LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 1 August 1978

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act Amendment,
Petroleum Products Subsidy Act Amendment.

PLYMPTON COMMUNITY SOCIAL CENTRE AND NURSING HOME

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Plympton Community Social Centre and Nursing Home.

STATISTICAL RECORD OF THE LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report on the Statistical Record of the Legislature, 1836-1977.

QUESTIONS

RADIOGRAPHERS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Health a question concerning the registration of radiographers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Australasian Institute of Radiography (South Australian Branch) is concerned that its efforts so far to achieve registration of radiographers in this State have not been successful. It believes that these persons should be registered, particularly those using ionising radiation, because, in the institute's view, that is essential in the interests of public safety. Earlier this year, the South Australian branch noted that the Victorian Government had called for a submission from the Victorian branch of the institute on this matter. I have asked questions previously in the Chamber about this subject and I again ask the Minister of Health whether he can say whether or not he is considering the question of registration and, if he is viewing that matter favourably, can he give any estimate at all as to when he believes that the present Government will agree to such registration.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The circumstances have not changed since the Government made its previous decision not to register these people. At present, the Government is not considering the matter further.

SECURITY

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking you, Sir, a question regarding security.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: As you, Sir, would be well aware, there was recently some public controversy concerning a directive issued by you and the Speaker of the House of Assembly regarding security measures affecting press representatives in this building. When that directive was issued, I was critical of what seemed to be a restriction on responsible members of the press, as I believe it is important that what we do in this place is subject to totally open scrutiny by the media. However, I have had occasion recently, since the directive was reissued, to visit Advertiser Newspapers Limited on three separate occasions. On the first occasion, I was denied access to the building on the basis that security measures were in force. I had to wait in the lower part of the building while a telephone call was made to establish my credentials.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is that when you got knocked back?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will not indicate what happened. On that occasion, I was finally given access. On the second occasion I was persuaded to sign a book, in which I had to make various statements regarding why I was there, what I was doing, and whom I wanted to see. On the third occasion, I refused to sign any document, and this apparently caused some consternation, Advertiser Newspapers Limited being strict about this matter. I understand that Advertiser Newspapers Limited was one of the parties that was extremely critical of the measures introduced in this place. I therefore ask you, Sir, as President of the Council, to approach Advertiser Newspapers Limited to obtain access for responsible members of Parliament to its editorial section, as such access has always been available in the past and should, I believe, be available to members in future, particularly in view of the attitudes taken regarding its representatives in this place?

The PRESIDENT: I was surprised at the concern expressed by the press when the pass system, which had been in vogue for many years, was brought up to present-day requirements. I know that some newspapers have a security system of their own. Provided that the honourable member does not wish me to select the "responsible" members of Parliament, I will certainly take up this matter for him.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COMPANIES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General, a question regarding the business interests in other States of purported South Australian companies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I should like to explain my question by referring to a report written by a Samcor employee who, for various reasons, must remain anonymous. I wish that the Leader of the Opposition would lift his head from between his knees and listen to me. Ren DeGaris can vouch for credibility, as I refer to a six-page diatribe of what ought to happen at Samcor. As I respect the limitation on the time the Council has available to deal with the serious questions that the Opposition may bowl up from time to time, I will read only a paragraph on page 3, as follows:

> To the union my advice to you is to scrap your stupid seniority clause, it is only safeguarding bludgers. There are too many no-hopers hiding behind its curtain. Each year hundreds of new people come on to the works, of which only between 5 and 10 per cent are any good . . .

And it continues its bitter complaint against the trade

union movement. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture could explode the whole of that myth. This document was printed in Parliament House at the behest of the Leader of the Opposition, who from time to time raises questions in this place about the Government's so-called unit of information, which he says protects the Government, while he hides behind—

The PRESIDENT: I think that the honourable member is getting away from his explanation.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: —scurrilous lies. I wish to read from the first page of this document. This anonymous person, whom I believe to be Ren DeGaris, says the companies which have refused for some years to do any further business with Samcor are: Holbrook Meats (Allan Turner); Foster's Meat (Jack Hopkins); Turners Limited (Ern Just); Metro Meat (Ken Dingwall, and we have heard that name recently from the Leader); Jackson's Corio (Brian Place); Gilbertson's (Vern Walkley); Coles; Target; Woolworths; Freez Pak; Borthwick's; Walker's Meats (Jock Walker); Blue Ribbon Smallgoods; S.A. Bacon (Rodney Phillips); Tender Cut; Tenda Pak; Tom's (Rugless Stores); Tom's (Wallis Stores); Lazy Lamb; New Adelaide (H. James); Mases Meats; Angliss and Company; City Meat; and Village Meats. What is set out in the document is quite untrue. Will the Leader of the House ask the Attorney-General to ascertain what interests, particularly Victorian business connections, the companies listed above have in meat killing works and associated abattoirs works?

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

PROFESSIONAL NEGLIGENCE

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health regarding the setting up within the Public and Consumer Affairs Department of committees to advise consumers and, where warranted, to take legal action in relation to professional negligence.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: An article in the *Advertiser* dated 1 May 1978—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Question!

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Wait.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You did it to me twice the week before last.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member called "Question"; that is enough. The Hon. Mr. Burdett will ask his question.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: What action, if any, does the Minister intend to take to comply with the repeated requests of the Professional Negligence Action Group to set up committees within the Consumer Affairs Branch, the committees to include persons with expertise in the respective professional areas, to advise members of the public on, and, where warranted, to take legal action in regard to, professional negligence?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall seek the information for the honourable member and bring back a reply.

S.G.I.C.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Leader of the Government say how much the State Government Insurance Commission spent on advertising in the financial year 1977-78? What is the value of life premiums collected by the commission?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will seek the information for the honourable member and bring back a reply.

SAMCOR

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I understand that there has been considerable speculation in the press that Samcor's loss for the 1977-78 financial year will be nearly $4 000 000. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate the position of other service works in Australia comparable to Samcor?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The losses at Samcor for 1977-78 are expected to be just under $4 000 000. The annual report and balance sheet, which will be tabled in this Council, will show the breakdown of the various areas that have been causes of loss during the financial year. Some losses are the result of exceptional circumstances brought about by such events as the live sheep dispute and the boycotted markets following that dispute. However, there will be a complete report on the whole issue. The honourable member's question also dealt with other service abattoirs throughout Australia. I understand that Homebush in New South Wales will also lose over $4 000 000 this year. The Western Australian Meat Commission, which handles the Midland Junction works, is expected to lose $5 000 000 this year. It is interesting to note that the Cannon Hill abattoir in Queensland will make a small profit. This is indicative of the position throughout Australia. The southern States, certainly, have faced a great shortage of stock as a result of the drought. Naturally, there has been a lack of through-put in the abattoir.

This situation contrasts with the position at Cannon Hill, which has benefited from the relaxation of beef imports into the United States. Throughput there, especially in the beef area, has been good. I understand that it is intended to introduce a second shift on the beef kill before long. The figures indicate that considerable losses have been sustained by the States that have been affected by the drought. The only public service abattoirs that have been able to make a profit, even if only a small profit, have been those that have had other outlets for throughput for their meat, and so have been able to maintain their throughput.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Minister tell the Council how the meat union at Samcor intends to increase its production by 15 per cent? What method does it intend to use?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The productive increase, which the Australian Meat Employees Union has offered to Samcor for no increase in wages, has resulted from a combination of changes in various award conditions. In some cases tallies have been increased, and other changes have involved the manning of killing chains. There have been several other changes to the award conditions for slaughtermen and other meat industry employees at Samcor which, on average, amount to a 15 per cent increase in productivity. There are many specific changes. Some range from increases greater than 100 per cent to cases where there have been virtually no increases in productivity. An average has been determined as a calculation of all those specific changes to the award conditions.

REDCLIFF PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Mines and Energy to the question I asked on 13 July about the Redcliff petro-chemical plant?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: My colleague informs me that the submission to the Loan Council for infrastructure support for the Redcliff petro-chemical complex was one of a number of submissions made by the State Government to the Loan Council. It was a matter of considerable disappointment to the South Australian Government that the Commonwealth would not agree to an immediate decision on the Redcliff application but insisted that all applications should be referred to a working party of State Under-Treasurers and the Commonwealth Secretary to the Treasury in order to attempt to determine priorities.

The working party met immediately after the Loan Council, and additional information has already been provided by all States on their various projects. It was emphasised at the Loan Council that a decision on Redcliff was one of urgency, and the request was made that the working party should report its findings as soon as practicable and hopefully by the end of August. It is apparent, at this stage at least, that the working party has been pursuing its inquiries with some diligence. Ultimately, the Commonwealth must decide whether or not to support the Redcliff application, and in this connection it is vital that there be the maximum bi-partisan support in South Australia for the project.

MEAT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Some time ago the Minister of Agriculture announced the formation of an *ad hoc* committee to examine the problems associated with the entry of intrastate killed meat into the Adelaide metropolitan area. I am informed that the present situation for country abattoirs, particularly in Mount Gambier, is extremely aggravating. As the Minister well knows, meat is able freely to enter the metropolitan area from Victoria, yet many South Australian country abattoirs are unable to supply the same market because of artificial restrictions on entry. I am informed that the result is that the local South Australian abattoirs have to sit idly by and watch some of the local stock being acquired by Victorian buyers, knowing full well that the stock will be transported short distances into Victoria, slaughtered, and sent back to the Adelaide metropolitan area. I am informed that jobs are now being lost to Victoria as a result of these South Australian Government restrictions. In view of the urgency of this situation, my questions are: first, what are the terms of reference of this committee; secondly, how many times has it met; thirdly, does it meet on a regular basis and, if so, what is that basis; and, fourthly, has it been given a deadline for completion of its report and, if so, when does the Minister expect to receive the committee's report?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The honourable member's initial statement was incorrect: it is not the purpose of the committee to examine specifically the entry of intrastate killed meat into the Samcor area. The working party has been given broad terms of reference to examine the present system of entry under permit into the Samcor area, to examine all the factors relating to that (including the question of intrastate trade), and to examine the question of the quotas that apply to South Australian abattoirs and whether or not this system should be continued. If the committee recommends that it should be continued, the committee is to inquire whether anomalies that have crept into the allocation of quotas over the years should be rectified. The committee has been given broad terms of reference to examine the whole question. I cannot tell the honourable member exactly how many times the committee has met, but I can say that it has met frequently and has examined the situation in other States as well as in South Australia; in particular, the committee has visited Homebush and Cannon Hill. I can get for the honourable member information on the number of times that the committee has met. It has certainly been diligent.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Will its report be tabled in Parliament?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Not necessarily. The committee was established by Cabinet, and its report will be submitted to Cabinet, which will decide whether or not to release it publicly. In reply to the honourable member's final question, I point out that a deadline has not been set, but I understand that the committee's investigations are going well and I expect to get a report before the end of the year.

DEMONSTRATIONS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of you, Mr. President, regarding litter resulting from demonstrations on the steps of Parliament House during the previous sitting week.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Question! Now we are even.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I called "Question" only once, but the honourable member has called it three times. Are you, Mr. President, aware that in the previous sitting week, during two demonstrations in the evening, vast quantities of litter were deposited on the footpath and on the steps of Parliament House? Who has jurisdiction for, first, the footpath of North Terrace outside Parliament House and, secondly, the steps of Parliament House? Do you, Mr. President, know whether any steps have been taken to prevent this form of littering?

The PRESIDENT: The Presiding Officers (the Speaker of the House of Assembly and I) have jurisdiction over the steps of Parliament House. The footpath is under the control of the Adelaide City Council. I was aware that one demonstration was to be held, but another demonstration was held without my knowledge. It seems to be a fairly common practice for people to use Parliament House as the venue for demonstrations. As a matter of courtesy, people wishing to demonstrate should contact the Presiding Officers; most people do this, but some do not do it. If we do not have prior knowledge, we cannot lay down guidelines for these people. I was not aware that litter had been left on the steps of Parliament House. I have dockets going back as far as 1966 on this matter. It is difficult to define just who polices the steps of Parliament House in connection with litter. As I have said, the footpath is under the control of the Adelaide City Council. The Speaker and I will endeavour to see that people wishing to hold demonstrations on the steps contact us prior to their demonstrations, and we will certainly lay down guidelines for them to follow. Further, we will do our best to see that those guidelines are followed.

MEAT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In view of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture said that the award conditions had been changed in relation to meat industry workers at Samcor, can he state how those award conditions were changed?

The PRESIDENT: Because a similar question is on notice, I rule that it would be better that it be replied to in that way.

McDONALDS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about McDonalds?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Over the last 18 months, Samcor has had discussions with the McDonalds hamburger firm on the possibility of supplying products to that organisation. Although hamburgers have been processed at the Samcor works for the company's only supplier in Australia, F. J. Walker Pty. Ltd., I understand that McDonalds are not looking to change suppliers at this stage. Nevertheless, the corporation is maintaining contact with both McDonalds and Walkers on the possibility of further developing business arrangements.

MEAT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Minister of Agriculture provided information on certain abattoirs for the Hon. Miss Levy earlier this afternoon. The information, I believe, did not disclose all that would be necessary to make comparisons between abattoirs, so I ask the Minister whether he will be able to provide information about abattoirs other than service abattoirs and service abattoirs not run by Government institutions or other public utilities in South Australia. Further, for the abattoirs he has given information on, can he provide information with figures of through-put through them so that a proper comparison can be made?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It is certainly very difficult to make comparisons with the privately operated abattoirs. As far as the publicly-owned ones are concerned, I will try to obtain the information the honourable member has requested. I stated that the figures that I quoted were the expected losses for the year. It may be some time before the actual figures are announced and the figures for the year are finalised. As soon as I obtain the information, I will give it to the honourable member.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make an explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Health on the subject of empty wards at Flinders Medical Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: A report in the *Advertiser* last week by a medical writer, Barry Hailstone, stated that five wards were empty at the Flinders Medical Centre. The article indicated that as a result more that 160 beds were not being used, that there were chains on the doors, and that the wards were fully equipped, and may not be open for patients for about two years. In that report there is some explanation by the Executive Director of the Health Commission (Mr. Joel), who was reported as saying that staffing plans at the centre might have to be reconsidered. He went on to say there would not be any retrenchments but that vacancies would not be filled. This morning the *Advertiser* contained a very thought-provoking letter from a Dr. Southwood, on the same subject. It stressed the question of lack of staff. Under the new federalism policy of the Commonwealth Government, a large amount of money in untied grants is provided by Canberra to the States for use by them as they think fit. Last financial year South Australia received $507 000 000 in untied grants, a 17·4 per cent increase on the previous year. This year the expected figure that this State will receive from Canberra in untied grants is $560 000 000, an increase of more than 10 per cent over the previous year. My questions are: is it a fact that these wards and beds at Flinders Medical Centre are vacant? If so, has the Minister any further information to give the Council in regard to that situation? Secondly, and just as importantly, has the Minister been successful in obtaining a sufficient portion of the untied grants money coming into this State for the current financial year to assist with some of the problems of Flinders that this recent publicity has disclosed?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is most interesting to note the concern of the honourable member in relation to the allocations for hospitals. He showed no interest whatever in the matter in his Address in Reply speech. He made no comment about cut-backs.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about answering the question?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: What I want to say—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Your job is to answer the question.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am terribly sorry to embarrass the honourable member about his lack of enthusiasm.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You have never embarrassed me in my life.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Your hide is so thick that no-one can. The position is, of course, that Flinders is a Government hospital and as such is included in the hospitals agreement which has been signed between the State and the Federal Government, and which is on a cost-sharing basis with the Commonwealth. We have been informed that no further beds can be approved as far as the running is concerned, which means that no staff can be provided to look after the patients in new beds which are open. As the honourable member knows, this State Government has spent more than 20 per cent of its Revenue Budget on health and welfare, compared to the amount of about 12 per cent that used to be provided by the Liberal Government, so we are not doing a bad job in that regard. It is true to say that we are unable to provide extra beds at present, because of the severe cut by the Federal Government. It is contrary to the agreement, and we are unable to do anything about it. Indeed, members opposite have been urging the Government to cut back in certain areas. The Hon. Mr. Hill says this afternoon that we should open five more wards at Flinders, as though it would cost nothing to do so. We are not going to do that. We cannot do it, because of the agreement between the State and Federal Governments. We cannot provide extra money outside the agreement in this regard.

JUNIORS' WAGES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking a question of the Leader of the

Government, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Can the Minister ascertain the number of junior employees in departmental stores who are on a subsidised form of weekly wage payment? Can the Minister ascertain what percentage of the total junior labour force is represented in the main departmental store area in both the inner city and the urban areas?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will take this matter up with the Minister.

ARMED HOLD-UPS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My question concerns action that I think the people are clamouring for because of the increased number of armed hold-ups in T.A.B. offices in this city and also bank branches in this State. There has been an increase in this form of crime in South Australia in recent months. Public opinion, in my view, wants increased penalties because public opinion believes they would act as a deterrent against offenders involved in this form of crime. Therefore, does the Government intend to legislate to ensure that increased penalties for such offences will result?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Sometimes increasing penalties laid down by Parliament is not the answer. In many cases the penalties laid down by Parliament are quite sufficient, but they are not handed out by the courts. I am not aware of what the penalties are in relation to this particular offence, but I point out that the courts do not always award the penalties laid down. I will draw my colleague's attention to the honourable member's question and get a reply.

INSURANCE ADVERTISING

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in the Council, a question regarding advertising by Eagle Insurance Company and other insurance companies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Some honourable members would be aware of the extensive advertising campaign that has been conducted in recent weeks by Eagle Insurance Company, with its full-page advertisements in the *Advertiser* and other media advertising outlets. Will the Minister ascertain the total cost of the advertising campaign conducted not only by Eagle Insurance Company but also by the other companies that have stepped up their publicity and advertising campaigns in the past three months?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will try to seek that information for the honourable member.

The PRESIDENT: Before the Minister replies, I draw his attention to Standing Order 107.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (on notice): Will the Government when it enters the commercial field make itself and its instrumentalities bound by consumer protection legislation and, in particular, the provisions of each of the following Acts: Consumer Credit Act, Consumer Transactions Act, Builders Licensing Act, Defective Houses Act, Unfair Advertising Act, Fair Credit Reports Act, Commonwealth Trade Practices Act, Land and Business Agents Act, Excessive Rents Act, Housing Improvement Act, Prices Act (particularly in regard to access to the services of officers of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department), Commonwealth Life Insurance Act, Food and Drugs Act, Landlord and Tenant Act, and Sale of Goods Act?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government believes that activities undertaken by the Government in the commercial field should be subject to consumer protection legislation in appropriate cases. Each case should, however, be dealt with on its merits, and this will be the policy pursued.

SAMCOR

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (on notice): In relation to the recent announcement by the Minister of an agreement by the workforce of Samcor to increase productivity by 15 per cent:

1. What conditions or provisions were attached to and part of the agreement to increase productivity by 15 per cent?

2. What percentage increase in productivity was initially recommended by the management and/or the Board of Samcor which led to the acceptance of the 15 per cent increase in productivity?

3. What conditions or provisions, in addition to an increase in productivity, were initially recommended by the management and/or board of Samcor in conjunction with an increase in productivity?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The A.M.I.E.U. insisted that a rise in productivity by award employees at Samcor should be linked to increases in productivity by staff employees. This has been substantially achieved.

2. The 15 per cent average increase in productivity is derived from a complex calculation of changes to tallies, manning of killing chains and other award conditions. These changes range from more than 100 per cent in some cases to only 5 per cent in others. The negotiations have been concerned with specific changes to these conditions.

3. Besides award changes required to improve productivity, negotiations have been established with the A.M.I.E.U. to increase the amount of self-management by workers at Samcor and reduce the cost of supervision.

HOSPITALS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE (on notice):

1. On the latest figures available, what is the average daily bed occupancy, respectively, of:
   (a) Royal Adelaide Hospital;
   (b) Queen Elizabeth Hospital;
   (c) Flinders Medical Centre; and
   (d) Modbury Hospital?

2. What is the average daily cost of keeping a patient at each of these four hospitals respectively?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The reply is as follows:

Hospital	Average Daily Bed Occupancy		Average Daily Cost per Patient
	No.	Per cent	$
Royal Adelaide	984	77	125
Queen Elizabeth ...	524	72	139
Flinders Medical Centre.....	247	80	170*
Modbury	170	79	108

These figures relate to the year ended 30 June 1977.
*Patients were not admitted to the Flinders Medical Centre until April 1976. The high maintenance costs per patient treated were influenced by the purchase of opening stock, equipment and other preliminary expenses incurred.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Soil Conservation Act, 1939-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The extended drought that we have experienced in this State over the past few years has highlighted the need to institute vigorous programmes of soil conservation in order to protect our agricultural industries. The present Soil Conservation Act contains many of the necessary controls, but the application of the Act is dependent on the creation of soil conservation districts. The present mechanism for creating such districts is cumbersome and unwieldy. At present, soil conservation districts are created at the request of occupiers of land in a given area, who may petition the Minister to constitute that area a soil conservation district. The petition must be signed by three-fifths of the occupiers of the proposed district. If this condition can be met, the petition is referred in due course to the Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation appointed under the Act. The committee, in turn, is empowered to recommend that the area that is the subject of the petition, or another area, be declared a soil conservation district, and, provided that three-fifths of the occupiers of land in the recommended area consent, the Governor may then declare the area to be a soil conservation district.

In districts that contain a large number of small landholders, it has proved difficult in the past to obtain the consent of the required three-fifths; this difficulty arises not so much from opposition of the landholders as it does from the difficulty in ascertaining exactly who are the potential petitioners within a given area. It is proposed that the procedure be modified, first, to place initiative for the creation of soil conservation districts more directly in the hands of the Minister and, secondly, to enable the Minister to obtain consent to soil conservation proposals through local government bodies, as well as by direct reference to the landholders.

The Bill also provides for registration of orders requiring the preservation of vegetation. At present, such orders are binding only on the owners and occupiers of the land as at the time of the making of the order. Thus, if there is a change of ownership or occupation, the successor in title, or the subsequent occupier, may ignore the order with impunity. The Bill provides that where the order is registered it is to be binding not only on the original owner and occupier but also on their successors. The Bill also increases the penalties prescribed by the principal Act. The increase is necessary in view of the decline in the value of money since the penalties were originally fixed. It also facilitates proof of service of notices under the principal Act. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts definitions of "council" and "local government area" in section 2 of the principal Act. The former means a municipal or district council within the meaning of the Local Government Act, 1934-1978, and includes a body corporate vested with the powers of a municipal or district council. The latter means the whole or a part of a municipality or district as defined in the Local Government Act and includes the whole or any part of an area in relation to which a body corporate is vested with the powers of a municipality or district council. These definitions are made necessary by the new procedures for creating soil conservation districts discussed above.

Clause 4 removes an obsolete reference to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925, in section 3 of the principal Act, and substitutes a reference to the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972. Clause 5 deletes subsection (4a) of section 4 of the principal Act. This subsection became obsolete in 1946. A reference to the old Public Service Act of 1936 is also amended.

Clause 6 repeals sections 6a, 6b and 6c of the principal Act and enacts, in substitution, a new section 6a. This amendment establishes the new procedure for creating soil conservation districts. Under the new section, the Governor is empowered to constitute, divide or abolish a soil conservation district on the recommendation of the Minister. The Minister's recommendation must be supported by the Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation, and, in addition, be approved by either the council or councils of the area in question or a majority of the owners or occupiers. Where the approval of the owners or occupiers is sought, provision is made for the Minister to conduct a poll. Clause 7 effects an amendment to section 6d of the principal Act consequential on the amendments to sections 2 and 6a.

Clause 8 amends section 6h of the principal Act, which relates to the powers of district soil conservation boards to secure evidence. This is the first of several penalty provisions in the principal Act in which the amount of the penalty is converted to decimal currency and increased, in this case, from the equivalent of $100 to $500. A reference to the old Public Service Act of 1936 is also amended. Clause 9 amends the penalty provisions of section 6j of the principal Act, which creates an offence of causing sand to drift from one area of land to another. The penalty of £50 is increased to $500.

Clause 10 amends section 7 of the principal Act which sets out certain powers of entry upon land. The penalty of £50 is increased to $500 and reference to the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972, is substituted for reference to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925. Clauses 11, 12 and 13 amend the penalty provisions of sections 9, 12 and 12a, respectively, of the principal Act. These in turn relate to the power to declare soil conservation reserves, the control of roads and stock routes and notice of intention to clear land. In section 9, a penalty of £50 is increased to $500, and in the case of the other sections a penalty of £100 is increased to $1 000.

Clause 14 amends section 13 of the principal Act, which provides for the protection of trees and other plants. The penalties prescribed by this section are increased to $1 000. In addition, new subsections numbered (8), (9) and (10) are enacted providing that orders for the protection of trees and other plants are to be registrable upon the titles to the relevant land and thereupon become binding on successors in title to, or subsequent occupiers of, that land. Clause 15 effects essentially formal amendments to section 13h of the principal Act. This section provides that soil conservation orders shall be registrable and binding on successors in title to the land which is the subject of the order. This amendment brings section 13h into conformity with the new provisions enacted by clause 14.

Clause 16 of the Bill amends section 13j of the principal Act, which deals with the enforcement of orders. The penalties are increased to $1 000. Clause 17 amends section 13k of the principal Act, which provides that fines resulting from contraventions of soil conservation orders, and expenses incurred by the committee in the carrying out of works specified in an order, shall be a charge on the relevant land. The section also provides that interest fixed by the committee and approved by the Minister at a rate not exceeding 4 per cent a year shall accrue on the amount owing in respect of such charges. This amendment removes the percentage limitation, which is considered to be both inflexible and out of touch with prevailing monetary values.

Clause 18 enacts a new subsection (3) to section 17 of the principal Act. This subsection provides that a statement in writing under the hand of an officer of the Public Service certifying that a notice or order has been duly served for the purposes of the Act shall, if tendered in legal proceedings, be evidence of service, in the absence of proof to the contrary. As section 17 presently stands, it is necessary to call the person who actually served the notice or order. This has proved inconvenient at times, and, in at least one instance, impossible. Clause 19 increases the penalty that may be imposed by regulation from £50 to $500.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (AGRICULTURE) BILL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Agricultural Chemicals Act, 1955-1975; the Artificial Breeding Act, 1961-1974; the Fruit Fly Act, 1947-1975; the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act, 1962-1967; the Red Scale Control Act, 1962-1975; the San Jose Scale Control Act, 1962-1975; the Stock Medicines Act, 1939-1973; and the Swine Compensation Act, 1936-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It removes obsolete references to the "Department of Agriculture" and the "Minister of Agriculture" from various Acts. The amendments are formed in such a way as to avoid reference to a specified Minister or a specified department. This should avoid the need for further statutory amendment as a result of any further changes in nomenclature. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part I is formal. Part II amends the Agricultural Chemicals Act. The definition of "Minister" is removed. The result of this amendment is that references to the "Minister" in the principal Act will be interpreted in accordance with the definition contained in the Acts Interpretation Act. Section 27 of the Act is also amended. This provides for the results of analysis carried out in pursuance of the Act to be published in the *Journal of the Department of Agriculture of South Australia* or in such other manner as the Minister thinks fit. The reference to the *Journal of the Department of Agriculture* is removed by the amendment.

Part III amends the Artificial Breeding Act. The definition of "Minister" is removed. Section 24, which provides that the Artificial Breeding Board is to have access to the herd production records of the Agriculture Department, is amended. The specific reference is removed and replaced by a general provision requiring the Minister to make available to the board such records as it reasonably requires for carrying out its functions.

Part IV amends the Fruit Fly Act. The amendments relate simply to references to the Minister of Agriculture and an officer of the Department of Agriculture.

Parts V, VI and VII make parallel amendments to the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act, the Red Scale Control Act and the San Jose Scale Control Act. Here again, obsolete references to the Department of Agriculture are removed.

Part VIII amends the Stock Medicines Act by removing obsolete references from section 11, which relates to the contents of labels that may be attached to packages of stock medicines.

Part IX amends the Swine Compensation Act. A reference to research undertaken at any Pig Industry Research Unit conducted by the Department of Agriculture is recast in rather more general terms.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 20 July. Page 130.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In rising to speak to this motion, I thank the Governor for presenting the Speech with which he opened Parliament and I reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and my continuing belief in the Westminster system of Government, as opposed to republicanism.

I express sincere regret at the death of the Hon. Frank Potter, who passed away suddenly last February, and I extend my condolences to Mrs. Potter and the members of the family.

I do not wish to dwell in great detail on the many subjects mentioned in the Speech but I do wish to deal with matters affecting local government and transport, and also agriculture. First, I wish to make some comments with reference to local government and transport. I note in paragraph 14 of the Speech that further amendments to the Local Government Act will be brought down. Although these may possibly, to quote the Governor, "bring the Act into a more appropriate form", it also puts off still further the amended, consolidated, and, if possible, shortened new Act, which is overdue, and which is badly needed because of the complexities and length of the present legislation. I refer to the Local Government Act Revision Committee which did much valuable work in this regard which appears to have been laid aside

indefinitely.

I refer to the policy of this Government over highways and main roads, the reaction of local government to this, and also to the tendency of this Government not to grow up and do its own thing as I urged it to do last year at this time, but to blame the "wicked" Federal Government for every shortcoming. I also express my concern at the tendency of some sections (and I emphasise some sections) of local government (because not all parts of it fail to see through the fog) which unthinkingly do likewise.

I refer to the 1·52 per cent of income tax revenue now being returned to local government by the Federal Government which is a great increase on previous direct funding from that source. It has been promised that this will increase to 2 per cent within the life of this Federal Parliament. However, local government, not unnaturally, wants it now. It has calculated how much it will not get if it does not get it now, and again some sections unfairly, in my view, tend to blame the Federal Government for not giving it now. They forget the situation which obtained when this Federal Government came to power, how it increased direct funding from $80 000 000 under Mr. Whitlam to $140 000 000 under Mr. Fraser.

We must remember that in the first place the Federal Government has increased this funding direct to councils and, in the second place, the State Government, pursuing a policy of centralism, has tended to withhold highways money from councils—very much so in fact. In my day in local government, many competent councils were granted debit orders to construct and seal main roads; in many cases they proved that they could do so more efficiently, more quickly and more economically than the Highways Department. I am quite certain that that is irrefutable.

But today the tendency is to use almost all the available money within the Highways Department to build a centralist colossus and then blame the "wicked" Federal Government for not providing more money for grant works. It is a pity that more local government bodies do not see through this. It has not been uncommon in recent years to see a road reconstructed to the point of being ready for sealing and then no money provided for the final seal. This is most regrettable and very short sighted, in my view. However, I do not blame the Highways Department. I blame Government policy for these errors.

One must note with interest, in passing, the attempt by the A.L.P. to bring politics into local government and the crashing failure which it was in recent local government elections. It was impossible to miss the concentrated campaigns for either blatantly advertised or thinly disguised "Labor teams" in these elections, and how they fell flat on their face. In Port Adelaide, Mount Gambier, Gawler and Tea Tree Gully, just to name four areas, the people made it very plain indeed that they do not want politics in local government and I commend their clearly expressed wishes in this regard. Having had 14 years experience in local government I most certainly do not believe that Party politics has a place in local government affairs.

I note with concern the position with regard to transport. One can only view with alarm the very large deficit of the public transport system and the tendency—which appears to be steadily increasing of this Government to replace private operators with Government transport, which tends to increase the deficit—an alarming state of affairs. Turning to major highways, I also view with great concern this Government's neglect of the Stuart Highway, which is excluded because of the overriding importance (in this Government's view) of the South-Eastern Freeway. In my view much more money (than the pittance which is provided for maintenance) should be allocated to the Stuart Highway by this Government from its share of the National Highway "cake", even if it means slowing down the South-Eastern Freeway which is nearly completed in any case. The exercise has taken up a considerable period of time and a large amount of money.

Turning now to the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, I have protested before about the unhappy and unwieldy marriage between these widely differing departments into the one department. In protesting again, I will have more to say about that later. My attention has been drawn to the necessity of maintaining a good relationship between the department and the primary industries. It is a relationship that has been good in the past, but it may have suffered a little lately.

Further, I refer to the necessity of promoting a better understanding between country people and city people. I refer to the unified approach of country people in April at the time of the live sheep dispute and the projected unity of country-based organisations. That unity has done, and will do, no harm whatsoever. On the contrary, country people have proved conclusively to their city cousins that they can be united and successful in the face of adversity. They gained much goodwill in the process. Indeed, their united approach did much good, but the apparent unavailability or lack of desire to assist by the Minister certainly contributed nothing to the settlement of the issue. I am sorry that the Minister is not present in the Chamber—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They've only got one member present.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. C. J. Sumner): Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We have quality.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Government has three members away presently. If the Minister regards himself as quality, he is the only one who holds that view, and I point out that you, Mr. Acting President, have indicated that interjections are out of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: That is right.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Further, I commend the good relations that generally have obtained between country people and the rural press (I include both city and country-based rural press), which have been helpful in this matter. Doubtless, some mistakes have been made, but generally the press has served the people well. However, my attention has been drawn to a report in the press of an attack on the rural media and farming community by the Minister of Agriculture. Again, I regret the Minister's temporary absence from this Chamber.

Certainly, if the Minister can criticise these people in public, I believe I have the right to criticise him in this place, and I am only sorry that he is not here to hear my criticism. I am appalled that such an inaccurate and unfair statement can be made in this day and age by a so-called responsible Minister of the Crown. I refer to a report of the Minister's speech in the country edition of the *Advertiser* of 25 July. The speech was also dealt with in the leading article of the *Stock Journal* of 27 July. Further, I have gone to great lengths to ensure that these reports were correct. The *Advertiser* report is as follows:

> "It is, unfortunately, in the area of agricultural policy that our communications in Australia are most seriously lacking," he said. "I believe it is a pity that most policy-makers are content to use the media as the major communicator when both seeking farmer opinion or when informing farmers of policy decisions or programmes. I say this because, with some notable exceptions, our rural media journalists have no

> training or understanding of the political and bureaucratic structure of policy formation. Most journalists have Diplomas in Agriculture or similar disciplines, but rarely do they have units in Government administration or political science. Because of this their reporting is only half informed, and because of this lack of understanding, the resulting report is often muddled and occasionally gratuitous."

Statements such as this, which are not only inaccurate but also offensive and foolish in the extreme, do nothing to improve communication between rural people and the department. They do nothing whatever to improve communication between rural people and the Government, between country people and city people, or between the rural media and the department. Rather, they achieve the opposite result in the most damaging way.

The Minister is reported as saying that our rural media journalists have no training, but this is nonsense. On the contrary, I suggest that our rural media journalists are just as well trained, on average, as the average city journalist; in some instances, they are even better trained.

I refer again to the report of the Minister's statement as follows:

> Rarely do they have units in Government administration or political science.

In what way does the Minister believe that such units would help an agricultural journalist, unless it was to help the Minister put over more easily a socialistic attitude to agriculture, or to promote to better advantage any predisposition towards agricultural communes that the Minister may have?

The report also stated:

> Australian journalists had a lot to learn from countries such as India where informed reporting was of a very high standard, Mr. Chatterton said. Indian reporters still maintain the tradition of reporting facts not hasty opinions, he said.

I cannot understand the Minister's raising India as an example, unless he has some sort of Indian background or association. When I was in India, that country was under a left-wing socialist Government, which doubtless the Minister would approve of and which had declared a state of emergency and had thrown many of its opponents into gaol. As a consequence, that Government was thrown out on its ear. Reporters were allowed only to write what they were told to write. So much for the Minister's "tradition of reporting facts". Does the Minister suggest that the same situation regarding journalism should obtain in South Australia? Does he suggest that rural journalists or all journalists should report only facts, or what the Government serves up to them as facts? I assure the Minister that the standard of journalism in India at that time left much to be desired, and any suggestion that we should adopt such standards would appal the fair-minded Australian public, which is accustomed to much better service from the media. The Minister also stated:

> Departmental officers acquire degrees or diplomas which require considerable skills in writing and reading. Farmers, on the other hand, usually have a much lower standard of education.

What does the Minister equate with the term "education"? I will deal with that later. To say that farmers have "a much lower standard" is another matter. True, in some cases there may be some truth in that, but to state it as a general rule, to say that farmers have a much lower standard, is merely a gratuitous insult to a progressive farming community, just as were his comments earlier about rural media journalists having no training or understanding. On the other hand, the President of the United Farmers and Graziers stated:

> The resiliancy of our industry never ceases to amaze me. The resiliance to which I refer is made up of faith in the industry, understanding of the business of agriculture, and plain hard work.

He also indicated that there was only a small number of applications for rural assistance and that only a small number of those applications were refused, and I may deal further with that matter later.

The Minister's remarks take no cognisance whatever of the fact that the farming community comprises about 6 per cent of the Australian population, yet it produces about 50 per cent of our exports. Indeed, the farming community is generally efficient and competent. Therefore, I believe that the Minister's comments are completely deplorable, especially when one realises that he ostensibly is attempting to obtain better communication between the rural community, the department and himself. He is, in fact, doing the reverse.

Just who is this man who can make such sweeping statements? Is he some demi-god, some all-sufficient agriculturist who has proved by his own practical experience and achievements his right to say such things? The very reverse is the case. No-one doubts that the honourable gentleman has a science degree with an agricultural base from Reading University in England. No-one doubts that he is an academic theorist. No-one doubts that from time to time he issues a number of somewhat inefficient press releases, a number of which I have seen (and for which, I understand, his press officer is not to blame) and which rather belie his claim to be in a position to demand more efficiency from the local press. What one also cannot doubt are the opinions of neighbouring farmers, gardeners, and vignerons in the Barossa Valley who say that, if one wants to see the most run-down, inefficient, and uncared for property in the Barossa Valley, one should go to a certain property at Lyndoch adjacent to the properties of Mr. Thumm and Mr. Noel Burge. These are not my opinions: they are those of "farmers with a much lower standard of education" (to quote the Minister) but, having taken their advice and having seen for myself, I cannot but agree. So, is the Minister in a position to make the caustic comments that he made last week in his speech to the Rural Youth Convention? I suggest that the Minister is in no such position.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you saying that the Minister is not even communicating with himself?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: He is not even communicating with himself, let alone with others.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Was he looking for a headline?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: He certainly got one. Now let me turn to the subject of education. What does the Minister mean by education? Does he mean only book learning and academic theory? Or, does he realise that practical knowledge, skill, judgment and experience are continuing processes of education? Does the Minister realise that competence, resilience, and skill enable about 6 per cent of the population to produce about 50 per cent of our exports? If he does, he will readily admit that many of these practical primary producers are far better educated in the skills of their profession (even if not in the use of the English language in some cases) than either he is or I am.

The fact that relatively few farmers had to fill out the Minister's relatively complicated drought relief form with some assistance is a tribute to the ingenuity, resourcefulness, and staying power of the average primary producer in this State after two, and in some cases, three years of drought. The farmers' efforts should be praised, not downgraded, and I point out that the Minister has downgraded them. The Minister should realise that education is a continuing process and that some of the

most outstanding Australian citizens whom this country has produced had a formal education only to primary standard, but they continued to learn throughout their lives, as the Minister (and, in fact, all of us) should do. Mr. John Curtin and Mr. Ben Chifley, on the Minister's side of politics, are outstanding examples of such citizens. The Minister should be constructive and helpful in his approach, but his speech had neither of those qualities. The following is an extract with reference to his speech from an article in the *Stock Journal* of 27 July:

> As far as being a constructive contribution in helping the problems involved in disseminating information to the primary producer of South Australia, it was a complete waste of time and effort. And as a public relations exercise it scored very poorly.
>
> We don't expect anyone—let alone people in authority like Mr. Chatterton—to blandly accept what is offered without careful examination and if it is warranted, be critical. But any issue becomes far more clouded if the criticism is not constructive and no solution is offered. And this is precisely the trap that the Minister has fallen into.

I am sorry to have to take the Minister to task but when Don Dunstan, who is usually smart, does such a foolish thing as to replace the Hon. Tom Casey who, whatever his faults (and we all have them), could always relate sensibly and reasonably to primary producers, as Minister of Agriculture with a young theorist who, however well meaning, is still inexperienced, unproven, and ill-advised, the Premier must expect his junior Minister to be chastised when he makes such foolish statements as those made last week.

I turn now to the unhappy marriage of the Agriculture Department and the Fisheries Department and to the management (or mismanagement) of fishing licences. I regret the present policy of the department (although I concede that it may be necessary in some cases) to fail to renew the fishing licences of men who, having experienced drought for two or three years, have used fishing as a supplementary means of livelihood. To quote Mr. Kerin of the United Farmers and Graziers again, such men have shown resilience and resourcefulness and, by so doing, have probably reduced the number of people who have had to apply to the Rural Assistance Branch. If the purpose of the policy is partly to ensure that taxpayers have only one source of income, I find it strangely inconsistent if the direction in the first place comes from those who have three or four sources of income.

In conclusion, I must say that I found the Governor's Speech most disappointing, since it seemed to be like the continuing cry of a spoilt child who refused to grow up and manage its own affairs but constantly blamed Mum and Dad; in this case, the Federal Government. I have previously urged the Government to take a positive line and to manage its $1 100 000 000 of gross income properly and to live within its means, as an adult should. It has been said that the most comfortable way of living is to live within one's means. I commend that thought to the Government.

This Government will go down in history in 20 years or 30 years time with a more apt summation than we could possibly make today. In 20 years or 30 years time there will be some sort of historical summation of what went on between 1940 and 1980. That summation will state that, under Tom Playford, there was a build-up of industry, a balanced economy, and buoyancy. However, in the following 10 years Don Dunstan drove most of that away. We have lost our cost advantage and our buoyancy. As one gentleman told me the other day, Western Australia and Queensland (and I point out that he had visited those two States) are going like a bomb, but we are stagnating. Under Sir Thomas Playford, we were going like a bomb. What Tom Playford built up in 30 years Don Dunstan has driven away in 10 years. I am concerned that we are in this situation. I will have to leave other areas of concern to my colleagues. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I pay my respects to His Excellency the Governor. I endorse the wording of the draft Address in Reply. I thank His Excellency for his Speech, and I assure him that I will give my best attention to all matters placed before me. Further, I join in His Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

I join with other honourable members in paying my respects to the memory of the late Hon. Frank Potter, a former President of this Council. He worked to the best of his ability in the interests of this Parliament, and I am sure that his widow and children will long honour his memory.

Recently, I received a letter from a 15-year-old high school boy who asked what would be the position in 10 years time when he hopefully was married and earning a living. His letter asked whether he would be able to enjoy the socially recognised necessities of living that he and his parents accept as normal today, such as air-conditioning, natural gas and electric heating of the home, a motor car, and a hot water service. His letter concluded by asking, "What is the Government doing about the conservation of energy?"

It is a sobering thought, when trying to answer the young man's letter, that our lifestyle may be radically changed within the next 10 years. Our lifestyle has already changed so dramatically since the end of the Second World War. Thanks to better wages, the ability to borrow money more easily, mass production, and the sales of many commodity items, most people are now able to afford colour television. (I understand that the highest sales in Australia are in South Australia). Some form of air-conditioning, electric or gas cooking stoves, a motor car, a hot water system and winter heating by either natural gas, electricity or oil are many luxuries unheard of at the end of the Second World War.

Every item mentioned uses energy, energy created by fossil fuels, and our Australian supply of fossil fuels is running down. The world's resources of fossil fuels are also running down, so that world experts, and Australian experts, predict that by 1985 the demand for petroleum products will be greater than the supply. What are we doing about conserving the use of energy in South Australia? What are we doing about educating the public about the impending petroleum crisis and about the need to conserve energy in the home, in the office and the factory? Not a word was mentioned in the Governor's Speech that this Government is worried about the future and that we should learn to conserve our energy usage.

Energy was not one of the powers conferred on the Australian Parliament when the Federal Constitution was enacted, so it is the responsibility of the States which have always controlled the production and distribution of energy products also to plan for the future conservation of its uses. This Government likes to claim it has been a pioneer in much of the modern social reform that has occurred in Australia. It is fair to say that the Dunstan Government has been first off the rank in many other legislative fields, but when it comes to planning for the future energy uses for the industrial growth of the State, or considering how the work force will be transported, or how the home-owner will be able to use the every-day luxuries he now enjoys, luxuries that all use electrical or gas energy in some form, it apparently says it has not got enough money unless the Federal Government is prepared

to come to the party.

Has this Government got any policy at all regarding energy and the conservation of it? Has it any guidelines about petrol consumption of motor cars? Does it care whether the public buys an automatic defrosting refrigerator which uses twice as much electricity as a conventional refrigerator? Has it any concern about the amount of energy used to heat or cool a modern uninsulated home? Has it made any study of the amount of energy wasted by industry? Most of these matters could be dealt with initially by education, and by the use of the mass media. A large section of the private sector is already very concerned about our future energy supplies, and it only needs this Government to take some positive initiative for the word to spread, and for all sections of the community to appreciate the need for conservation, which, if left unattended, could well create a major problem within the expected life of this Parliament.

Is there any reason why this State should not be the forerunner in announcing a policy of energy conservation that the other States could well copy? The Hon. R. C. DeGaris made the following suggestion in his Address in Reply speech:

> We should establish some authority, whether it be inside Parliament as a committee, or an established statutory body, to identify the areas where the State could assist in policy matters to reach certain conservation targets and make recommendations to the Parliament for legislative or administrative action to minimise our reliance upon petroleum fuels.

I appreciate this suggestion and consider that if the Government does not announce a clear-cut policy on energy and conservation a Parliamentary committee should be given certain guidelines to advise the Government, and that this committee should consist of concerned people from both sides of the Parliament.

The average Australian family lives in a cocoon of luxury that is unheard of in any under-developed country. Since the Second World War, the world has been conscious of the need to develop and upgrade the living standards of all the peoples of the world. In the under-developed countries many millions of dollars have been spent in industrial and mineral development and in education so that living standards can be better than before, but in most cases the countries are still poor when measured in terms of the money spent by and for the more sophisticated developing countries.

When the crunch comes and petroleum products become harder and dearer to buy the effect of the energy shortage on the Third World will be disastrous. We will see a decline to a negative growth rate worse than these countries have ever experienced. This resultant lack of economic stability could well foster a frightening political instability because so much of the economic advancement in the under-developed nations has been achieved by arduous effort in recent decades and will be in grave danger of being wiped out, and the goal of shedding the "undeveloped" status will recede further and further into the distance. This prospect looms because oil will no longer be available as the great balancing tool of the twentieth century.

Petroleum use has been the cheap, flexible energy source that could be quickly applied to help provide the rapidly growing energy appetites of these expanding nations and economies. Furthermore, it will be the rich nations—the United States of America, Japan and the European Economic Community countries—that will get the lion's share of what remains of the petroleum available in the world.

Again, if we can set the ball rolling here in South Australia to learn how to economise, and how to conserve our fuel in transport and in industry, and so set an example for Australia, such savings could make a contribution to the world scene, no matter how small, and the chances for the developing nations to improve their economies would be strengthened. This State Government must grasp the nettle and teach the electorate of the need to conserve and save its energy. This is a problem that will not go away by shelving it or by procrastination. I support the motion.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I take this opportunity of reaffirming my loyalty to Her Majesty and to thank His Excellency the Governor for his Speech.

It is pleasing to note in the Governor's Speech that it seems that at least two reports of the South Australian Law Reform Committee may be the basis of legislation to be introduced in this session, namely, contractual capacity of infants, and occupier's liability. But, it is disappointing that no mention is made of upgrading the status and function of the Law Reform Committee or making available to that committee greater resources so that the area of law reform will assume the priority that it ought to have.

Until I took my seat in this Council in March this year, I had been a member of the Law Reform Committee for some 4½ years. It afforded me a valued opportunity to be involved in a most important process, and to experience both the inadequacies and the frustrations of the present system under which we undertake law reform in this State.

If one were to look at the meagre financial resources available to the committee in this State, and be aware that until recently there was no full-time or even part-time research assistance available to the committee, one could not help but wonder how any reports of the quality that we have received from the committee could ever have been prepared and published. But, if we were to look at the quality of the members serving on the committee (and I exclude myself), one can see how devoted they are to the cause of law reform and how much credit ought to be given to those members of the committee who have undertaken considerable research and drafting tasks in their own time beyond the call of duty to achieve such a very high standard. For it must be remembered that all of those who have been involved in the Law Reform Committee in this State since its inception in 1968 have been part-time members at a nominal remuneration.

Although all members have made contributions to the work of the committee, particular reference ought to be made to the work of its Chairman, Mr. Justice Zelling, who has kept the committee progressing and has done a mammoth amount of work in researching subjects and preparing draft papers for consideration by committee members and completing the final reports. It must be remembered that what I will say later about the way in which I believe law reform ought to be undertaken in this State is not a reflection on any present or former member of the Law Reform Committee or on the contribution that those members have made and are making in the cause of law reform in this State.

The law is essential to enable society and democracy to function effectively, and to provide the framework within which every member of society is enabled to achieve his or her aspirations. The attitude with which citizens regard the law and the respect which they show towards it is determined not only by the traditions of society but also by the justice of its application and the manner of its administration. Injustice brings the law into disrepute, and unjust, harsh and oppressive laws very quickly result in a breakdown of the rule of law and lead to anarchy. Of course, the law can suppress rather than enhance the

legitimate aspirations of citizens; but it is important to recognise that laws enacted by Parliament must facilitate the achievement of those aspirations and not be generally harsh and oppressive.

One recognises, of course, that there are those who would want to take advantage of the inequalities that exist in various pockets of society and to exploit rather than assist and contribute. It is recognised that the law does have a significant part to play in eliminating that exploitation, but without at the same time suppressing the genuine and legitimate aspirations of others in the community. It is in this context that it is important for government to recognise that in enacting laws it is governing the whole community, and, although government may have achieved a majority of votes at an election, that is not a mandate to govern for the benefit of that majority only. Government is elected in a democracy to govern for the benefit of the whole community.

Governments must also recognise that the sorts of law that are enacted to deal with particular difficulties in society should be framed so as to deal only with those difficulties and not to cast the net so wide that what would otherwise be legitimate activities and practices are caught. Increasingly, we see Governments tending to use legislation to close a loophole or to deal with a particular difficulty in such a way that the remedy is a drastic one of broad application affecting more than those whom it was designed to affect.

It is obvious that as society develops so will the need for legislation change, so will anomalies become obvious, so will injustices in the application of the law manifest themselves, and so will the impact of laws and practices established over a long period of time need to be revised. Often, government, for any of a number of reasons, is not motivated to deal with those changing needs, anomalies, injustices, and revisions. It is in these circumstances, but not only in these circumstances, that a law reform committee or commission has an important part to play, and can make a significant contribution, both legally and socially. Its work can enhance respect for the law.

It is not denied that there are areas of the law to be changed by virtue of Government policy but, even in those circumstances, it is important that such changes and the consequences of those changes should be fully and objectively assessed as to their form, substance and consequences. In this area, there is often inadequate, if any, research, and there appears not to be a professional and experienced assessment of the impact of legislation. One needs merely to refer back to the Contracts Review Bill, which came before the Council at the end of the last session, to see how imperfectly the consequences of a substantial change in legal principles were researched and assessed before becoming the subject of legislation.

In my view there is a paramount requirement for any Government to make a positive and continuing commitment to reform of the law and for that commitment to be backed up with a continuing commitment of resources to enable the reform of the law to continue at a reasonable pace. Although some may counter with the reply that funds are short, my answer is that one must recognise the high priority of law reform and, if necessary, rearrange the funding and resources of some area of lesser priority. If one accepts the proposition that the law is an indispensable part of the fabric of our society, one must accept that the continuing reform of that law must have a very high priority.

How best may law reform be achieved? Of course, it is not solely the province of a Law Reform Committee or a Law Reform Commission, but it has been demonstrated in Australia and many other countries that for law reform over the whole spectrum of the law to be undertaken effectively there must be a body charged with the specific responsibility of researching and recommending the reform of the law. Time and time again, it has been established that a body charged with a specific responsibility generally can be relied upon to discharge that responsibility effectively as against Governments that have overriding responsibilities for such a wide and diverse range of related and unrelated matters that they cannot apply themselves constantly and diligently to specific areas such as reform of the law.

As I have said, a Law Reform Committee or Law Reform Commission need not be the only body that is involved in law reform, although its responsibility will cover the whole field of the law. It is quite proper for a review of a specific but substantial area of the law to be undertaken by an *ad hoc* Royal Commission or committee established for that purpose, as was done with the Special Committee of Justice Mitchell on reform of the criminal law. But, it is still vital to establish a permanent commission, adequately staffed, and free of political influence, that is charged with the continuing responsibility to research and recommend reforms of the law. There is another particular value in such a commission. Farrar, in his book *Law Reform and the Law Commission*, writes in relation to the English and Scottish Law Commissions, and in answer to the question: "What is the responsibility of the Law Commissioners?", as follows:

> The answer would seem to be that the Commissioners should give great weight to public opinion but ultimately should not sacrifice their 'unbiased opinion, . . . mature judgment . . . and enlightened conscience' to it . . . The Law Commission should and does consult public opinion . . . but ultimately they owe us their judgment. One might of course add that in their case there is the extra safeguard of Parliament in case of possible errors of judgment. Unlike the Judiciary their value judgments need to pass the test of Parliament before implementation.

There is a growing movement in countries of the common law tradition, and in other countries, too, to establish permanent law reform commissions whose volume of work is growing continually. A review of some of those law reform agencies can be most helpful in considering the course which we should follow in South Australia.

England seems to have experienced the earliest movement for reform of the law. Although a comprehensive review of the progress of law reform in that country is beyond my means and inappropriate in these circumstances, it is of value to note the progression to permanent law reforms commissions and their work. In the early part of the 17th Century it was recognised that the common law required reform. It was uncertain, and the laws were so many that it was not possible for the common people to put them into practice or even for lawyers to understand them fully. Veale, in his work *The Popular Movement for Law Reform 1640-1660* said that the "heaping up of laws without digesting them maketh but a chaos and confusion and turneth the laws many times to become but snares of the people".

At about that time Bacon proposed that "six commissioners should be appointed to investigate obsolete and contradictory laws and to report to Parliament regularly so that appropriate legislation could be introduced", but those proposals came to nothing and although in the following 30 years there was considerable public discussion about reform of the law, there was very little of a practical nature for the next 150 years. Reform of the law in earnest started after 1828, when numerous commissions were set up, and continued through to the 20th Century, although there was a period when reform

lost its momentum.

In 1934 the Law Revision Committee was estalished with a membership which was drawn from the Judiciary and the practising and academic and legal professions. It considered matters referred to it by the Lord Chancellor. But the success of the Law Revision Committee depended upon the initiative of the Lord Chancellor of the day. Viscount Sankey, who had been responsible for establishing the Law Revision Committee, referred seven important questions to the committee in its first year but his successor was less keen and referred only two questions in three years. After the Second World War the work of the committee declined partly because there was no possibility of devoting Parliamentary time to what was then described as the "reform of pure lawyers' law".

There were susequently a number of *ad hoc* committees and Royal Commissions to consider specific areas of reform of the law but in the 1950s there was a need felt to revive the Law Revision Commission. In 1952 it was reconstituted under the name of the Law Reform Committee. But there were, according to Farrar, several major criticisms of that Committee, namely:

1. That the initiative and choice of topics remains with the Lord Chancellor of the day and depends on his enthusiasm for law reform.
2. That the committee tends to be composed of lawyers and a need was felt for lay representation.
3. That the committee suffers from being a part-time body.

In 1965 a Law Commission for England and Wales, and the Scottish Law Commission were established. The former was comprised of full-time members, the latter of mainly part-time members. Each Commission comprises a chairman and four other commissioners. They are all lawyers from the Judiciary, the academic and practising legal professions. They are required to submit programmes of law reform and, when approval has been given, "to undertake the examination of particular items of the programme and to formulate proposals for reform by means of draft Bills or otherwise".

Although the great volume of work to be undertaken by the Law Commission cannot be compared with the volume of work to be undertaken in this State, and the financial resources of the United Kingdom Government and the South Australian Government differ markedly the procedures adopted by the English Law Commission in its work bear noting. The Law Commission ordinarily prepares working papers, rather than seeking evidence on matters under consideration. The working papers are circulated "to pave the way for informed consultations". The working paper sets out the existing state of the law and often refers to comparative positions under other jurisdictions. It also indicates what defects the Commissioners consider exist and what their provisional proposals for reform may be. The working papers are distributed to such organisations and individuals (both lawyers and laymen) as the Law Commission thinks it desirable to consult. The press and other media have access to those papers, and do actively promote discussion. When the working paper has been reconsidered, in the light of consultations and submissions the Law Commission produces a report, and, where legislation is proposed, draft clauses are attached. But the responsibility of the English Law Commission does not cease there. The practice has developed (and a desirable practice it is if I may say so) where those who are responsible for the Law Commission's report assist Parliament at various stages of the Bill by being on call if consultations are needed on possible amendments or additions. Again Farrar says:

> This has usually been at the committee stages when the details as opposed to the general policy of the Bill are under scrutiny. It is felt that the existence of such help ensured that piecemeal amendments did not destroy the cohesion of the draft Bills and further ensured clarity of drafting.

The experience of the English Law Commission ought to be contrasted with that of the Scottish Law Commission. It suffered initially from the disability that the majority of its members were part-time and that its financial resources were limited.

Presently it comprises the chairman who is full-time, two other full-time commissioners and two part-time commissioners, with a legal staff consisting of two Parliamentary draftsmen on a part-time basis, a full-time secretary and eight other qualified lawyers on a full-time basis. But it still suffers from lack of resources compared with those of the English Law Commission.

In passing, it is interesting to note that the July 1978 Commonwealth Law Bulletin records in relation to the United Kingdom that since 1969 the reports numbered 1 to 8 of the English Law Commission have resulted in the repeal of 726 whole Acts of Parliament and parts of over 1200 other Acts of Parliament. An impressive and enviable record, compared with the much less impressive record of implementation of the Government in South Australia.

In Australia the Australian Law Reform Commission has already made a significant contribution to law reform. It has a blend of full-time and part-time commissioners, full-time staff and, in addition to publishing reports, it publishes discussion papers and holds public hearings. It makes, thereby, a valuable contribution to law reform here.

I want, now, to look briefly at several of the law reform agencies of the States of Australia and the Provinces of Canada. There are helpful comparisons also to be made with law reform agencies in the United States, but time will not allow me to consider them in detail. Suffice it to say that their structure, staffing, resources and work are, in many instances, similar to that of other permanent and established law reform agencies.

Tasmania's Law Reform Commission was established in 1974 and comprises a chairman, a deputy chairman and executive director (who is full-time), and five part-time members of whom two appear to be lay persons. It has limited part-time research assistance and suffers from difficulties similar to those of our own Law Reform Committee. The commission acts on references from the Attorney-General but has, however, noted a dramatic fall in the number of references in 1977. In 1975 there were nine references, in 1976 twelve references, and in 1977 two relatively minor references. The commission does, however, solicit suggestions for law reform, assesses them, and reports to the Attorney-General if the reforms are required and practicable. It meets with various representatives from the community and government officers to assist in formulating an opinion on areas of possible law reform. It held nine formal meetings in 1977.

One should compare this with the Western Australian Law Reform Commission which was established in 1972. It comprises three commissioners, all part-time, one nominated by the Crown, one from the academic legal profession, and one from the practising legal profession. Its 1977 report indicates that the time is fast approaching when the structure of the Western Australian Law Reform Commission must be reviewed in view of its developing role in the field of law reform. This suggests a movement towards some full-time commissioners. The staff of the Western Australian Law Reform Commission comprises a full-time executive officer, a senior research officer, three research officers, three clerks and typists. The commission acts on references by the Attorney-General and the

commission may suggest references to the Attorney-General who may then refer them formally to the Law Reform Commission. It meets at least once a week. The Western Australian Law Reform Commission issues working papers prior to the publication of reports. It states at page 4 of its 1977 report:

> The commission has adopted the practice, particularly when it needs assistance in pinpointing any defects which have come to light in the actual working of the law, of placing a notice in the press calling for preliminary submissions. The notice points out that a further opportunity of commenting will be given when the working paper is issued. In every case so far, the notice has produced replies from persons and organisations detailing the respect in which the particular correspondent considered the existing law to be defective and suggesting the possible improvement.

The commission says that the working paper which sets out the results of the commission's research is the principal means by which the commission makes contact with the public. It states:

> Contemporaneously with the issue of a working paper, the commission publishes a notice in the press inviting those interested to obtain a copy of the paper without charge and to submit comments. Copies of the paper are sent as a matter of course to those whom the commission considers may be affected by the project, or otherwise interested in it.

These are procedures which, in my view, are highly desirable and tend towards the desirable objective of involving the community more effectively in law reform.

Turning now to British Columbia, where the Law Reform Commission in that Province was established in 1970, it comprises six Commissioners, of whom one is Chairman. There is one counsel assisting the commission, two legal research officers and one secretary to the commission, all of whom are full-time. Only the Chairman is a full-time Commissioner and, as a part-time body, that commission indicates that it suffers from difficulties similar to those from which the Law Reform Committee in South Australia suffers.

In the Canadian Province of Ontario, the Ontario Law Reform Commission was established in 1965 and comprises six Commissioners, who deal with matters on a referral basis from the Attorney-General and on subjects which on its own initiative it considers relate to the reform of the law. Its full-time staff comprises counsel assisting the commission, a secretary to the commission, four legal research officers and seven clerical and administrative staff.

The Institute of Law Research and Reform in the Province of Alberta is perhaps unique. It was established in 1967 as a co-operative venture of the Government of Alberta, the University of Alberta and the Law Society of Alberta. Until 1973, its funding was by the Government of Alberta and University of Alberta, but in 1973 the Alberta Law Foundation was established and now 60 per cent of the funding of the Institute of Law Research and Law Reform is provided by that foundation and 40 per cent by the Alberta Government. Interestingly, the Alberta Law Foundation was set up to receive interest on lawyers' trust accounts where it was not practicable to attribute the interest to specific clients.

The institute has a commission comprising nine members all of whom are practising lawyers except the Vice-President (academic) of the University of Alberta. Its optimum level of staffing is nine or 10 lawyers, but presently it has six. Its major role as an institute is similar to that of law reform commissions in the other Canadian Provinces. The institute selects its own topics for consideration, and meets for a full day twice a month. It co-opts external members for specific subjects from time to time and generally attaches draft legislation to its report.

In South Australia the Law Reform Committee was established by the Liberal Government in 1968 and at that time comprised five members. That has since been expanded to seven members representing the Judiciary, the Crown Law Office, and the practising and academic professions, and that is a good cross-section of legal experience. But they all serve on a part-time basis. Generally, the committee meets for one afternoon a month and, until recently, had no full-time or even part-time research officers. It now has one full-time research officer, but otherwise its financial resources are meagre. It generally acts on references from the Attorney-General and occasionally has sought from the Attorney-General a reference on a matter which it viewed as an important matter for consideration.

Ordinarily, it does not publish working papers (except in the most recent case of the law relating to solar energy) and does not ordinarily seek from the community in general a response to particular topics on which it may be working. It just does not have the resources or the facilities to do this properly. It has sought some assistance in relation to landlord and tenant matters from the South Australian Housing Trust on one area then under consideration, and a member of the staff of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs was present during the consideration of another reference. In relation to the report on the powers of investment of trustees, views were sought from those whom the committee felt had some experience in that field.

It is my view that, if the committee is to undertake its work effectively, it needs to have adequate resources to be able to give its undivided attention to reform of the law.

As I have said earlier, where Commissioners or committee members are part-time on a very limited basis it is extraordinarily difficult for them to give the necessary time to the research, reading and contemplation which the various topics before the Law Reform Committee require from time to time. Therefore, I am of the view that there ought to be a permanent statutory commission with, at least, a full-time Chairman who can give his or her undivided attention to law reform, and the organisation of the work of the committee and the development of the procedures and course which it will follow.

There ought to be part-time commissioners and both the Chairman and the commissioners ought to represent the Judiciary, the practising and academic professions. I am not sure that lay persons ought to be involved as Commissioners in the detailed work of law reform. Their involvement would come in making submissions and being available for consultation on particular topics which come to the committee.

It is also important with part-time commissioners to ensure that they are adequately remunerated so that, if they are in private practice, in particular, they can make the necessary adjustments to their practice to enable them to give proper and adequate time to the responsibilities of their position as commissioners.

With a full-time Chairman and part-time commissioners, who are adequately remunerated, there will be a much greater opportunity for the committee to meet more frequently (as it should if there is to be any effective continuity) and for longer periods of time to provide working papers and to give greater consideration to draft reports and other proposals before them.

In this context it is also important to have an adequate number of research officers and secretarial assistance, in order that the commissioners may not only assess what the current law is but also identify the defects in the existing

law, reach a conclusion as to the way in which they are able to resolve those defects and assess the consequences of any proposed course of action, as well as undertaking research into comparative positions in other jurisdictions, and the work of other law reform commissions and committees.

A permanent Law Reform Commission ought to be able to deal with matters referred by the Attorney-General and also to initiate consideration of areas of law reform.

When the Government has determined to implement recommendations of the Law Reform Committee there ought to be a structure established through which the Law Reform Commission can be involved at the drafting stage of a Bill and when the matter is before the Parliament. Whilst a member of the office of Parliamentary Counsel ordinarily attends the Law Reform Committee meetings rarely, if ever, is that representative called upon or available to prepare a draft Bill consistent with the report and recommendations of the Law Reform Committee for presentation with the report. It is my view that this would be a tremendous advantage not only to the Law Reform Committee but also to the Government of the day in considering the recommendations of the Law Reform Committee or commission and properly interpreting them.

Recently, there have been several pieces of legislation which involved changes to existing principles of law where considerable time in the Parliament could have been saved if they had first been assessed by a Law Reform Commission. One is the Contracts Review Bill which, by action in this House, has now been referred to the Law Reform Committee.

In another area we have seen the Enforcement of Judgments Bill introduced into the Parliament. That was the subject of a report by the Law Reform Committee but there has been no liaison with that committee either by the Government or by the Parliament on the Bill or the committee's report. Considerable time could have been saved if there had been some procedure available for consultation with the Law Reform Committee.

Earlier this year the Attorney-General indicated his support for the presentation of draft reports or working papers in certain cases to foster public discussion and debate on matters referred to the committee for report and for the proposal that draft Bills be annexed to a report where the report requires such draft.

It is important to circulate working papers and discussion papers, for them to be publicised in the press and other media and for the widest possible circulation of proposals to be achieved so that ordinary members of the community may be involved in making submissions. It is important to get a public response even if that response is against any proposal so that the Law Reform Commission is then in a position of making an assessment as to the comparative need and merit of a particular proposal.

There would also be value in an annual report to Parliament by the Law Reform Commission so that not only legislators but also members of the community could get an overall picture of the commission's work, assess the progress made by the commission in the course of the year, and assess the progress of the Government in implementing reforms. It is not possible to get that perspective at present, other than by making independent calculations in connection with the reports that have been presented within a year. There is no report of progress or any indication of difficulties in other areas under consideration. The commission ought to have the opportunity to raise these sorts of matters. Its reports should be tabled in Parliament.

The media has a responsibility in the work of law reform not to react but to respond. The responsibility of the media is to assess properly the recommendations made and to report them fairly and in a balanced way. The media ought to foster discussion and contributions from the public. There should also be an avenue of communication from the media to the Law Reform Commission for the purpose of clarifying recommendations, if they need clarifying.

It needs to be recognised that, in the context of law reform, the Government of the day must have a positive commitment to reform of the law. That commitment will be evidenced not only by the number and sorts of matters referred by the Government to the Law Reform Commission but also by the availability of finance and other resources to the commission, by the record of implementation of recommendations, and by the liaison between the Government and the Law Reform Commission on the implementation of reports.

The Liberal Party has positively affirmed its commitment to a continuing programme of reform of the law by the establishment of a full-time Law Reform Commission with adequate staffing. That commitment, backed by the fact that it established the present Law Reform Committee in 1968, is evidence of its intention that this important area of community concern will be given the priority which it requires and which the community needs. I have no doubt that, if a permanent Law Reform Commission were established, it would make a significant contribution to reform of the law, enhance the rule of law in our community, and make a significant contribution to the quality of our society. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.22 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 2 August at 2.15 p.m.