member give way?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There is no give-way rule. *Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Cameron will continue with his speech.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Where—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Cameron.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Next, I refer to the railway station development as announced in the 1975 policy speech. Mr. Dunstan was the first one to bring this forward. He said that a modern administration building for the State Transport Authority, an international hotel, a restaurant, shops and an 8 000-seat stadium would be built. However, Mr. Virgo went further and had his photograph taken in front of a plan of that project. Indeed, any honourable member who wants to look at the edition of the *Advertiser* or *News* at that time will see Mr. Virgo standing and pointing at what will happen. Mr. Virgo stated:

Preliminary plans for the 14½-acre site include an international hotel.

We have had an international hotel in Victoria Square ever since 1970! That project has been put up to all sorts of people, including Japanese businessmen.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: Has it been built?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No, every time a Japanese businessman comes through they try to flog that site to him. Indeed, people who present a Hong Kong passport at the airport are immediately conducted to the Premier's office to see whether they are interested in the site. It seems that we are not satisfied with what we are to have on the railway site, either. One of the problems with the Government is that so many furrphies come out that even its own Ministers do not know what is the situation. I can understand that, because Mr. Virgo is quite a man to keep up with.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: Does he live in a pipe dream?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I believe—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise seriously on a point of order. It is wrong for a person who accepts the responsibility of relieving you, Mr. Deputy President, in the Chair from time to time to sit behind his one-time friend and colleague and make interjections helping him spread a pack of lies and insinuations against the Government.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There is no point of order. The Hon. Mr. Cameron.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Hon. Mr. Sumner is getting worried, because he cannot believe that the Hon. Mr. Virgo has been so outrageous. However, I assure the honourable member that that is the case, and I will provide him with any material he needs afterwards about the point that is worrying him. He is concerned that Mr. Virgo said we would have the world's biggest dial-a-bus system. The next point that comes to my attention is the 1970 policy speech in which the Government indicated that when in Government in 1968-70 the Liberal Party had allowed building prices to escalate. It gave that one specific example, saying that the prices of building materials had increased by 8.3 per cent in two years. What a shocking thing to happen! At that time the square metre cost of building a house in Adelaide was the second lowest in mainland Australia. By a strange coincidence, despite a direct promise by the Labor Government that it would curtail such increases, we now have the highest building costs of any mainland State in Australia. In spite of the

sycophantic Mr. Neighbour and his comments on radio commercials, this is the real position. Any person who has been resident in both Sydney and Adelaide will know only too well that we have had enormous increases in costs in South Australia to the extent that we now have far higher costs than apply in Sydney.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Rubbish!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is not rubbish. The cost of building a house here is now the highest of any mainland State. The Hon. Mr. Dunford is going to get a shock soon, because there will be more figures coming out.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: From where?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: He will get those figures from an absolutely neutral source, showing that he himself is talking rubbish. I ask the Hon. Mr. Dunford to pick out any builder in Adelaide who also builds in Sydney, get the same floor plan, and ask him. The most unfortunate thing in all this is that the Government is hiding its head in the sand; it does not recognise the problem and will not do anything about it; it will just let South Australia put up with it. That is the incredible thing about it. It just shows how shallow the Government is—it ducks for cover.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Is it the price of the bricks, labour, or what is the problem?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: You will get the information eventually. My next point is the express bus lanes fiasco. We heard in the 1973 A.L.P. policy speech that we were going to have express routes using reserved bus lanes to suburbs such as Ingle Farm, Grange, and West Lakes. I do not know whether any honourable member has travelled along those routes lately; I do not know whether the Hon. Mr. Carnie has.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: I cannot help you there.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In Adelaide, where does this situation exist, except for a painted sign near the Botanic Garden indicating a reserved express bus lane for about 500 metres? That was a direct promise to the people of this State, and it was broken by the Government. Something was expected by the people, particularly after all the Government said about public transport when it came into Government in 1970. What it was not going to do! Mr. Virgo was going to have hovertrains running at 300 miles an hour and peregrine trains going over the hills at 160 m.p.h. They were to be called "peregrine" because of the peregrine falcon, which dives at such a fast rate. It was in the paper.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It went back to the *Advertiser* library.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Mr. Virgo had an amazing imagination, but we have not seen those reserved bus lanes. And then we come to the ring bus route. We were going to have a 12-mile route circling Adelaide, which would be operating by October, 1974. Again, this was a direct promise that it would start. What do we see? Absolutely nothing. Again, I bet an election was coming up. In 1976 we had exactly the same announcement, a little like the new contracts announced for an industry on Friday, this having been already announced five or six weeks previously. The Government has no new ideas.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Let us look at the electrification of transport in Adelaide. In 1973, Mr. Virgo said we were going to have double-decker trains operating on the Adelaide to Christie Downs railway line by 1975. They would be introduced in a \$22 700 000 project to electrify the entire Adelaide to Christie Downs railway

service. I do not know; I travel around Adelaide a bit but have seen no double-decker trains. They were going to have 36 cars—18 power units and 18 trailers—operating by the middle of 1977, in a \$22 700 000 project.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Government hasn't done a thing.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Of course not, but an election was coming up. Again in 1973, two months later, we read:

Almost certain electrification of the Adelaide to Elizabeth rail line was announced by Mr. Virgo yesterday. This would follow electrification of the Adelaide to Christie Downs line.

There is a problem there, because the first one has not even been started, but the Government had to keep the announcements rolling out, so its fertile imagination went to work. Later, we even had a line running to Gawler in 1975. I do not know whether anyone has been out to Gawler lately and has seen any start on that, but I am certain it has not occurred.

The next point is the Windy Point restaurant. The Premier was up there one night recently, I heard. I do not know whether, while he was there, he looked for the restaurant that he announced in 1973. I will quote what he said:

Such Government-backed projects as the Adelaide Festival Hall, Edmund Wright House, Ayers House, and the Windy Point restaurant were nearing fruition.

I always understood that "nearing fruition" meant nearing completion. In the Estimates of 1972 the Government actually allocated \$40 000 in the Budget for this project. I do not know what happened to that money, but it did not go to the Windy Point restaurant. Perhaps it has been built below ground and has not been open to the public.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It must have been architects' fees.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I wonder who the architect was—that would be interesting to know. In the 1973 Labor Party policy speech, the Premier said Whyalla was to be the base of a West Coast tourist boom, and added, "That means we have to provide the complex of tourist accommodation and facility." When he says "we", I suppose he means the Government. I do not know whether he went ahead with it. I contacted the people in Whyalla but they had not seen anything of that sort there yet, so I presume it did not happen. In 1975, we were going to have a new hospital in Whyalla but, from what I hear, that is not proceeding. In 1971, Mr. Virgo said that he believed a fast passenger rail service between Adelaide and Whyalla was desirable. The reason we have not got the fast passenger service between here and Whyalla is that the standardisation promised by the Government has not occurred. In 1973, we were going to establish a waste disposal authority in Adelaide. In 1974, the Acting Premier, Mr. Corcoran, said on May 22 that the Government intended to introduce a Bill in the next session of Parliament to establish the authority.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I don't remember that Bill.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not remember it, either, and I was here at the time. There must have been some reason why the Government did not go ahead with it. Apparently, it was something just to fool the public. Again, in the 1973 policy speech the Government stated:

We will establish an environmental research institute. This multi-discipline body will provide environmental advice and research for Government and industry.

When the Premier was tackled on this issue by us, he said:

Detailed financial examinations and feasibility studies had been made for an environment research institute and the Government was reviewing the results.

What a load of hogwash! If the Government has not done it after three years, I am afraid that is a broken promise; it has not occurred.

Let us look at a project closer to the Premier's heart—Hackney redevelopment. If that is not the most hackneyed announcement, I do not know what is! It was first announced in 1970. Why has it not been finished? The answer is that the Premier has been indulging in Monarto and fiddling away the State's money up there when he should have been doing some work in the inner city redevelopment. He did not proceed with it, because he was frightened that the sort of people going there might not vote for him. As it is a sensitive area, the Premier thought that he should leave the matter as it stands and not proceed with it.

I turn now to the matter of Redcliff. Anyone who has read the Government's record in this regard will surely never again believe anything that the Government says. This matter must involve the greatest confidence trick of all time. Every time that a measure such as this is announced, it slips out just before an election. All the relevant information is not given, and the Opposition must continually probe the Government.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Why don't you tell the Council?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I can tell the honourable member that his Party's time is nearly up. The people of South Australia are waking up to him and his Party. The trouble with the honourable member and his colleagues is that they have allowed what was a reasonable Party, the Australian Labor Party, to be converted into a one-man band. He and his colleagues are a bunch of sycophants, who stand up and say, "Donny is a jolly good fellow." That is all that they have to say. Government members are involved solely in some sort of public relations exercise and, the moment that the prop is pulled away from them, the Labor Party will fall with a heavy crash. Government members are part of a super sales team, which has been selling false products for the whole seven years that the Labor Government has been in office in this State. However, they will not get away with it for much longer.

I am surprised that people like the Hon. Mr. Foster have allowed what was a very good Party to be converted to a one-man band. He and his colleagues have sat back and let this happen, and their Party will pay the price for it. No Party can be based on the sort of false advertising that the Labor Party has put forward to the people of this State. Labor members will go out with a big crash, because the media and the people of this State will not continue forever to be fooled by them. I support the motion.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and express my appreciation for the manner in which the Lieutenant-Governor delivered his Opening Speech in the Council. I join with honourable members who have already spoken in expressing my appreciation for the contribution that the Lieutenant-Governor has made to the administration of this State. He is indeed a wonderful man, who has great credentials and who has fulfilled with distinction the role of Lieutenant-Governor.

I join with other honourable members in expressing regret that Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls were not here to open this session of the Parliament, and in saying that they are a wonderful couple. These true Australians, having been given a task that was strange to them, accepted the challenge and carried out with distinction the duties of that office. I hope that both these fine people enjoy their retirement.

I also support the expressions of condolence for the families of those members who have passed away since the last session. In this respect, I refer to Sir Glen Pearson, Tom Stott, Geoffrey Clarke, and Howard Huntley Shannon. I knew Sir Glen Pearson and Tom Stott perhaps better than I did the other gentlemen because, being an agriculturist, I had more to do with them. I admired very much their contributions to the affairs of rural producers and of the State generally.

Sir Glen Pearson, a resident of Eyre Peninsula, served that area and the whole State with distinction. We were indeed proud of him, and I express to his family not only my sincere appreciation for his efforts made on our behalf but also my sincere sympathy on their loss. I join with all other honourable members in expressing my regret that he and the other former members to whom I have referred are no longer with us.

In his Speech, His Excellency detailed a programme of proposed legislation for the present session. One wonders every day how much more legislation we really need. South Australia must be the most over-governed community in the Commonwealth, if not the world.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think the legislation we want is legislation to repeal other legislation that is already on the Statute Book.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Honourable members in this Council have already assisted with legislation that has designated every vendor as a crook and every consumer as some type of saint. This sort of legislation has cost the consumer dearly and the retailer nothing. I make this point, because we have today so much legislation prescribing that a vendor must be controlled. The vendor is told that he must do this or do that, and he is liable to court action if it is found that he has in any way misrepresented himself.

Although the concept behind this legislation is all right up to a point, we must not overlook that many consumers are just as astute as vendors are in their dealings. At present, the vendor can underwrite any protection that he must provide for the consumer, and he can pass on the cost thereof to the consumer. As a result, we have in the past couple of years seen an escalation of costs which has not been necessary but for which the public has had to pay. Already, we have helped to make housing in South Australia the most costly in the country. At present we have all kinds of legislation that makes it necessary for the constructor and developer to comply with requirements. They can be taken to court if they cannot provide those facilities, despite the fact that those who should be able to provide the work force to carry out the necessary construction find they have a strike on their hands, or because it is necessary to deal with perhaps three or four departments to get a clearance to proceed with subdivision.

All these costly complications have been passed on to the house purchaser. As a result, even though I have seen these figures disputed, I believe that undeniably we have the most costly housing in Australia. Perhaps it would be appropriate to set aside part of each session to correct some of the mistakes we have made in the previous session, rather than launch into another great campaign of what is considered to be new legislation. We never

seem to get anything settled, so that people can buy an Act of Parliament, whether it be the Mining Act, the Dairy Industry Act, or any other Act, and say, "That is what Parliament has decreed that I am required to do."

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Wouldn't it be better without this hostile Upper House, so that the Lower House could make decisions without amendments such as those you people make?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I know the honourable member speaks with tongue in cheek often, and he knows as well as I do that our legislation would be just that much worse but for this Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It would be much worse, because 75 per cent of all amendments moved here are accepted by the Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That doesn't mean they improve it.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The people are awake to you, too.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Whyte would like to continue.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I know that the people are awake to what we do on their behalf and are pleased about what we have been able to salvage for them. I want to speak now on land use. To me, much revolves around the use of land. If you are a single tax advocate, or if you live in a community that understands and believes in the philosophy of single tax, you will hear much about the single tax that should be applied to land and its use. Like most other philosophies, it has some merit.

In South Australia we have always been proud of our land tenure system. Our first leases were issued in 1861, and by 1886 South Australia had devised and accepted the best system of land tenure in the world. That is written in the annals of history: it is not just my assumption. Many countries have done the best they could, in view of the mess they had, to follow in South Australia's footsteps. Therefore, over the years (certainly, throughout my lifetime) we have given credit to the Lands Department, and more especially, to the Pastoral Board. Until the Kangaroo Island incident recently, I had not heard condemnation of the Lands Department or the Pastoral Board. They had been held in high esteem and the leases were of much importance. Most land has been held in perpetuity and some of the land is freehold, but in all the leases of land belonging to the Crown we have a covenant, and the lessee is bound by that to deal with the land in accordance with the Crown's desires.

Over the years, both the lessees and the lessor (the Lands Department on behalf of the Crown) have seen to it that land is put to its best use. In most respects, that has been administered with credit to the officers of that department. It surprises me to see the Hon. Mr. Casey and the Hon. Mr. Cornwall at one another's throat to see who will be the next Minister of Lands.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Where did you get that from?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I have many spies in your ranks. I have many good friends in the Labor Party and perhaps they are a step ahead of members opposite. I do not want to take sides; I do not want to condemn the present Minister, either.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You tried to earlier this year.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: We tried to straighten him up. He needs that occasionally to keep him on his toes. What has always been the jurisdiction and prerogative of the Lands Department is being phased out. When a person approaches the Lands Department about the subdivision of

a lease, no longer can the department say that it knows the use of that land and that it will be quite acceptable if the land is subdivided.

First, the person must run the gauntlet. The Lands Department will say honestly that there seems to be nothing wrong with the subdivision but that first the person must get State Planning Authority approval. The State Planning Authority will say that it must bring the environmentalists in, so no longer is there the prerogative of the Lands Department which was written into the Act and which all people in South Australia have so far been able to recognise. I repeat that it seems strange that two members opposite are fighting for a diminishing realm.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: That's a silly statement; I thought you were better than that.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It would be more appropriate if we said that this was a silly situation. We can see an especially designed department (and great credit falls on the department and the many Ministers who have administered it over the years) having all its authority eroded to the extent that no-one really knows who can give the authority for a subdivision. It is no good the Minister of Lands telling me that I can subdivide land, because I know that I would first need the approval of the State Planning Authority, which would in turn need some direction from the environmentalists. That is an entirely wrong approach.

If the Minister of Lands wants any assistance from me to attempt to correct the situation and put land usage and its control back where it rightfully belongs—with the Lands Department—he can rely on me at any time he likes to call. Although there are some anomalous situations, I will not go into them tonight. The Chief Secretary has asked me to proceed with my speech, and I am always happy to assist him in any way, despite the couple of occasions that he has turned on me after I have helped him.

I do not wish to condemn the environmentalists or the State Planning Authority. I believe that we need such an authority. We need State planning, and I agree that the authority should play a role in our society, as much as can be contributed through planning. However, in the first place, surely the use of land should be assessed by the Agriculture Department, which can supply facts and figures pertaining to that land. Finally and conclusively the land should be assessed by the Lands Department. Then, if the State Planning Authority or the environmentalists want to come into the picture to give advice (even if they make demands), it would not be so bad. But, first, let us get our leases straight and let us know where we stand with them.

I now refer to a report on vegetation clearance brought down by the Environment Department. I recommend this well documented report to honourable members as it has much merit. I hope that sufficient copies of the report will be made available. I am concerned, and have expressed my concern to the Minister, that insufficient copies will be made available, bearing in mind the deadline for submissions to be made to the permanent head of the Environment Department.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: The time has been extended.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am pleased to hear the Minister tell me that the extension of time, which I requested, has been granted. This type of report can have far-reaching effects on the development of land and its uses in South Australia. Having read through the report, I do not believe that it is intended to impede the progress of land use. I accept that from my reading of the report, but I strongly suggest to all honourable members that this report and any legislation stemming from

it will be good and effective only if there is comprehensive representation on any board or commission formed to administer land use and vegetation clearing. Mr. Deputy President, *Hansard* seems interested in what I am saying and, if you could make it a little easier for the reporters to hear, they would appreciate it.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Would honourable members please return to their seats and refrain from talking? It must be remembered that the Hon. Mr. Whyte has not a voice that is easy for *Hansard* to hear. Let us respect that point.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I emphasise that I believe there are many good points in the report, but it will be necessary for all parties who are concerned to have time to make submissions to the permanent head of the Environment Department. It will be necessary for all organisations concerned with vegetation clearance to make sure that they are represented on any administrative group stemming from legislation associated with the report. So far as I can see in the report, it is not intended that people should no longer clear land for productive purposes. However, it is foreseen that all vegetation clearance will be investigated before such clearance is commenced.

In the past, the Soil Conservation Board largely administered requests for land clearing in many areas, and the Lands Department had an interest, too. Generally there has been a reasonably careful watch kept in this State over land clearing. This report goes a good way in following the steps taken by the previous departments concerned, but the situation needs some careful watching in case some environmentalists or someone a bit crazy gets too carried away.

The man on the land is having a hard run at present, no matter which way one looks at it. Figures available show that the rural situation averaged out over Australia this year is in a precarious situation. In South Australia we are experiencing the third extremely dull year in a row, and it will be necessary for assistance to be provided, unless we are soon blessed with substantial rains. The financial situation of many holdings will soon be such that Government assistance will be required or we shall see an exodus from the land that it will be hard to replace.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Even with substantial rains the feed situation will still be critical.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The feed situation is critical at this time. However, rain is a wonderful thing. I know that the Minister of Agriculture, who has more recent surveys than I can cite, understands that we are in a sorry plight at present. It is suggested that the shearing figures will be down by about 20 per cent over the whole of Australia. Just how that is applied to South Australia I do not know, but I do know that our sheep flocks are greatly depleted. Big areas of land are sown to grain and perhaps late rains may save the situation. We know that money is made available through the Commonwealth Government to deal with drought situations. I say once again, as I have pointed out many times in this Council, to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Lands (I am never too sure which one of those departments administers what when it comes to emergency finance) that it will be necessary for a more rational acceptance to be applied to people who need assistance than is presently occurring as regards the criteria necessary to qualify for drought assistance.

Other States have declared drought areas, but we have found that in South Australia that is not really the answer. We know that to apply and to be accepted under the present criteria is something of a nightmare. First, one

has to prove that one is viable; and secondly, one has to prove that no-one else will lend him 10 cents. What should happen is a quick distribution of this money which is made available to the States at no rate of interest. It is repayable but it costs the State nothing. On the other hand, the State can charge interest, and no particular interest rate is set. Presently, any money provided has been made available at 4 per cent, and I congratulate the State Government on setting that acceptable rate.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: With a 15-month holiday.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: True. There is a moratorium for some months during which no interest is charged, and this applies to the State's repayment to the Commonwealth. There is a moratorium until 1978, when the first repayment has to be made to the Commonwealth. I can never understand why the State Government does not welcome this with open arms. What really should apply is that a person whose property is affected who can substantiate his position is due to drought and whose working overdraft has been exceeded should be able to get this money without any further fuss. It is necessary to take security over his land; no-one denies that. If a person accepts money, he must provide some security. The money should be more readily available and should be put into circulation in the rural community of South Australia without further humbug. I put to the Minister that the present criteria are inhibiting the use of Commonwealth Government money that could be put into circulation in this State without the fuss that now applies.

I should now like to deal with succession duties, which many members on both sides of this Council have discussed over the years in relation to capital intensified propositions. Whether it is a rural or a private enterprise, or whatever it is, if it is a capital intensified situation, succession duties will surely rob those people who should be able to carry on that business but who, in many cases, will have no opportunity to do so. Likewise, the provision concerning gift duty, where there is an exemption of \$4 000 every 18 months, is quite ridiculous. That figure has not been varied since the Act was first introduced, and it should be more like \$20 000 today, taking into account current inflation. In other situations, alterations apply because of continuing inflation, and it is time we had an alteration in the exemption figure for gift duty. It is also time we had another look at succession duties, which actually provide very little money for the State coffers but which often deny the opportunity to a family to continue in business. The Ministers in this Chamber should take up in Cabinet the possibility of a review of succession duties and gift duty.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The exemption would be \$10 000 if it had been indexed to inflation when the amount of \$4 000 was first introduced.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But your people do not believe in indexation.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I did not say anything about indexation. I appreciate what my Leader has said, and it is a most conservative figure; I am suggesting that the figure should be more like \$20 000 than \$10 000 to make it practicable to provide for security, which is what everyone, whether or not he is a union man, desires. The one thing we all want in life is some sort of security, and the only way to get it is with more rational thinking about succession duties and gift duty to provide that type of security, just as many unionists fight for security. I reiterate that I believe the Ministers opposite should take this thought with them to Cabinet and do something about revising these taxes.

During the last session I said something about the racial discrimination legislation; I said I believed it should be amended to provide for a means of conciliation rather than having as the only course direct court action. If one takes someone to court, it is not the best way to make friends. One would probably get away with it much better by punching him on the nose than by taking him to court. Yet in our racial discrimination legislation the only course of action is to go to the courts. I hope that, if I proceed with the amendments, as suggested, honourable members will take note of the situation obtaining in Ceduna at present. I could point to many other instances which illustrate that we should be trying to achieve a point of acceptance or conciliation rather than having straight-out confrontation.

I should like briefly to refer to this country's resources. It is indeed necessary that we pay full attention to all our resources, as well as to their mining, processing and marketing. I have for a long time believed that we do not consider fully the value of our resources. We expect as much as we can as quickly as we can and in the rawest form that it can be expected. I cannot see why we should not process to a greater extent many of our commodities. It may well be argued that we cannot compete on the world market with our steel and that we cannot bring our iron ore to a processed state which is acceptable economically.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: What?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am sorry that the Minister seems surprised.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: We have been exporting steel to the United States for some time.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Let me enlighten the Minister. Australia exports millions of tonnes of iron ore because the countries that take it can process it to an acceptable quality more cheaply than we can. The quantity of steel that we send from our Australian processing plants amounts to peanuts. In this respect, we cannot compete on the world market because of labour costs. The same applies to wool. We export it in a raw state because we cannot process it economically here. If this situation did not obtain, there would not be an embargo such as there is on processed wool at present. We cannot export woven yarn to America because of the import embargo. This occurs because the rest of the world has access to our raw materials. It would indeed be interesting to ascertain what it would mean to the Australian work force if we were to process steel and wool to some extent leaving those commodities still acceptable overseas. I do not think any work has been done on this matter for a long time.

I do not want to enter into a debate on whether or not we should mine or sell our uranium. Although I am not a scientist, I read as much as I can about both sides of this controversial argument. However, I believe that if we do mine and sell our uranium we should sell it in a processed form. A report, which was written by, I think, Dr. Crook, and which appeared in last weekend's edition of the *Sunday Mail*, was indeed interesting. That gentleman suggested that we should lease our uranium.

The big controversy is not about selling our uranium but about what can be done with the waste if it gets into the wrong hands. Dr. Crook suggested that we should lease our uranium and that, when the energy from, I think, the uranium rod was expended, the rod should be returned to us. Certainly, that would be a definite control that we would have over the commodity. What we would do with that rod when it was returned to Australia, I do not know; that is another point. However, if we do export our uranium, it should be exported in a processed form. The

same applies to many of our commodities. At present, we are shipping overseas millions of tonnes of some of the best coal in the world. South Africa has proved that it can economically extract petroleum from coal. Indeed, that country is leading the world in this process, and the various by-products are now paying for the processing. We are exporting huge quantities of a raw commodity that should not be leaving this country without a full investigation regarding whether it can be processed here. This matter is well worthy of further consideration.

I wish now to refer to a point which was raised by the Hon. Mr. Sumner and with which I do not agree. The honourable member, in his contribution to the debate, referred to the assimilation of ethnic groups. The last thing that we in Australia want to have is several sets of standards and communities. Surely, we do not want to reach the stage where one sign in a street is in Greek whereas another sign on the other side of the same street is in Turkish.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I didn't say anything like that in my speech.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I gathered from what the honourable member was saying that he believed that ethnic groups needed to establish here. I believe that ethnic groups need all the support that we can give them to maintain their culture, but I also believe that it is necessary to have as much assimilation as possible.

I conclude by referring to law and order in this State. We have reached the stage where it is necessary (and this is in complete contradiction of what the Hon. Mr. Creedon said yesterday) to give the Police Force more power and all the support that we can give it. I believe that our institutions would have many fewer inmates if some youths in the city went home with a sore behind rather than a summons to appear in court. We should assist the police to once again regain some control over the safety and conduct of our society. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR FUEL RATIONING (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) 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.

As honourable members will be aware, there is at least a possibility that supplies of motor fuel may be restricted in this State pending the outcome of industrial disputation quite remote from South Australia. Accordingly, the Government considers it prudent to place on the Statute Book a measure having limited life capable of dealing with any emergency that may occur within the next three months. As will be apparent from the examination of the clauses of the measure, it is substantially the same as a measure that was enacted by this Chamber previously.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is a commencement provision in the usual form, and in connection with this clause I would make it clear that the measure will not be brought into operation unless there is a real need to ration supplies of motor fuel. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Act, and I would draw honourable members' particular

attention to the definition of "motor fuel", which has been drawn in this form to ensure that only particular fuels that are in short supply will be subject to rationing.

Clause 5 enables the Ministers to issue permits and provides that permits may contain conditions as to use, etc. Clause 6 enables the Ministers to revoke any permit issued. Clause 7 is intended to provide sufficient flexibility to ensure that, in appropriate circumstances, supplies of fuel can be made available without the need for individual permits to be obtained. Clause 8 prohibits the sale of motor fuel to a person other than a permit holder but excepts a sale the subject of Clause 7. Clause 9 prohibits the use of motor fuel the subject of rationing for a purpose other than a purpose for which that motor fuel has been made available.

Clause 10 prohibits a permit holder from parting with possession of his permit. Clause 11 prohibits a person other than a permit holder from obtaining motor fuel excepting, again, purchasers the subject of Clause 7 authorisation. Clause 12 requires a person in charge of a vehicle using fuel supplied under a permit to carry a permit with him, and Clause 13 is in aid of this clause and authorises officers of the Police Force to stop vehicles and question drivers. Clause 14 provides a penalty for false statements made in connection for an application for a permit. Clause 15 enables the movement of bulk fuel to be controlled, and Clause 16 authorises the Minister to require information relating to "fuel storages", as defined, to ensure that the whereabouts of substantial quantities of fuel can be ascertained quickly.

Clause 17 authorises a delegation of power by the Minister to ensure a convenient administration of the Act. Clause 18 gives formal protection to the Minister and

persons authorised by him. Clause 19 is an evidentiary provision which, in the circumstances of a shortage of fuel, it is suggested, is a reasonable one. Clause 20 is a most important clause and the attention of honourable members is particularly drawn to it. This clause would enable rationing to be supplied quite selectively throughout the State, as it is not impossible that shortages will occur only in certain areas. Clause 21 is an anti-profiteering measure. Clause 22 is intended to ensure that no prosecutions will be commenced for offences against the Act without the express consent of the Attorney-General. Clause 23 forfeits any motor fuel in connection with which an offence has been committed to the Crown. Clause 24 is a formal provision. Clause 25 is a formal regulation-making provision. Clause 26 expires the measure on October 31, 1977.

As has been observed, this measure is essentially a temporary one and in the course of this session this Chamber will be asked to consider, in a more leisurely way, a measure that will remain on the Statute Book and be capable of being brought to life to deal with relatively short-term emergencies, thus obviating the need for this Chamber's being asked to consider, at short notice, measures of this kind.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.47 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 4, at 2.15 p.m.