LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 2 August 1979

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:

Administration of Acts Act Amendment,

Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings).

QUESTIONS

EVIDENCE ACT

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question regarding the Evidence Act.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Earlier this year, the New South Wales Labor Government amended that State's Evidence Act to provide that in all cases before the courts Crown privilege of Government communications shall be determined at the absolute discretion of the Attorney-General. So sweeping is the amendment, in fact, that the Attorney's discretion is extended to all Government communications, whether they be oral or written, and regardless of whether the communications are between Ministers alone, or between Ministers and senior Crown employees, or between senior Crown employees alone.

The New South Wales courts are now denied access to any privileged communication, even for the purpose of verifying whether the Attorney's discretion has been exercised in the public interest, and even whether disclosure of the communications in question is essential to the just determination of a case before them.

As the Attorney-General would know, this amendment overturns at one stroke the invaluable common law protection, restated as recently as 1978 in Sankey's case, which invests the courts with the responsibility to decide matters of Crown privilege. He would also know that, as a matter of law, it interferes with the doctrine of the separation of powers and, as a matter of politics, makes a farce of any pretensions of open government.

Already in New South Wales the amendment Act has provoked public criticism from Mr. Justice Samuels of the Court of Appeal, from the Australian Sector of the International Commission of Jurists, and from many others in the professional and public media.

Is the Government bound by national Labor Party policy to introduce a similar amendment to the South Australian Evidence Act? If the Government is not so bound, will the Attorney give an assurance that similar legislation will not be proposed in this State?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I do not believe that the South Australian Government is bound by any national policy on this issue. I have not studied in detail the proposal that has been introduced in New South Wales. At present there is no intention to act in the manner outlined by the honourable member.

SALVATION JANE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture about salvation jane.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: As the Minister would be more than well aware, there is a proposal to introduce biological control of salvation jane. This particular plant has two common names: salvation jane or Patterson's curse, and I suppose which name one prefers depends on whether one is a bee-keeper, a farmer in a drought-prone area or a farmer in an area not prone to drought.

Undoubtedly, arguments can be advanced in favour of retaining the plant, but this weed does create problems. From personal experience, I know that it is very difficult to eradicate by means other than biological control.

I have been told that this matter will be discussed at Agricultural Council and that to date replies have been received from all States, except South Australia, favouring the introduction of biological control. Will the Minister say when he will reply to the Commonwealth Government on this proposal and tell the Council his views on the future of biological control of this weed?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: First, I must correct the honourable member by pointing out that biological control does not mean eradication; it is impossible to eradicate salvation jane. It is ecologically impossible for a biological control agent to do anything but control; it cannot eradicate the plant.

Concerning the Agricultural Council meeting to be held in Perth on Monday, I have had prepared by my department a cost benefit study on biological control in South Australia, and that study has thrown a completely different light on previous discussions. A number of possible scenarios have been prepared in terms of how much control can be achieved compared with prices for honey and livestock. The interesting thing that came out of this study was that, in almost all circumstances, the losses to the State through biological control were greater than the gains. The study was carried out very quickly as background material for Agricultural Council, but it is certainly serious enough for that council to consider. The other States in Australia should conduct a similar study, because most of them have not tried to apply any cost benefit analysis to this question at all.

In Perth on Monday I will be asking the other States to consider the cost benefit analysis that we have done in South Australia and to do a similar analysis so that a much more accurate picture could be obtained for Australia as a whole. So far, most of the opinions either in favour or against biological control have not been based on any real calculations: they have been based on the particular prejudices of the people concerned, and I would like to have the matter debated on a more rational basis. The report prepared by the Agriculture Department in this State will provide the basis certainly as it applies in South Australia.

JOSEPH VERCO

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about the *Joseph Verco*.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: An Opposition member in another place made great play in the adjournment debate on Tuesday on some facts he claimed he had picked up in some fishing ports concerning the use and cost of the fisheries research vessel *Joseph Verco*. As my understanding is that the fishing industry fully supported the purchase of this vessel and, indeed, has been involved in advising the Government on the refitting of the vessel and on

nominating representatives to sit on an advisory committee to recommend certain priorities for the vessel, can the Minister throw any light on the strange accusations of the Opposition in this matter?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Certainly, the accusations made by the member for Flinders in another place were surprising. I do not understand how he came by this information, which is false and which does not reflect the views of the fishing industry. The industry has supported the purchase and use of *Joseph Verco*. A statement was made about the very few days that the vessel was at sea, but that was incorrect: for the 1978-79 financial year, the vessel was scheduled to operate for 163 days at sea, but it did not operate for that period, because of mechanical problems that have now been corrected. It was at sea for 149 days. Comparing that with the periods that the average trawlers in the various fisheries spend at sea, one finds that the average rock-lobster fisherman spends between 120 and 130 days at sea; the prawn trawlers in St. Vincent Gulf spend between 100 and 120 days at sea; and the Spencer Gulf trawlers spend a little longer, namely, between 140 and 150 days. So, the activities of the *Joseph Verco* compare favourably indeed with three of our major fishing areas.

Another comment made by the member in another place related to the alleged high cost of running the *Joseph Verco*. We have done some comparisons between the cost of this vessel and the cost of a prawn boat (the figures for the prawn boat have been supplied by the Prawn Boat Owners Association). Comparing the *Joseph Verco* with the average prawn boat, one sees that a prawn trawler averages $6 789 per metre per year, whereas the *Joseph Verco* costs $7 874 per metre per year. When one considers that it is a research vessel, and not a commercial trawler, that, I think, is a favourable comparison indeed.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What is the difference between the two figures?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It is $6 789 for a commercial prawn trawler per metre per year and $7 874 per metre per year for the *Joseph Verco*. If one compares the displacement, the figures are even more favourable in terms of the *Joseph Verco*, because for the average prawn trawler it is $1 990, whereas for the *Joseph Verco* it is $1 184. The *Joseph Verco* comes out very well in terms of being a research vessel if it can maintain costs within that sort of range. It is also interesting that the honourable member in another place criticised some of the additions and improvements that have been made to the *Joseph Verco*.

In particular, he referred to the Kort nozzle, and this improvement has increased the thrust by 80 per cent and has reduced the fuel consumption by 20 per cent. Surely this is the direction in which we want to move in the current fuel crisis. There were many other inaccuracies in the adjournment speech of the honourable member in another place. One was that the total cost of the *Joseph Verco* was over $1 000 000, whereas the costs to date have been $300 000 for purchase; improvements in gear and the Kort nozzle, $71 774; and running costs $345 989, which totals just over $700 000, well short of the $1 000 000 to which the honourable member referred.

LEAD TRAP

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I desire to direct a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Mines and Energy in another place. Can the Minister make a report available on the practicability of the lead trap muffler described in today's press as being capable of removing a significant percentage of lead emission from a motor vehicle by containing it in a mesh of stainless steel and alumina within the muffler?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

RURAL ADJUSTMENT SCHEME

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture about the rural adjustment scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I refer to the deplorable manner in which the Federal Government sees fit—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Hon. Mr. Hill and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris can whine: I am pleased to hear some expression of honesty from them at last.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member seems to make a habit every day, when he asks a question, of going through some rigmarole that is of little relevance to the question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is relevant, because it deals with honesty. However, I bow to the fact that you, Mr. President, get upset whenever I mention—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Question!

The PRESIDENT: Order! If you are reflecting on my conduct in the Chair, I will ask you to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No, I am not.

The PRESIDENT: Do you withdraw?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I withdraw.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Chuck him out.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I do not want Dawkins to tell you to chuck me out. I will chuck him out. Members opposite do this every day. When I was on my feet yesterday, I had to put up with—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Question!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My question is directed to the Minister. Whenever anyone on the Opposition front bench jumps up, he will get "Question" called on him.

The PRESIDENT: "Question" has been called.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The flushing out by the Minister of Agriculture of the Federal Government's attempt to con farmers—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Question!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is the Minister aware that he has flushed out the Federal Government's action that has conned farmers over rural adjustment funding for this coming financial year? Is he also aware that the Federal member for Wakefield is on an orgy of letter writing in an attempt to divert attention from the miserableness of his Treasurer, his Prime Minister, and his Minister for Primary Industry towards the poorer farmers in the community? Further, does the Minister expect Mr. Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles not to deny the point that the Minister has made; that is, that the Commonwealth has reduced its rural adjustment funds to South Australia by 85 per cent? Is the Minister aware that that gentleman cannot do that, and knows it?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Question!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I have asked the question. There are more ways of choking a cat than throwing it at the Liberal Party.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have been trying my best to see that the honourable member is heard but he does not seem to appreciate that I am calling the Council to order,

and on the next occasion I will name the member.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I did not hear you, Mr. President, because of the shouting by Mr. DeGaris and Mr. Hill on the other side of the Chamber. Will the Minister of Agriculture straighten out the facts for Mr. Giles and tell the Council just what the position is concerning rural adjustment funds for 1979-80? Will he also explain the reference Mr. Giles made that $200 000 is available for wine-grape growers in this State?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The member for Wakefield does seem to be confused over the whole area of rural adjustment, and he seems to be very reluctant to admit that the Federal Government has in fact cut the funds for 1979-80 by 85 per cent. I pointed this out in a series of letters in the rural press which seems to have stunned him into producing an irrelevant reply to my letter. He has tried to suggest that the State Government is somehow making a lot of money out of rural adjustment. He said that only 85 per cent of the money made available by the Commonwealth has to be repaid and that 15 per cent is in the form of a grant. I do not know what this revelation is supposed to prove. It has been in force ever since the Rural Adjustment Scheme was brought into force in the early 1970's. The 15 per cent is in the form of a grant to cover the bad debts that occur under the scheme. If the member for Wakefield does not believe that, he should be aware of the fact that already under the drought scheme we have about $750 000 worth of bad debts at present.

So it is a 15 per cent grant to cover a cost that has to be completely borne by the State. It is something that has been in the scheme from its very inception, and his attempts to raise this in his letters are a complete red herring and totally irrelevant to the very substantial reductions that have been made by the Federal Government in rural assistance funding. The Federal member in question also points out that $250 000 is available for carry-on loans for grapegrowers on the basis of a $1 for $1 contribution by the State Government. This Government has already agreed to make a $1 for $1 contribution to the existing carry-on loans for grapegrowers, and will continue to do so. The whole point about the grapegrowers' carry-on loans is that they cannot be used for adjustment purposes: they are for people who continue to grow grapes. However, that is the very thing that most of them do not want to do: they want to adjust out of grapegrowing into some other form of horticultural production in order to improve their returns, and for that purpose those funds are not available to them, because of the very severe reductions that have been made by the Federal Government.

Finally, Mr. Giles refers to the fact that some of the loans that are made available to farmers are paid back to the State Government before their full term. This is something, again, that has been going on since the very inception of the scheme, and these recycled funds are lent out to farmers for the remainder of that term. It is not a source of additional funds that can be made available to fill the gap in deficiencies involved in the scheme from inadequate funds from the Federal Government. It is nothing new, and that is another irrelevant argument that he is raising to try to distract people's attention from the real inadequacies that have been caused by the mini-Budget.

BOLIVAR WATER

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am a little doubtful whether I should address my question to the Minister of Water Resources or the Minister of Public Works. However, is the responsible Minister aware that some time ago the then Minister of Works, the Hon. Des Corcoran, furnished me with a list of people who were given the opportunity to use recycled water on the Adelaide Plains? Is he also aware that, according to further information I have received, most of those people are small growers, who hoped that the Government would help them to use this water and that, therefore, the bulk of them are not able to avail themselves of Bolivar water? Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from his colleague what further progress, if any, has been made with the more general use of recycled Bolivar water in the Adelaide Plains area, having regard to the parlous condition of the underground water basin there?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I will take up the honourable member's question with the Minister of Water Resources and bring back a reply.

MEDIACTION

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General a question regarding consumer affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My investigations into the activities of an organisation known as MediAction, to which I referred in a question I asked yesterday, led me to a May Oliver, who stated that she was with a company of doctors in Crafers. I wish to state that in no way is the matter that I raised yesterday connected with any of the clinics run by general practitioners in that area. I have never implied at any time that they were the people involved, although some of them seem to have been identified by statements in this morning's press.

Will the Minister ascertain whether Mr. Denis Sandery, of the address given in my question yesterday, was previously employed as a public servant in South Australia and is the person who is involved in building houses in the southern suburbs? Is he the same person who has been before the Builders Licensing Board and ordered to make good shoddy workmanship in certain houses, and the same person that has had representations made to him by that board in an attempt to have him correct carpentry and joinery faults in houses in the southern suburbs? Is he also the same person that has been called back to some of these houses, in one instance five times, and in another instance seven times—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Has he still got his licence?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I wish that the Leader would shut up. Is this the person who has been called back to those houses merely to carry out what should have been a direct order by the Builders Licensing Board to replace certain laminex cupboard tops, but has refused to do this and has glued the existing laminex seven or eight times? Will the Minister have this matter investigated to see whether this is one and the same person, and will he report back to the Council on the matter?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Unfortunately, it is not possible for me to keep tabs on all details of the administration of my department. I am afraid that I have no immediate knowledge of the matters to which the honourable member has drawn the Council's attention. I will therefore try to follow up the matters that he has raised and bring back any information I can to the Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask the Minister also to ascertain whether Mr. Sandery still has a licence and, if he has, why. This is indeed important, especially as someone's name has been mentioned in the Council in

relation to shoddy workmanship. If this is correct, it is up to the board to say why the man still has his licence.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I shall be pleased to obtain that information for the honourable member.

SALVATION JANE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Minister of Agriculture said in his reply that the Government had done a cost benefit analysis of the use of biological control on salvation jane. Is he willing to make that cost benefit analysis available to the Council and, if he is willing so to do at this stage, is the Minister prepared to indicate the various bases that were used in arriving at that cost benefit analysis, particularly the price used for the sale of stock, for the return on crops, what yields of crop he estimated, and what price was used for the sale of honey in the cost benefit analysis?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will certainly make the cost benefit analysis available to any honourable member who would like a copy of it. I certainly intend also to make it available to the various producer organisations so that they can comment on it. Like all cost benefit analyses, it must contain certain suppositions that are open to challenge. It is appropriate that the producer organisations involved should have an opportunity to comment on it and, if they consider that the details are incorrect, the organisations concerned can put forward other evidence to show that the costs or the benefits are greater or less. It is their right to do that. Therefore, the analysis will be available to producer organisations and to any honourable member who would like a copy of it. However, the cost benefit analysis has not been completed; further detail is still required before the final draft is available.

Yesterday, I received a deputation from graziers in the North of the State who claimed that salvation jane was beneficial to the grazing industry, and that the cost benefit analysis should be drawn up in a completely different way, as all benefits and no costs. So, it is interesting that some people in farmer organisations are very much in favour of salvation jane. They have also presented me with a petition containing about 2 000 names of farmers and graziers in the North of the State who are supporting salvation jane and are opposing the introduction of biological control.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General a further question regarding consumer affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I feel reluctant at times to mention the names of people. However, I usually check my facts. I do not resile from the fact that, if I mention the names of people in the Council, I do so because other more unfortunate people have the right to be protected by this institution.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about checking with the Minister first?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Perhaps the Leader does not know whether I go to the Minister first; on some occasions I do, but not always.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I hope this has something to do with the question that the honourable member wishes to ask.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I will not mention the companies involved, but I may do so next week. On reflection, I do not suppose I can ask the question unless I name the companies. Representations have been made to me by people who live in the eastern suburbs regarding a firm which operates in James Place under the following business names: James Place Cameras Pty. Ltd., Marcus Camera Repair Service, and L. H. Marcus Pty. Ltd. It appears, from what I have been told on two different occasions on unrelated matters, that it is extremely difficult to get these companies to honour undertakings that they make under warranty.

One of the complaints referred to me involved tripping to and from this business for about six months in an attempt to rectify faults in cameras. My constituent requested the Consumer Affairs Branch to make some representations on his behalf. A film was also given to the Consumer Affairs Branch. The branch approached the firm, which was not very co-operative and argued that it was not its fault. From inquiries I have made, I understand that the firm adopts a half-way type of attitude towards consumers. Can the Minister say how effective the Consumer Affairs Branch is with companies like this? In asking that question, I am not casting any reflection on the Consumer Affairs Branch, but I am pointing out the non-co-operative attitude of the companies concerned. Further, how can other consumers be warned about a statement on a docket regarding a warranty, if the firm will not honour that warranty?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am not aware of the specific details of the matter brought to the attention of the Council by the honourable member. The honourable member should bring those details to my attention so that I can have them properly investigated and provide him with a reply. The general approach adopted by the Public and Consumer Affairs Department, in its consumer affairs role, is that when it receives a complaint it attempts to conciliate between the consumer and the person or firm complained against to see whether the matter can be resolved satisfactorily without resort to legal proceedings. In most cases the matter is resolved after discussions by the department with the person or company that has provided the product or service and after further consultations with the consumer to see whether he is satisfied with the results.

If there is a clear breach of the law, the department usually seeks my permission to proceed with a prosecution. I cannot answer the honourable member's question more specifically than that. I suggest that the honourable member provide me with more information. In taking up complaints, the department can, in a very general way, be very effective and has, of course, been effective in protecting consumers in this State. It also looks after the interests of consumers when they are confronted with firms that do not comply with the requirements of the law.

FOOTBALL PARK FLOODLIGHTING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Environment, in his capacity as the champion of environmentalists in this State and also as a resident of West Lakes, comment upon the decision of the Royal Commission in regard to lighting at Football Park?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am a little nonplussed by the question, and I do not know what scope the honourable member wants me to cover: whether he wants a personal response, whether he wants me to comment as

an environmentalist, or whether he wants me to reply as Minister of Environment.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister can reply as Minister of Environment. No-one wants his personal explanation.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Mr. President, I am pleased that you clarified that, because the question was rather ambiguous. The Environment Department was involved in an environmental impact study on the lighting of Football Park. All of the recommendations it made were taken into account. As Minister of Environment, I am quite pleased with the result of the recommendations made by the Royal Commission, and I find no fault with them.

COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to direct a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Some members of this Chamber and another place attended the screening of a film that you, Mr. President, made available to be screened between 12 o'clock and 1 o'clock in this building today. The film, *When the Chips are Down,* dealt with advanced technology and told of the most frightful problems that should be of very grave concern to us all. The film spelt out, in pictorial form and in commentary, that unemployment in the Western world could be expected to rise (at a conservative estimate made two years ago) by about 30 per cent. The film showed the complete automation of many industrial concepts. It also showed that the communications system as we know it today will be almost bereft of human employment. The film showed the headlong crash of technology that can no longer be averted because of the international advances being made.

For those members who wish to see the film, it shows that life as we know it for future generations will be just as frightening as war. The Minister of Labour and Industry has made the film available to community groups and to some schools. However, I am concerned that there are insufficient copies of the film available in video form or—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What other form are they in?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I did not hear what the Leader said, and just as well.

The PRESIDENT: The Leader asked what other form the films were in.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I do not have to go into technical details to explain to the Leader what form they were in, and I do not intend to do so. It should be explained on a screen, be it videotape or any other method.

Will the Attorney-General request the Minister of Labour and Industry and also the Minister of Education to make every endeavour to have a greater number of these films made available and to ensure that they are available at a faster rate than they are at the moment to all high schools, all colleges of advanced education, and to any community groups that wish to see them. I also ask you, Mr. President, whether or not you will prevail upon the Federal Government or the appropriate Minister to request the A.B.C. to show this particular film in its entirety during prime viewing time.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I understand that this significant and informative film discusses the problems that this society will undoubtedly face with the increasing sophistication of future technology.

I was unable to view the film this afternoon but, if it is possible to organise a rescreening, I will make my best effort to be present, as I want to see it, and I am sure that all other honourable members should do so. There may be the possibility that you, Sir, could intervene again to see whether it is possible to have the film rescreened. I certainly commend the Minister of Labour and Industry for his initiative in making this film available for public viewing, particularly for viewing in the schools. The Hon. Mr. Foster has raised the question of whether sufficient prints are available. I know that a fair number of prints have been ordered by the Minister of Labour and Industry and that they have been distributed fairly widely. I will approach him to see whether any more can be done to increase the number of prints available and to see whether the Minister of Education can facilitate their distribution through the school system.

GOLD FIND

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, give any information on the reported gold discovery (I think by Western Mining Corporation) in the South-East? A report to this effect appeared in the press a few days ago.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will obtain a report on the matter for the honourable member.

ROLLING STOCK

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to ask a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, on safety measures in regard to railway rolling stock.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: For many years in this Chamber questions have been raised that reflect public concern throughout the State—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Question!

The PRESIDENT: "Question" has been called. The Hon. Mr. Hill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Transport provide details of the State Transport Authority's latest policy in regard to the need to install lights or reflectors or light-coloured paint or reflectorised paint to use on rolling stock in South Australia, because of the dangers that occur at railway crossings that do not have boom gates?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

The PRESIDENT: I make one point at this stage. I make it clear that the value and quality of debate is not my affair, but the conduct of it is my prerogative. The "Question" swapping exercise has reached the point of being square all the way round at this time. It has been a somewhat schoolboy exercise, and I hope that we can continue without any more of it.

MARIJUANA

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Although we have breathalyser tests with regard to alcohol, we are unable to ascertain the degree of intoxication from marijuana. Will the Attorney-General report as to whether any test can be carried out with regard to the degree of intoxication from marijuana? It has been reported that a test is being carried

out in Queensland. Will that device be used in South Australia?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: As I understand it, one of the conclusions of the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs was that there is extreme difficulty in ascertaining whether or not a person is under the effect of a drug such as marijuana. The honourable member obviously has some information.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Queensland has a system.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It has a system whereby the degree of effect from this drug can be ascertained. I will try to obtain the information and reply specifically to the honourable member's question when I am able to do so.

FILM RESCREENING

The PRESIDENT: The Attorney-General and the Hon. Mr. Foster mentioned the possible rescreening of the film *When the Chips are Down*. I point out that, as the film is used considerably, it may not be obtainable for some time. If any honourable member cares to send me a note regarding this matter, I will take it up at the next meeting of the Joint House Committee, which was responsible for obtaining the film on this occasion.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) BILL

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

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is to replace the revenue lost as a result of a decision earlier this year, by all States, to abolish road maintenance charges (commonly known as the ton-mile tax) as from 1 July 1979.

Members will recall that South Australia, along with all other mainland States (excluding the Northern Territory), has imposed road maintenance charges on heavy road vehicles for a number of years. Those charges were designed to recover the cost of the excessive wear and tear caused on roads by heavy vehicles, particularly by interstate hauliers, who also enjoy a privileged position in respect of motor registration charges and other charges on constitutional grounds.

Members will also be aware that this system of road charges has been the subject of considerable criticism and mounting pressure for its removal, by the road transport industry and its members. The extent of avoidance, particularly by interstate hauliers, who in many cases adopted a practice of establishing "straw" companies as a device to avoid the charges, has been a matter of considerable concern not only to the Governments involved but also to those members of the transport industry who accepted their responsibilities in accordance with the legislation.

These problems have been recognised by all State Governments for many years. Indeed, much time and effort has been spent by State Governments and the Australian Transport Advisory Council in seeking a more equitable alternative to the road maintenance charges system.

Of the alternatives considered by the Australian Transport Advisory Council, all but one were rejected on the grounds that they offered no better arrangement than the then existing road maintenance charges system. They all suffered from shortcomings in the areas of equity, evasion, safety and ease and cost of administration.

The system which the respective State Governments supported as an appropriate alternative to the road maintenance charges system involved the Commonwealth Government levying and collecting a fuel charge on behalf of the States as part of the Commonwealth's fuel excise system. It was supported for the following reasons:

(a) it would be constitutionally valid;

(b) it would provide little scope for evasion and avoidance by any groups of road users;

(c) it would be administratively convenient and cheap to operate as it would be an extension of the Commonwealth's existing customs and excise arrangements for which administrative and collection procedures are already operating; and

(d) from an economic management point of view, it would make sense for a charge on fuel (like a tax on income) to be co-ordinated at one central point.

I regret to say that, despite persistent requests from all State Governments, Labor, Liberal and National Party alike, the Commonwealth Government has refused, steadfastly, to co-operate with the States in this particular matter.

Honourable members, of course, now know the final outcome. Long-distance road hauliers blockaded key roads earlier this year and forced the Queensland Government to submit to their pressure that road maintenance charges be abolished. The unilateral decision of the Queensland Government left all other States with no alternative but to agree to abolish those charges as from 1 July 1979.

That decision resulted in an annual loss of approximately $5 000 000 to the Highways Department for road maintenance purposes. It is a loss which the department cannot afford if it is to continue to maintain the State's roads at a level which is considered essential for the effective operation of the road transport industry and also for the use of the motoring public generally.

It is a loss which could not be met from the general revenue and Loan funds available to the State. These funds are under heavy pressure as a result of considerably reduced Commonwealth Government support in recent years for general purpose loan funds and for special purpose funds. With a similar situation confronting all States, the members of the Australian Transport Advisory Council set up a working party in April 1979 to inquire into and recommend an alternative method of raising the equivalent amount of revenue lost through the abolition of road maintenance charges.

The working party's report was considered by the Australian Transport Advisory Council in June 1979. It recommended that a charge be made on certain petroleum products used in propelling road vehicles, coupled with an appropriate adjustment in motor registration fees so that the burden remained, as far as possible, with the heavy road vehicle user.

The working party also recommended that:

(a) the charge should be levied and collected by the Commonwealth Government on behalf of the States for reasons similar to those I mentioned earlier. This approach was supported strongly by the oil companies;

(b) in the event that the Commonwealth Government would not support that approach, then the charge should be levied and collected at the oil company level rather than the retail level in order to avoid the problems associated with previous fuel franchising systems.

As to the Commonwealth Government levying and collecting the charge, this matter was raised at the recent Premiers' Conference. I regret to say that, once again, the proposal was rejected out of hand by the Commonwealth Government. As a consequence, all States are now left with no alternative but to introduce a business franchise fuel licensing system. Western Australia and Victoria have already legislated to introduce this type of system. New South Wales and Queensland are considering the question.

In respect to this Bill, the Government is following closely the major principles incorporated in the current Victorian legislation as uniformity between States is essential in order to avoid border problems which could be detrimental to the industry. Basically, the legislation provides for each oil company to pay a nominal licence fee plus a fee based on the value of its sales in a previous period for certain petroleum products (namely motor spirit and distillate) used in propelling vehicles on roads and for each retailer to pay a nominal licence fee only, provided he purchases his supplies of those products from a licensed oil company.

In essence, the system involves two licences: a class A licence—where the wholesaler, generally the oil company, will be required to pay $50 per month plus an additional fee per litre of 4·5 per cent of the bulk wholesale reseller's maximum price for petrol and 7·1 per cent of the bulk wholesale reseller's price for distillate, on the sale of those products. A class B licence—where the retailer, or service station proprietor, will pay a $50 annual fee only.

The higher rate for automotive distillate is consistent with the Victorian approach and is based on the premise that the heavy vehicle road hauliers should bear the brunt of the new charge. Most heavy vehicles are diesel powered. On the basis of the latest available figures for consumption of petrol and distillate, it is estimated that these charges will produce revenue of approximately $14 000 000 in a full year.

In view of this, and as a first step towards the user pays principle, the Government has decided to reduce motor registration fees for private vehicles and light commercial vehicles, thereby creating a package deal and offsetting some of the effects of the additional fuel costs. It is also anticipated that, with some increased registration fees for heavy vehicles combined with the increased rate for diesel fuel, payment by the heavy haulier will approach that which he would have paid under the road maintenance charges system.

Regulations to give effect to these changes in motor registration fees have been prepared. Discussions have been held with the oil companies and it is hoped that the legislation can be passed so as to give them time to apply for and gain a price rise from 1 September 1979. This should enable them to collect approximately the equivalent of one month's fee by the 1 October 1979, the date from which it is proposed that this Bill will apply. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Clause 4 provides definitions of terms used in the Bill. The term "petroleum products" is defined to mean motor spirit or diesel fuel, that is, the two petroleum products that are principally used for the propulsion of motor vehicles.

Clauses 5 to 10, the "grouping provisions" of the Bill, are designed to prevent avoidance of the liability to pay the fee for a Class A licence or the full amount of the fee. The Class A licences proposed by this Bill may be regarded as corresponding to the tobacco wholesalers' licences under the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, 1974-1978. Under the Bill, as with the tobacco wholesalers' licence, the class A licence is to be a monthly licence and the fee for the licence is to be based upon the value of petroleum products sold by the licensee during the calendar month that is the last calendar month but one preceding the calendar month during which the licence will be inforce. The fact that the fee is based upon sales during an antecedent period enables a seller, if he splits his business into two or more businesses, takes out separate class A licences for those businesses and directs all or the bulk of his sales through different businesses in different months, to eliminate or reduce his fees for the licences for those businesses. The grouping provisions in the Bill, which correspond to sections 4a to 4f of the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, therefore, are designed to enable those separate businesses to be treated as one business requiring one Class A licence, the fee for which would be based upon the total of the sales in all of those businesses during the relevant antecedent period.

Clause 11 provides that the measure shall not affect the operation of other Acts, in particular the Motor Fuel Distribution Act, 1973, as amended.

Clause 12 provides that the Commissioner of Stamps shall have the general administration of the measure. Clause 13 provides for the constitution of a Business Franchise (Petroleum) Appeal Tribunal which under Part IV of the measure is to hear any appeal against a refusal to grant a licence or against any assessment by the commissioner of the fee for a class A licence.

Clause 14 provides for the appointment of a registrar of the tribunal. Clause 15 provides for the appointment of inspectors. Clause 16 empowers inspectors to enter premises used in connection with the business of dealing with petroleum products, to inspect any such premises and any records that relate to any such business and to ask questions with respect to any such business.

Clauses 17 and 18 are the most significant provisions of the Bill. Under clause 17 a person is to be guilty of an offence if he sells petroleum products on or after the appointed day without having obtained the appropriate licence. The appointed day is to be specified by proclamation. The clause provides for two types of licences referred to as class A licences and class B licences. A class A licence is required by any person who sells petroleum products and delivers them within the State for consumption or re-sale where he has not purchased those products from the holder of a licence under a sale made in pursuance of that licence. The major oil companies will, therefore, be required to obtain class A licences. A class B licence is required by any person who sells petroleum products and delivers them within the State for consumption or re-sale where he has purchased those products from the holder of a licence under a sale made in pursuance of that licence. Subclause (3) of clause 17 provides that a holder of a class A licence may sell petroleum products in pursuance of that licence where he purchased those products from another class A licensee or from a class B licensee.

Clause 18 fixes the fees for class A and class B licences. The fee for a class B licence is to be an annual fee of $50. The fee for a class A licence (which is to be a monthly licence) is to be $50 together with an amount of 4·5 per cent of the value of motor spirit and 7·1 per cent of the value of diesel fuel sold by the applicant during the

calendar month that is the last calendar month but one preceding the calendar month in which the licence will be in force. The value of motor spirit and diesel fuel sold during that relevant period by a class A licensee to another class A licensee for re-sale is to be disregarded. Under the clause the value of diesel fuel sold that is not to be used for propelling diesel engined road vehicles and the value of motor spirit or diesel fuel sold for delivery and consumption outside the State shall also be disregarded. Subclauses (4) to (8) provide for the fixing by the Minister of a value for motor spirit and a value for diesel fuel. The respective values are to be published in the *Gazette* not more frequently than quarterly and are not to exceed the maximum prices for premium grade motor spirit and for diesel fuel, respectively, fixed under the Prices Act, 1948-1978, at the relevant time and applicable to bulk wholesale resellers.

Clause 19 provides for reassessment and adjustment of the fee for a class A licence. Clause 20 empowers the Commissioner to require any person dealing with petroleum products to furnish him with information as to those dealings. Clause 21 provides for the grant of licences by the Commissioner. A class B licensee is to be required to keep the Commissioner correctly advised as to the premises from which he conducts his business. Clause 22 provides that class A licences are to expire at the end of the month in which they are granted and that class B licences are to expire on the next anniversary of the appointed day occurring after they are granted.

Clause 23 provides for the surrender of a class B licence. Clause 24 requires the Commissioner to keep a register of licences. Clause 25 requires class A licensees, on or after 1 July 1980, to endorse every invoice, statement of account and receipt issued for or in relation to the sale of petroleum products with the words "Licensed petroleum wholesaler". Clause 26 requires any person carrying on the business of dealing with petroleum products to keep records of a kind to be prescribed by regulation for a period of five years after they are made.

Clause 27 provides that there shall be a right of appeal to the tribunal against a refusal by the Commissioner to grant a licence and against an assessment or reassessment by the Commissioner of the fee for a licence. Clause 28 provides for the time for lodging an appeal to the tribunal against a refusal to grant a licence and provides for the powers of the tribunal upon such an appeal. Clause 29 provides for appeals against assessments or reassessments by the Commissioner of the fees for class A licences. The clause provides that an appeal lies to the tribunal only after the licence applicant has lodged with the Commissioner an objection against his assessment or reassessment.

Clause 30 provides that licence fees less the cost of administering the measure are to be paid into the Highways Fund under the Highways Act, 1926-1979, on a monthly basis. Clause 31 prohibits the improper disclosure of information obtained in the course of administering the measure. Clause 32 provides that it shall be an offence to make false or misleading statements in providing information required in connection with the administration of the measure. Clause 33 protects the Commissioner, the tribunal and inspectors from personal liability for acts or omissions in good faith made in the course of the administration of the measure.

Clause 34 provides that the Commissioner may make an additional assessment and recover a further amount in payment of the fee for a licence where the deficiency in the amount of his original assessment was caused by a false statement made by the licensee. Clause 35 provides for the recovery of an amount equal to the licence fee which should have been paid by a person who was required to obtain a licence but did not do so.

Clause 36 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 37 provides for the summary disposition of proceedings for offences against the measure. Clause 38 provides that where a corporation is guilty of an offence against the measure the officers of the corporation shall, also, in certain circumstances, be guilty of an offence. Clause 39 provides for the service of documents. Clause 40 provides for the making of regulations.

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

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the amendment and subsequent expiry of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963-1979. The Bill provides that the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act shall not apply to any journey, or part of any journey, occurring after 1 July 1979. The Bill, if enacted, would, therefore, effectively remove the liability to pay road maintenance charges as from that day. In addition, the Bill provides for the expiry of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation in order to enable road maintenance charges that fell due before 1 July 1979, to be recovered.

This decision to remove the road maintenance charges was taken in order to resolve the long distance hauliers' blockade of key roads in April and to forestall any further such action. It is proposed that the revenue raised by means of road maintenance charges will be replaced by revenue raised by means of licence fees under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Bill, 1979, if enacted.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 provides for the enactment of new sections 14 and 15. New section 14 provides that the Act shall not apply and be deemed not to have applied to any journey, or part of any journey, occurring after 1 July 1979. New section 15 provides for the expiry of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 1 August. Page 278.)

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I thank His Excellency the Governor for his Speech, and I take the opportunity of renewing my allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen. I join in the expressions of sympathy to the families of deceased members. His Excellency, in his Speech, outlined the legislative programme for this session. In regard to the legislative programme of the Government, my concerns are, first, that in future the Government takes the trouble in the second reading explanation of a Bill to give an accurate and comprehensive account of what the Bill will do; and, secondly, that the Bills give effect to the legislative programme of the Government, and that they will be effective and efficient in carrying out the purposes

for which they are said to be introduced and will not impose all sorts of controls which go much further than is necessary to carry out what is said to be the purpose of the Bill.

I intend to deal briefly with each of these points and then to give some examples from the past, some relating to one or the other point and some relating to both. The second reading explanation should, of course, as it generally does, give some background as to why the Bill is necessary and what problem in the community it is designed to overcome. It must be remembered that every Bill, if it is passed and if it comes into operation, changes the law. It is a piece of the law of the State which was not there before in that form. Even an Appropriation Bill changes the law. It is therefore essential that the explanation should not only explain the reasons and the background but accurately summarise what the Bill does. We believe in responsible government—that the Government is responsible to Parliament for its actions. It is therefore a very grave responsibility of the Minister to give a true picture to Parliament of what the Bill he is introducing is going to do.

While the Minister's main and first responsibility is to explain the Bill to Parliament, which is being asked to pass the Bill, the second reading explanation is usually and properly taken by the press and by interested members of the public as being the authoritative explanation by the Minister as to what the Bill does. This is still another reason why it is essential that the explanation be accurate. Furthermore, the precise legal language (or what should be the precise legal language—and more of this later) of Bills is not easy for many people, including even many senior members of Parliament, to understand. There have been complaints from time to time about the allegedly artificial and stilted language of Acts of Parliament. It has been suggested that it should be possible to draft Bills in layman's language. It may be possible to draft Bills in less archaic and more comprehensible terms than was formerly the case. I think that a move in that direction has already been made, and it may be possible to take this move even further. But, while it is highly desirable that Acts of Parliament should be in a language readily understood by the people, it is absolutely essential that the law be as certain as possible.

There will always be some cases where the meaning of a Statute or its application in a particular case is controversial. We tend to over-emphasise these cases because they often have dramatic consequences when they occur but, when one looks at the bulk of the Statute law (the consolidation having reached "public meetings" in eight volumes, and that bulk being added to year by year), the cases where Statutes have proved uncertain must be a remarkably small percentage, as it were, of the Statute law. In other words, the system works. The traditional method of draftsmanship is the only method of ensuring this, although certainly draftsmen ought to make Bills as readily understandable by laymen as possible.

What it amounts to is that the explanation and the Bill perform two different and important functions. The Bill sets out with certainty what are the actual operative provisions of the law, although it may be difficult for many people to gain from the Bill a true picture of what it does. Therefore, the explanation is necessary to do just that—to give, in layman's language and unfettered by the absolute need for complete certainty, an accurate description of what the Bill does. So often members of Parliament, outside the Houses of Parliament, either in meetings or privately, when referring to a Bill will ask, "What does the Bill do?" They do not want to read and analyse the Bill: they want to be told simply what it does. This is exactly what a second reading explanation should do. It is essential that this be done accurately; the explanation should not pull the wool over the eyes of Parliament. My complaint is that so often the explanations are not accurate. I shall later give some examples, which are by no means isolated, to demonstrate this.

Many members of Parliament are finding it difficult, within the constraints of time available to them, to digest a Bill. When members are discussing a Bill and preparing their speeches, they may rely on a second reading explanation rather than the Bill itself to inform them as to what the Bill does. In such cases it is essential that the explanation be accurate.

My second complaint is related to the first. Many Bills introduced are not efficient to carry out their expressed purposes and in fact go much beyond the expressed purposes. On a number of occasions there have been Legislative Council Select Committees on Bills which have been obliged to act as drafting committees with the assistance, of course, of Parliamentary Counsel. I strongly support the committee system and I think that all of the Bills that have been referred to Select Committees have been improved as a result of their consideration. However, the role of Select Committees should be mainly to take evidence on the effect which the Bill would have in practice. A Select Committee should not be for the purpose of rectifying haphazard, ill-considered legislation introduced by the Government. Useful as Select Committees are, they are not a substitute for introducing satisfactory legislation in the first place.

I turn now to some examples. The first one I will mention is the Land Commission Bill. I will refer to the remarks of your predecessor, Mr. President, the late Hon. Frank Potter. On page 1141 of *Hansard,* 10 October 1973, he said, "The object of the Bill is most laudable." He refers to more of what is in the second reading speech and says, "Having heard all that, I was inclined to say 'Hear, hear'." But further on he says, "However, I was most disappointed when I turned to the provisions of the Bill." This is just what I am talking about. Further on, he said:

> The Bill does not deal only with the acquisition of broad acres, but goes much further.

The second reading explanation led one to suppose that the acquisition of broad acres was all that the Bill was aimed at. The Hon. Frank Potter went on to point out other areas where the Bill did not line up with the second reading speech.

The next Bill to which I refer as an example is the Urban Land Price Control Bill. This Bill has now expired but it is nonetheless an example of what I have been talking about. I would refer again to the remarks of your predecessor, Mr. President, the late Hon. Frank Potter, because they are most apposite. On page 1434 of *Hansard,* 25 October 1973, the second reading explanation referred to the report of the Speechley Committee, as follows:

> My understanding is that the Government desired to give effect to that final recommending paragraph.

Further on, he says:

> I would have supported this idea and this limit of control for a limited time until the supply and demand of allotments was more in balance. However—

and this is what I am talking about: the difference between the speech and the Bill—

> what do we find? It has become what I might describe as a hydra-headed Bill; in fact, it has sprouted two or three heads during the course of its passage through another place.

The next example to which I refer relates to the Consumer Credit Act Amendment Bill, 1975. This is a glaring example. The Bill was introduced in another place by the Hon. L. J. King (as he then was), Attorney-General and

Minister of Consumer Affairs. His general explanation of the Bill is to be found in two short paragraphs at page 3029 of *Hansard* of 19 March 1975. He talks about nothing else, before the clauses, except the need to control the potential abuse of bank cards. I think all honourable members in both Houses would have been happy to support that concept if it had been incorporated in a Bill. However, the Bill did not do anything of the kind. It did not even refer to bank cards. It did something much more sinister and sweeping: it gave the Government the power to control by regulation the whole of the bank credit system and, in addition, a significant portion of the total credit system.

The Bill was not proceeded with, but it was said that a new Bill in this area would be introduced later. The amendment to the Consumer Credit Act is mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. If it is to control abuses of bank card, let us hope that that is all that it does.

I refer next to the Debts Repayment Bill and the four Bills associated with it. I mention this Bill mainly as an example of the second question that I have canvassed, namely, the ineptitude of many Bills to carry out the purpose for which they were introduced. The purpose of this Bill was to provide a moratorium for comparatively small debtors, and a means to enable them to repay their debts.

The Bill as introduced completely destroyed the whole system of security that has enabled people to get credit. Fortunately, following a Select Committee, this fundamental defect was corrected. My point is that Bills containing such fundamental defects should not be introduced.

The next example is the Motor Body Repairs Industry Bill, which was introduced in the last session. The second reading explanation of the Bill was given in the Council on 22 February 1979 (page 2889 of *Hansard*). Part of that second reading explanation is as follows:

> Where a motor body repair industry has four or more employees who are being paid tradesmen's rates of pay, they shall employ one apprentice.

The Bill says nothing of the kind or anything remotely like it. The nearest that the Bill gets to it is to say in clause 40:

> The board may, with the approval of the Minister, make rules prescribing or providing for any matter or thing contemplated by this Part or relating to . . . *(h)* the employment of apprentices in a specified trade or trades at each motor body repairs workshop or motor body painting workshop that carries on its operations on a prescribed scale.

That is all that it says. The four-to-one ratio is nowhere mentioned in the Bill. What was said in the second reading explanation is totally inaccurate. The proposed board, if and when it is established and whoever its personnel may be, may or may not make rules for the four-to-one ratio and, if such rules are made, they may or may not be disallowed by one of the Houses of Parliament.

However, to suggest, as the explanation does, that the Bill does these things is completely incorrect. The explanation continues:

> (3) That machinery for the settlement of disputes between the workshops and their customers concerning the standard of work in the industry be set up.

This is utter rubbish. The Bill does no such thing. It does provide for complaints to be made against licensees and for persons found guilty of malpractice to be fined or suspended, but there is no provision for the settlement of disputes.

These are just a few examples of cases where the second reading explanation has not lined up with the Bill or where the Bill as presented was inept for the purpose for which it was said to be introduced, or where it has gone completely beyond that purpose. Without going into detail, some other examples are various stamp duty and succession duties Bills. The Mining Act Amendment Bill, the Inheritance (Family Provisions) Bill and the Contracts Review Bill are other examples.

I make this request of the Government: that second reading explanations include a careful and accurate overall account of what the Bill does. This, of course, cannot be achieved simply by explaining the clauses. I also make the plea that Bills are, when presented, so devised as to do effectively what they are said to be designed for and do not go beyond that purpose nor have other serious anomalous effects.

I now turn to an entirely different matter. I wish to discuss briefly the alarming situation at the South Australian Youth Training Centre, formerly called the McNally Training Centre. This was disclosed on Tuesday by the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. R. K. Abbott), when replying in another place to Questions on Notice asked by the member for Glenelg, Mr. Mathwin. Particularly in view of the dramatic nature of the replies, it is also alarming to note that some of these questions had been on notice since last year and that they have only this week been replied to. During this time, there has been a change of Ministers, and it is pleasing to see that the new Minister has had the courage to bring in replies which cannot reflect much credit on the Administration as soon as Parliament reconvened after his appointment, that is, apart from the short, hectic Santos part of the session, and I do not blame the Minister for not bringing in his answers then.

The most alarming thing is that 29 youths convicted of sexual offences were held in the centre, five of them convicted of homosexual rape, and these have been sleeping in open dormitory units. An analysis of the answers discloses that at least one has been in every open dormitory unit in the centre. It is wrong that this situation has been allowed to continue in the past. Separate quarters are available, namely, in Sturt unit, and offenders of this kind should, in fairness to the other inmates, not for any other reason, have been accommodated there. Surely, now that this has happened, such offenders will be accommodated in separate accommodation. I ask the Minister whether this will be the practice.

One of the member's questions refers to a certain inmate convicted of homosexual rape. Although the questions and answers do not disclose this, the inmate was in fact committed on two counts of heterosexual rape and, while an inmate in the centre, committed another offence of homosexual rape and was convicted. However, he still continues to sleep in open dormitory units.

The replies to the questions also disclose that there were 19 assaults by inmates on staff during the first five months of this year. As a result of these assaults, one staff member was off work for 58 days, one for three weeks, and one for two weeks.

In the same five months, 11 staff members resigned —surprise, surprise! I trust that the Minister and his officers will take steps to prevent a recurrence of this kind of conduct, at least with this appalling degree of frequency, because it does appear that working in the training centre is an extremely hazardous occupation, to say the least. I acknowledge that it may not be easy to make a correct decision on how the situation could be rectified. I do not pretend to have all the answers, but I suggest that inmates coming to the centre for the first time, and for relatively minor offences, should not be mixed with recidivists, who I suggest need more discipline, including reasonably early starts in the morning, to get them up and working. There is plenty of work which can usefully be done.

Being held in the centre (and it does not seem popular to say this these days) should be a punishment. The term of detention in the centre need not be long, but the discipline should be such that the inmates realise that they are being punished. I say this, because offenders rarely go to the centre for a first offence. The system of intensive neighbourhood care should make it possible to deal in another way with offenders who do not warrant highly disciplined attention. In conclusion, I commend Mr. Mathwin in another place for his assiduity in publicising these matters. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I support the motion. However, first, I want to congratulate Mrs. Cooper on her long service to this Council and State, and I hope that she has a happy and healthy retirement. I congratulate Mr. Davis on his appointment and I know he will enjoy his time in this Council. However, I am sorry the Opposition did not make its choice on the basis of attractiveness. I hope that in the future it sees the light and appoints a lady to its side of the Chamber.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is not an attractive view from here.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: It is not an attractive view from this side, either. Like Mr. Burdett, I have some complaints, and I am beginnning to wonder whether the Australian Government knows that we are all Australians, that we are all proud to be Australians and that as Australians we all like to work together. Why is it that the Australian Government continues to try to divide us? Why does Canberra want to be seen so often denigrating the States? For a number of years now it has been very caustic towards the States. In some cases I feel it has treated them differently when they should have been treated equally.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You can't under the Constitution.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: On average, they should be treated equally, but sometimes it does not appear that that is so. When the States show any signs of resentment the whip comes out and they are punished, and State funding suffers. The Australian Government seems to treat in a most cavalier fashion the taxpayers and various bodies that it should be keeping with funds. That Government is continually short-changing the States, as witness its most recent cuts relating to medicine, hospitals or anything to do with health. Funding in South Australia this year is $8 000 000 down on last year's figure.

The Australian Government has also hacked away at education. In fact, the cuts in funding have been so continuous over the last year or two that every area of State and local government has felt the pinch. The Government blandly tells the States to introduce their own taxes to meet or cover their own commitments. However, that same Government continues to increase taxation. Twelve months ago the Federal Government decided to impose a taxation levy. It then decided to continue that extra taxation impost beyond the original 12-month period that was promised would be the life of that imposition.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: A lot of good refunds are coming in at present.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: People will be looking for them, too. The staggering burdens imposed by recent Federal Budgets have caused tremendous hardship to the ordinary working people. I have noticed that, while heavier taxation burdens are imposed, less is being spent on essential services, and the deficit grows year by year. I believe a promise was made a few years ago which convinced the electorate that this Government would soon solve the problems caused by inflation and unemployment.

The Budget deficit for the financial year just ended was $640 000 000 more than anticipated. The inability of the Federal Government to curb inflation and its complete lack of control over unemployment will only add to the distrust of the electorate.

In a commentary which appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 9 July 1979, Ross Gittins, the Economics Editor, said:

> It's a sad state of affairs when a Budget deficit outcome $640 million more than originally expected can be regarded as a minor triumph for the Federal Government. The final deficit of $3 453 million announced on Friday compares with an estimate of $2 813 million at the time of the Budget. But at least it was $47 million less than the revised estimate, of $3 500 million given by the Treasurer, Mr. Howard, in May.
>
> **Surprise**
>
> The outcome was no doubt a relief to the Government and a surprise to some members of the money market who, even after Mr. Howard's revision, thought it would be much higher. The episode shows just how low the Government's credibility has fallen and how pessimistic the market is at present.
>
> While a few would deny that the Government ought to know better than anyone else what its deficit would be, the market just refused to believe Mr. Howard's word.
>
> It seems, however, that it may have taken a bit of last-minute squeezing of Government spending to turn out a result comfortably under his revised prediction. And even so, Mr. Howard has won himself the dubious distinction of presiding over a deficit greater than any the Labor Government managed to run up. The record book puts the deficit of the last Labor Treasurer, Mr. Hayden, in 1975-76 at $3 585 million. But this was achieved only after his Liberal successor, Mr. Lynch, had pulled a very neat trick by including in it $216 million worth of hospital Medibank payments which actually related to 1976-77. So Mr. Hayden's deficit was really $3 369 million—$84 million less than Mr. Howard's.
>
> In its search for excuses for its abysmal performance on the deficit, the Fraser Government some time ago hit on the idea of expressing the deficit as a percentage of gross national product. This is really just a way of adjusting the deficit for the effects of inflation. But it allowed Mr. Howard to claim that his deficit wasn't nearly as bad as Mr. Hayden's. Mr. Howard's represented 3.4 per cent of GDP, while Mr. Hayden's represented 5.02 per cent.
>
> All very nice, except that, as Mr. Hayden was quick to point out, these figurings exploit another trick that the Fraser Government has used to fudge its deficits—the encouragement of Federal statutory bodies and the States to borrow from the public rather than from the Federal Budget. A spokesman for Mr. Howard had to confirm Mr. Hayden's estimate that the total public sector deficit (or borrowing requirement) would reach 6.2 per cent of GDP in 1978-79, the highest proportion ever.
>
> But he objected that Mr. Hayden's calculation included all State and local government authorities, over which the Commonwealth had no control. This of course, is nonsense. As the recent Premiers' Conference showed, the Commonwealth has effective control over the great bulk of the borrowing of the States and their semi-government bodies.
>
> But Mr. Howard seems at last to have learnt this lesson. He told a Sydney luncheon last week that "it would make a mockery of the commitment of this Government to restraining the size of the public sector if it were to ignore the implications of the growth in the public sector borrowing requirement over recent years.
>
> **Restraint**
>
> "With these considerations in mind, the normal semi-government borrowing programs of the States in 1979-80 will

be held to virtually the same money level as 1978-79. The same degree of restraint will be exercised in respect of the Commonwealth's own semi-government borrowing program . . . The amount approved this year is significantly less than that approved last year . . ."

Mr. Howard has even admitted that about half of the four percentage-point overrun in money supply growth in 1978-79 was because of the Budget deficit blowout.

An important and wellknown New South Wales paper made that scathing attack on the Government, which I think really lacked credibility, and those who supported it have turned on it in this fashion. The opinion polls are evidence that the people have a very low opinion of the present Australian Government. People wonder where their hard-earned money has gone. Taxes are higher now than they were under the previous Government, and the deficit is greater now than it was under previous Governments. Less money is distributed to the States and local government now than was the case under the previous Government. The present Government, the borrower of overseas capital to the extent of $4 000 000 000, when in Opposition created an unholy hullaballoo when the previous Government was considering borrowing $4 000 000 000. At least the Labor Government promised that, in borrowing, it would put the money to a worthwhile use by buying Australia back. This Government has sought to beat the people in other ways. I quote from a Laurie Oakes report, dated 11 July, in which he states:

Federal Government sources expect the Arbitration Commission to grant an increase in real wages in the October national wage hearing. They say privately the commission will almost certainly decide this is the only way the present spate of industrial strife can be brought under control. Despite public denials, there is an acceptance among senior Ministers that the present extraordinary unrest is largely due to frustration over cuts in living standards resulting from the Government's policy of keeping the lid on wage rises.

The wave of disputes, in other words, is to a large extent a challenge against the way the wage indexation system has been applied. Three factors are involved: firstly, the action of the commission in granting less than full indexation overall; secondly, the change from quarterly to six-monthly indexation cases; thirdly, the fact that inflation over the last year increased considerably more than the 5 per cent rate predicted by the Government and accepted by the commission.

As a result of all this, real wages have fallen. And, while the Government deliberately set out to achieve such a decline over the last four years, there is now a feeling that it might have gone too far.

If Mr. Oakes is correct, it is high time that the Canberra Government pulled its head out of the sand. Harsh Budgets only drive us further into recession. Inflation is increasing, unemployment continues to grow, and the Government has failed to stimulate business. The slashing of its own Government spending and State Government spending has been discredited. Indeed, the Government has succeeded in bringing Australia to a dead halt.

It is intolerable that a country of Australia's wealth cannot find jobs for its relatively small population. Our community pays $1 000 000 000 a year in unemployment benefits. A report in the *Age* of 9 July states:

A Victorian Minister wants the Federal Government to increase its Budget deficit and reintroduce job-creation projects. The Minister for Housing, Mr. Dixon, said yesterday he believed the Federal Government was getting carried away with its fight against inflation at the expense of unemployment . . . "In framing its Budget, the Federal Government must be prepared to create jobs and develop manpower skills in the industries, knowing that this will be in Australia's long-term interests, notwithstanding the immediate consequence of a large Budget deficit", Mr. Dixon said.

We are suffering an unacceptable drain on our economy and a shameful waste of human and material resources. The Government has a phobia that Government spending is harmful to private enterprise. Because the Government increases its spending on capital programmes, it does not mean that there will be more public servants; in fact, most capital programmes are contracted to private companies. Public investment feeds private investment and, if controlled, there is no reason why it should inflate or harm the economy.

As the private sector probably provides three out of every four jobs, business interests must play a key role in leading to any recovery, and Government programmes must be designed to facilitate the role. To place a person back in employment not only saves the community the cost of unemployment benefits but it immediately reaps for the community at least as much in income tax. From that starting point there flows further revenue in sales tax or increased purchases and corporate tax on stimulated business activity, not to mention the additional employment opportunities which this, in itself, generates. Of course, it is not only Australians who have grave doubts about where Australia is going or what sort of a mess we have got ourselves into: there are those overseas who have grave doubts as to the stability of the Australian economy. An article in the *Advertiser* of 16 May refers to a review called the International Currency Review and states:

The review, which calls itself the journal of the world financial community, makes the claims in an assessment of the Australian economy during 1978 and early this year.

"Superficially, the Australian economy might seem to have the appearance of buoyancy", it says.

"Beneath the surface, however, the economy appears to be in serious trouble. In the first place, prices pressures have again been gathering momentum—with planned oil price increases and food prices particularly worrying. Yet formal wage rises have been lagging considerably behind the surge in prices, with the result that the rate of increase in real consumer spending has been declining, while industrial disruption has been on the increase."

The review also looks at the overall price index of manufactured goods, which it says is showing a 12 per cent year-on-year increase, compared with a rate of just over 7 per cent less than 12 months before. Of interest rates, it says the Federal Government has had to "bury political humbug associated with its claims to have jawboned interest rates downwards".

I believe that it is time we proved to ourselves, as Australians, and to those who doubt our status and economy, that Australia is capable of achieving the goals expected of it. There need to be some vast changes in the thinking of the Government in Canberra. It would be a pleasant surprise if the South Australian Opposition were to adopt a broader outlook. The South Australian Government of the past nine years has been the most successful of all our State Governments.

On the one hand, the Liberal Opposition demands that the State Government curtail its expenditure, yet on the other hand members in another place, such as Mr. Becker, Mr. Goldsworthy and Mr. Tonkin, and no doubt others amonst them, demand that the State find additional funds to support their own political hobby horses.

I gasp in wonder at times when I see the prejudices bursting through from leaders of community-based organisations. I like to think that they are somewhat naive and do not understand the rough and tumble of politics, but sadly I realise that I am wrong. I know that they are

nearly always pushing political wheelbarrows in partnership with members of the Opposition.

Therefore, it is time that these people became honest and, instead of being critical of a very worthy State Government, they should lay the blame where it belongs: on the money-grabbing anti-State and very un-Australian Commonwealth Liberal Government in Canberra. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I support the motion that the Address in Reply as read be adopted. I commend His Excellency for the manner in which he opened the session on 24 May. Also, I join with His Excellency and with other honourable members in expressing sympathy to relatives of those former members who have died since the previous session.

I express my appreciation for the Parliamentary service given by Mrs. Cooper, who has just retired. Mrs. Cooper served in this Chamber since 1959. I recall clearly my contact with her in that year. Within our Party at the time there was a vigorous preselection contest being held in which two candidates were required for Central District No. 2, which was a safe Liberal district. In a strong field Mrs. Cooper, ably supported, especially by her husband and the late Sir Shirley Jeffries, waged a vigorous but fair preselection campaign.

I was then Chairman of the late Mr. Frank Potter's campaign, and was happy when Mrs. Cooper topped the poll and my friend, Mr. Potter, came second. They then entered Parliament together, and Central District No. 2 was then represented by those two members as well as by Sir Frank Perry and Sir Arthur Rymill. In 1965 Sir Frank Perry died, and I was honoured to succeed him in this place. I now look back with some sadness to see that of the four members who then represented the district as colleagues, Sir Arthur Rymill retired in 1975, Mr. Potter has died and now Mrs. Cooper has retired.

However, it is most gratifying that such able men have replaced those colleagues to whom I have just referred. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, the Hon. Mr. Griffin, and now the Hon. Mr. Legh Davis. I have referred to this brief history to indicate my close knowledge of Mrs. Cooper as a member of my Party and as a Parliamentarian, and to say that I have been proud to be associated with her. I refer to her strong determination to uphold standards, her firm resolution to maintain her views, once decided, on Bills considered by this Chamber, and her unshakeable opinion that the interests of the State and its people were paramount over Party considerations. These were all outstanding characteristics that were displayed by Mrs. Cooper throughout her Parliamentary career. Therefore, I commend her for the 20 years of service that she has given to this Council.

Also, I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Legh Davis upon his election and upon his replacement of Mrs. Cooper. I trust that he enjoys his service in this Chamber and finds it most satisfying and rewarding.

The subject with which I intend to deal today concerns the relationship between the State Government in South Australia and local government. I refer especially to the past nine years in the context of this Government's association with local government. I have been most concerned that the State Government has shown a lack of support and assistance towards local government during that period. I have referred to that period, because it began in 1970 when the Labor Party came into office, and the Labor Party has governed South Australia since that time.

The initiatives and policies of the State Government, as such initiatives and policies affect local government, have been restrictive and damaging to local government. The latest trends towards community development boards, which will result in a duplicated form of local community control, an overlapping of local community involvement and a general further downgrading of local government is a trend for which the present Government should be condemned.

In my observations of local government I speak from a position of at least some experience. From 1959 to 1968 I served as a member of the Adelaide City Council; I held the Local Government portfolio in the State Government in the period 1968-70; I have observed local government closely since 1970; and I am now the shadow Minister of Local Government for the Opposition.

I claim that over the past nine years, as a result of the Labor Party's decisions and plans affecting local government, local government is losing its traditional effectiveness as the form of government nearest the people. There is a need for a renewal of confidence in its potential as an efficient and successful third tier of government in our federal system, as we know it, in Australia.

I give reasons to substantiate my claims. My first reason goes back to 1970, when the first priority and target of the State Government regarding local government should have been to rewrite the Local Government Act. During the term of office of the Labor Government of 1965-68 an extensive inquiry was established into the revision of the Local Government Act. An extremely competent committee was established by the then Labor Government. That committee sat during 1968 and 1969, and in 1970 its report was available to the new Labor Government when it came into office. I stress that that inquiry was established by the Labor Government: it was not established by the Liberal Party. Despite that report and its recommendations, despite the obvious need (and the fact that a total revision of the Act was absolutely necessary was accepted throughout local government circles), the Government did not give that matter top priority in 1970: it did not get on with the job and it has not as yet, even after nine years, rewritten the Local Government Act. That is the first principal evidence of a failure to show the leadership that this State Government should have shown towards local government.

The second major mistake involved the doctrinaire philosophy that local government areas should be amalgamated into large regions. The Labor Party's love for compulsion became evident, and the Boundaries Commission, which originally was to be given compulsory power to force local government bodies together, against their will, was born. It is interesting to recall that at about that same time in Canberra Mr. Whitlam as Prime Minister made no secret of the fact that a central Government in Canberra, together with regions throughout Australia, was the answer to Australia's needs for Governments in the future. That policy meant the abolition of State Governments. It meant the grouping into regions of existing local government bodies throughout the land. At the same time, speeches by the then Premier of this State, Mr. Dunstan, forecast the same concept. This State Government's endeavours at that period to bring local government areas into such regions failed, and the Boundaries Commission became, in effect, what it should always have been—an advisory body. The fact that this State Government should have resorted to such compulsion against the will of small councils in this State was a body blow to those who sought leadership and help from the State Government.

Thirdly, a major change came when the State Government demanded compulsory voting and full

franchise for local government. The Government did not take local government into its confidence; the Government did not discuss these issues with local government in great depth as it should have done. This was more evidence of its love of compulsion. The hard basic truth was that local government was traditionally a property franchise, and that truth was anathema to this Government. It insisted that two lodgers or boarders in a house ought to have the right to out-vote the owner at local government elections, despite the fact that that owner paid the rates to the local governing body for local administration, and the lodgers paid nothing to local government. Time and again the State Government tried to introduce this plan, which, generally speaking, was violently opposed by local government. When at last the State Government partly succeeded, the Act would not work. The Government came back to Parliament and amended the Act on advice from local government, and even then with the existing legislation that we have got we have found in this last period of local government elections of a month ago that different councils are placing different interpretations upon the new legislation affecting that area.

Fourthly, in this sequence of major initiatives which have damaged local government since 1970, came the concept of Community Councils for Social Development. Local government was mystified that other than their local government councils these other councils for social development were being established to do social development work which local government itself had been wanting to do for years. Local government itself for years had been crying out for more power and more resources to do this same social work. But, rather than give local government this extra power, the State Government, which after all is the parent of local government, had its own scheme. The State wanted to interfere at local level with local initiatives and be involved with local community activities that quite obviously should have been the role of an expanded and encouraged system of local government by the State Labor Party.

Fifthly, closely associated with that trend was the new concept of a Ministerial portfolio of community development. The holder of this office is also the Minister of Local Government. Anyone who has the slightest idea of the pride and self-reliance of those in local government (and I am referring to elected aldermen and councillors as well as senior officers in local government) would understand that this new vision is and will be seen for what it is—an umbrella over the whole local government area, with traditional local government downgraded and enveloped beneath and within that community development concept. The Minister is trying to convince members of local government otherwise, but he will never convince them that this approach of establishing a portfolio of community development will not have the effect of downgrading local government as it has always been known and established in this State.

Lastly, the major initiative over this long period of nine years that is unacceptable to local government is the current establishment of Community Development Boards. The Community Councils for Social Development failed, and the Government's response is to change their name to Community Development Boards and to widen their composition. I quote from the proposed functions of these Community Development Boards. I take these functions from an enclosure provided by the Minister of Community Development himself and attached to letters that he has written to members in the other place in regard to service on the proposed Community Development Boards which he is now in the process of establishing. There is no doubt that these are the functions that the Government intends for such boards. They are as follows:

> *(a)* Identify and define issues of concern to the community, existing community rescources and additional rescources which may be required for the development of the community.
>
> *(b)* Facilitate the involvement of people in the community in identifying and defining key community issues and developing means of dealing with those issues.
>
> *(c)* Encourage understanding within the community of key community issues.
>
> *(d)* Promote the development of links and co-operation between organisations in the community concerned with the well being of the community.
>
> *(e)* Consult with the community on any matter referred to the community board by the Minister for consideration and report.
>
> *(f)* Report to the Minister of matters which are either referred to the community board by the Minister, or which the community board considers should be brought to the Minister's attention.
>
> *(g)* Assess the progress of the community development activities and provide feedback to the Minister.

I pose the question: why should not local government carry out those same functions? Their powers might have to be widened, their resources might need support by way of State funding, but why not give that power and those resources to local government? For nine years the State Government has been restricting local government powers. Time and time again we have had Bills before us in that period in which power has not been given to local government but has been taken away from local government. Apparently the Minister believes (now that the Minister wants these Community Development Boards with those functions that I have just read out, not only as the Minister of Community Development but also as the Minister of Local Government) that local government is not capable of doing that work? It can only be interpreted in that way by local government interests throughout this State. Having said that in regard to the Minister's concept of Community Development Boards, let me hasten to say that there is a need for community leaders who would not normally stand for council office at local government level to liaise between themselves at regular meetings and to discuss community affairs.

Such people as the local school head, senior police officer, church leaders, and Community Welfare Department officer come readily to mind. These people should meet and report their concern, if any, and other findings to the local council. Their report could be tabled at each monthly council meeting. The democratically-elected representatives on that council would deal with such reports and take the necessary action, which action could include a close liaison with the Local Government Department and the Minister of Local Government. Indeed, I go so far as to say that councils might employ community development officers and, if necessary, State financial assistance should be provided for such a resource.

However, these proposals are entirely different from this State Government's appointing its own Community Development Boards, which by-pass local government and report back directly to the Minister. Therefore, I repeat that it is my strong view that since 1970 the Government's record of planning for local government to expand its role, responsibilities and services, and the Government's record of action to implement meaningful schemes for local government, to rewrite the Local

Government Act, to give more power to local government, and to show faith and confidence in the third tier of Government has been pathetic.

Indeed, the Government's record of downgrading local government over these nine years, of finally placing it under an umbrella of community development, of giving local power and control, first, to Community Councils of Social Development and, secondly, when these did not work, to Community Development Boards, instead of giving that same power and control to elected representatives of the people within the concept of traditional local government, is a record for which this Government must be strongly criticised and condemned.

After nine years under a Labor Administration, local community affairs, which should be the real clear-cut and separate concern of local government, are rapidly becoming a conglomeration of red tape, bureaucracy, duplication, State involvement, overlap, and inefficiency. Only a Government with socialism in its veins could have achieved such confusion and such a mess.

In its approach to local government, this State Government has charted a wrong course. It should turn back and begin all over again. It should place local government in its rightful place. It should acknowledge that local government is the form of government best suited to local communities and their needs. It should acknowledge that local government is the form of government closest to the people, and it should also acknowledge that it should be the only democratically-elected and representative body at the local level.

I therefore believe that the Government should scrap its grandiose plans to have Community Development Boards, as envisaged, which boards will do nothing more than local government can do if it is given the encouragement and opportunity.

I stress again that these boards are not elected by the people at local level. They are appointed by the very Minister who should be the champion of local government and its principles. I stress, too, that these boards will lead to overlapping at local level, to inefficiency because of duplication, to confusion with local government as to local needs and priorities for action, to State interference in specifically local matters, to the Minister's friends obtaining jobs on these boards, and to a host of other unnecessary problems. Local government cries out for a new charter, a new Act, new guidelines, and new initiatives.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: And new understanding.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Exactly. Local government cries out as the third tier of government for more power and more State finance. It pleads for the chance to get on with the job, unimpeded by State interference and doctrinaire and theoretical plans of how local community problems can best be solved. However, those cries fall on deaf ears.

As the Opposition spokesman for local government, I give a firm commitment that this voice of local government will not go unheard nor unheeded when the next State Liberal Government comes to office. I support the motion.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 7 August at 2.15 p.m.