

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 19 November 1981

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

QUESTIONS

FRUIT FLY INSPECTORS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about fruit fly inspectors.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I recently saw on television a beer advertisement which showed two men in uniforms, who were purporting to be fruit fly inspectors, stop a vehicle. It was obvious that they were meant to be fruit fly inspectors; fruit was shown. In the back of the vehicle were cartons of export beer. I think that the message that this particular advertisement was trying to put across was that the beer was too good to export out of this State.

Anyway, the two men confiscated the beer and the vehicle drove off. Finally in the advertisement the men did admit that they were not genuine fruit fly inspectors.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris interjecting:

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: In the advertisement that I saw they indicated that they had obtained the uniforms under some false pretence. My concern is that this advertisement does not reflect well on fruit fly inspectors. We do have some credibility problems in this area because many people in the community are not aware of the reasons why fruit is confiscated at fruit blocks. They believe it is an imposition on their liberty. Has the Minister seen this television advertisement? If he has, does he believe that it is in the best interests of maintaining the high reputation of fruit fly inspectors? If he does not, will he contact the company concerned in the hope that it will withdraw the advertisement?

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

ARTS FUNDING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Arts a question in relation to arts funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Today a rally was organised at the Adelaide Festival Centre Plaza to protest about cuts that have occurred in arts funding. The allegation has been made that Australian theatre is under siege, that cuts in funding to theatre companies has resulted in considerable hardship. In real terms, this amounts to a 39 per cent reduction since 1974. We must remember that, during the period of the Whitlam Government, at the Federal level funding for the arts and theatre, in particular, was substantially increased. There has been a slow deterioration in funding in the years since 1974, amounting to a cut of 39 per cent.

The allegation has been made that this year eight companies have lost their funding from the Australia Council, and most other companies have had their allocations reduced by about 20 per cent. In South Australia, the Stage Company has had all its funding cut and other companies

have been affected. It is further alleged that 400 jobs are under threat, and that there will be fewer opportunities for playwrights, composers and choreographers to have their work performed. Also, it is alleged that the film and television industry will suffer through the dissipation of the valuable training that theatre provides.

In addition to the substantial cuts mentioned at the Federal level, there have also been cuts in funds to the arts at a State level as a result of the State Government's tightening up and difficult financial position. Does the Minister agree that the protest about the cuts in funds for the arts, in particular for live theatre, is justified? What steps does the Minister intend to take with the Federal Government or by reinstating the level of State funding to the arts to try to solve the problem?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refute entirely the suggestion by the Leader that the State Government is reducing its funding to the arts. I have just come back from that meeting, at which I was privileged to speak. I quoted to the gathering the vast increases in the allocations to the arts in this State.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Mr Bannon's speech was better.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In your opinion it would be. I quoted these increases which, as far as the State's contribution to the arts is concerned, are quite staggering. I can produce those same figures and details of the same speech for the honourable member if he so wishes.

The purpose of the meeting was to object to some of the reductions in funding made by the Australia Council to performing arts companies in this State. As I said at the meeting, those reductions have been most regrettable. I support the general call in this State at the present moment (a call which is echoed all around Australia) that the Federal Government should not reduce its funding to the performing arts. In regard to what action we are taking, first, we are endeavouring to stretch ourselves to the very limit in our own allocations to the performing companies so that they can survive. Secondly, I have written to the Federal Minister expressing my concern and the State Government's concern. The Director of the Department for the Arts is in Sydney today having discussions on the matter. We are, as a State Government, doing all we can to overcome the problem that is being occasioned by the reductions by the Australia Council to the performing arts in this State.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Have you taken up the matter with the Federal Minister?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have just said so.

DENTURES SCHEME

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question on dentures for pensioners.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Members will no doubt recall that yesterday I also asked questions about this matter. I referred to the fact that the Minister of Health had announced 12 months ago that there would be a spectacle service available for pensioners in country areas, and that it would be introduced early this year. In fact, 12 months later nothing has happened. I also said that she ultimately had to admit to the member for Whyalla, Mr Brown, in the House of Assembly that the principal reason why it had not happened was that the Government had run out of money.

I referred to that at the time as a cruel confidence trick. I suggested that the announcement about the \$10 and \$25

dentures for pensioners, which appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser* on Monday or Tuesday this week, might also be a cruel confidence trick on the pensioners. Members will no doubt recall that I asked from where the money would come. I have since discovered, although I have not yet received an answer from the Minister, from where the money will come. It transpires that this is not a cruel confidence trick on the pensioners; it is a cruel confidence trick on the parents of every primary school child in South Australia, because the money is to come from the Budget allocation for the school dental programme.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: I very much doubt it.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The Minister may doubt it as much as he likes, but my information is spot on.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The question is not misleading; it is based on direct information. It is extraordinary, as I said yesterday (and I do not want to be guilty of undue prolixity), that no mention of money was made in the press announcement. No-one, the Minister in particular, said where the money was to come from. I will tell the Council where it will come from—the Government will steal it from the school dental health programme.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: From the mouths of children.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: From the mouths of babes and sucklings. Will the Minister confirm that the money to be used for the pensioner dental programme will be stolen from the fixed Budget allocation for the school dental programme, and is this the first step in dismantling the school dental programme, which is being pressed with some vigour by the Government?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

ARTS FUNDING

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Arts a question about grants for artistic and cultural purposes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members will be aware that from time to time I have commented about what I have considered to be adequate grants for artistic purposes in this State. However, I believe that the distribution of priorities has not always been for the benefit of all concerned. I had some part, I suppose, in persuading the Government to make a significant increase in assistance for serious music and the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra in particular. I know that the Minister has been quite generous in the amounts made available for the State Theatre Company, the South Australian Film Corporation and other artistic ventures. Will the Minister agree that the sums made available have been generous, and will he give the Council further information on the matter?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I should commend the Hon. Mr Dawkins for his question based on his deep and extremely genuine interest in the arts in this State. Any honourable member who has had the privilege of listening to choral items provided by Mr Dawkins's choir will have enjoyed a memorable performance. From time to time, he has brought pressure on me to ensure that the State maintains adequate funding in the arts.

An earlier question was asked on this subject based on an explanation which included some absolutely incorrect information. The honourable member asking that question indicated that this State had reduced its funding for the arts during the term of the present Government. The fact is that, since 1979, the Government has increased its fund-

ing to the arts by \$1 882 000. In 1979-80, the arts received an allocation of \$10 427 683. That allocation has been increased in the current 1981-82 year to \$12 310 000. The present Government is justly proud of that. However, the Government does not rest its claim that it is strongly supporting the arts on these vast aggregated sums. In addition, in two years of Government we have increased the allocation to alternate theatre in this State (and this involves the little people, not the top professional people) from \$77 800 in 1979 to \$185 000 in the current year. The 'Grants and provision for the arts' line in the Budget—which honourable members who are interested in this subject would know—covers a whole host of activities ranging from an individual being given a grant to learn to become a potter, to sending a talented youngster overseas for study, to funding the Adelaide Festival of Arts. The allocation for that line has increased from \$1 750 000 to \$2 580 000. Surely that is evidence of the real support being given to the arts by the present Government.

In relation to the specific matter raised by the Hon. Mr Dawkins, I can recall two years ago that he brought a deputation to see me about a funding allocation for the symphony orchestra. As a result of that deputation, the Government agreed at that time that the orchestra should have more strings and that more money was needed. The Government increased the allocation at that stage by a large sum up to \$185 000. I am now informed that, with those additional strings, the symphony orchestra is performing better than it has ever performed before. Notwithstanding that, the Government has allocated a further \$10 000 to the symphony orchestra for this current year. Surely all these facts are evidence of the Government's honouring its promise that it will maintain the thrust in the arts in South Australia.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister advise the Council when he has received a reply to his representations to the Minister for Home Affairs (Mr Wilson)?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall be pleased to do that.

DRUG INQUIRY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister, either the Hon. Mr Burdett or the Hon. Mr Hill, representing the Attorney-General, who I think has gone to Tasmania.

The PRESIDENT: Order! What is the Hon. Mr Foster's question?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My question is about drug trafficking and the Royal Commission that was set up in relation to that matter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I have repeatedly directed questions to the Attorney-General about the South Australian Government's involvement in some sort of private inquiry about drugs and related matters. I have repeatedly told the Attorney-General that the South Australian Government should act responsibly and join the Royal Commission involving the Federal Government and the three Eastern State Governments. To that the Attorney has replied that I should do research through the Parliamentary Library. That was not necessary, and I apologise to the Parliamentary Library staff for having taken up their time in respect of the matter. I now want to draw the attention of the Acting Attorney, if I can call him that, to pages 1465 and 1466 of the *Commonwealth Record* in respect of the matters.

May I also say that a public announcement was made from Canberra, when Mr Grant Nhill, Parliamentary Press reporter from this State was in Canberra, in respect of the drugs inquiry, and I want you to underline this in your memory. I refer to the Mr Asia ring, the one in which Terrence Clark was involved. He is now in prison in England, and he used the alias Sinclair. It is also interesting to see in the same paper from the library details about the Royal Commission into drug trafficking—terms of reference and everything else in respect of that matter. The Royal Commission was set up by the Federal Government. The *Record* states:

The Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Malcolm Fraser, said that Commonwealth-State police task groups have already been established to deal with particular aspects of the drug problem as follows:

There is half a page in respect of that. In regard to the Attorney attempting to get away from his responsibility, I do not want to weary the Council and I would like to have this document inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. I seek leave to do so if that is possible. It is not lengthy: it is a page and half.

The PRESIDENT: How much is statistical?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: This is lifted directly from the *Commonwealth Record*, pages 1465 and 1466, as supplied by the Parliamentary Library service.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Is it statistical?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No, it is not. It spells out the kinds of people who ought to be investigated and who are named directly by the Royal Commission. One is Terrence Clark, alias Sinclair, and I have said repeatedly in this Council that it is more than suspicious. It is in books and records of court cases that Clark, Mr Asia, this murderer and scoundrel, was in this city almost on the evening on which Wilson and his wife were murdered in Melbourne. Clark was here. He got bogus passports.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: How do you know?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I ask you to find out through your Attorney-General and the Royal Commission. I know from what I have read. I suggest that you read the book *Greed* in the library, and other authoritative sources on the matter. Not only are specific dates given when this person was here, but they give the names of people who were here with him and who are no longer living here. It was here that he orchestrated the false passport for himself, and it was here that the female couriers were organised and recruited. The way that was published, together with the continued refusal of the Attorney-General to involve South Australia in the way suggested by the Prime Minister in this document, leads me to believe he has something to hide.

It is stated that the Royal Commissioner, Mr Justice Stewart, will bring a former policeman's knowledge to bear on the drug ring inquiry, so he is a former policeman. I ask once more whether the Acting Attorney-General will have a submission drawn up by the Attorney-General's Department, through the Attorney-General, for Cabinet discussion, and then invite the Royal Commission to take note of that decision and include the South Australian drug trafficking scene in its ambit of investigation. I ask no more and no less than that. For three weeks the little bloke who is not here today has dodged the question and almost misled the Council by saying that the South Australian Government has to be invited. I have here the document and the Prime Minister's statement that gives the lie to that. It is the Attorney's responsibility, and the State's responsibility, to co-operate with that Royal Commission set up under the powers of the Commonwealth. Can the Acting Minister comply with that request?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Regarding the comments made about the Attorney-General, I point out that the Attorney-General is absent on Ministerial business. On Tuesday, he told the Leader of the Opposition in this place that he would be away. I heard that conversation. As I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition agreed to his being absent. No point should be taken about the fact that he is not here. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Attorney-General when he returns, and no doubt he will bring back a suitable reply.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I have a supplementary question. My understanding is that, when a Minister or a Leader of a Chamber is not available in the Chamber, the affairs of the Chamber go on uninterrupted, even regarding Bills coming before the Chamber that normally fall within the portfolio of that Minister. As a practising lawyer, why does the Minister of Community Welfare consider that the matter should be declared a non-question, when lawyers are specifically mentioned in this particular document as having carried out their responsibilities, both those lawyers who are elected to Parliament and those outside of Parliament?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I took the reply to the question because I am Acting Attorney-General. I did not say that it was a non-question at all. What I said was that I would refer it to the Attorney-General on his return and he would doubtless take appropriate action. The only other comment that I made was to point out that I felt that reference to the Attorney-General's not being present was not appropriate, because he is absent on Ministerial business and had spoken to the Leader of the Opposition about that matter.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I have a further supplementary question and previously I have raised this matter many times. In future, when a Minister or the Leader of the House is away, a brief note should be made available to the Opposition, as to who represents that person in his absence. This is done in every other Parliament in the Commonwealth.

The PRESIDENT: It is not very hard to find out. You need only ask.

HOSPITAL STATISTICS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about hospital statistics.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Two days ago the Minister tabled in this Chamber a report from the committee set up to report on abortion, which was previously known as the Mallen Committee and which is now known as the Cox Committee, being named after its Chairman. This report detailed the statistics on abortions for 1980, and included information relating to the number of terminations of pregnancy carried out in the five metropolitan teaching hospitals. These made up 72.8 per cent of the total number of terminations. No information at all was given regarding the hospitals at which the remaining terminations had been carried out.

In fact, there are 1 057 terminations for which no information is given regarding the hospital in which these abortions were done. The Health Commission must have this data because, following an amendment to the abortion law initiated by a private member (the current Minister of Mines and Energy), it is now necessary for hospitals, as well as doctors, to notify the Health Commission of any termination of pregnancy that is carried out. Will the Minister provide a list of the other hospitals where the 1 057

terminations were carried out in 1980, and say how many of these terminations occurred in each hospital?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Health and bring down a reply.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about domestic violence.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am sure that honourable members from both sides of the Chamber have much concern about the amount of domestic violence and unruly behaviour that has occurred in the community, not only in South Australia but throughout the Commonwealth. Earlier this week, before the Attorney-General left to undertake Government business in Perth—where he is today—he released a report on domestic violence. As I believe that the Department for Community Welfare has a Crisis Care Unit, which is closely involved in this area, can the Minister indicate how the unit dealt with problems of this nature that have occurred during the past financial year, and what other problems are dealt with by that unit?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: According to the department's annual report, which I recently tabled, domestic violence remains the most frequent cause for crisis care involvement in the community. The honourable member asked how the unit operates, and I can tell him that I have visited the unit on several occasions. Its operations are most impressive. It has a 24-hour telephone service, and involves volunteers as well as professionals, although only professionals actually go out in the cars when it is deemed necessary for an officer to be present.

The volunteers handle some of the telephone calls, of which there are many. The cars are equipped with a two-way radio and, of course, they are in contact with the police. It is most impressive to go on some of the calls and see the severe problems that very disturbed people have who are helped by unit officers.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Has the Minister an idea of the number of cases attended?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes. The Attorney-General's report reflects the Government's concern about this problem. There is a continuing demand for counselling and follow-up by community welfare officers in the area of parent-child conflict (that is a fairly serious area), and also in regard to sexual assaults, severe depression, and various problems relating to children. During 1980-81, the Crisis Care Unit had contact with 36 000 people through its 24-hour telephone service. The unit was involved in personal visits on 2 105 occasions. Of this number, 664 problems related to violence and/or domestic discord; a further 521 problems related to children; and other visits involved other traumatic experiences, personal problems, accommodation difficulties and other miscellaneous problems. The department's unit is a leader in Australia, particularly because of its close liaison with the police. In fact, 40 per cent of its work emanates from contacts made with the police.

MEDICINE FOR THE SICK

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about medicine for the sick.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Before lunch a press article was brought to my notice concerning a cancer patient by the name of George Woods at Mile End. This cancer patient could not afford the \$14 for the medicine required, and he had to go without. The report states:

His wife, Mary, has muscular atrophy which has affected her hand, heart and leg muscles, making it difficult to cook and care for their five children. 'Medicines seem to be coming off the free list and it's getting harder to manage,' Mrs Woods said. Her eyes filled with tears when she described how poverty was robbing her children of opportunities.

She went on to describe the situation concerning her children, how it was affecting her children and how she could not give them the opportunities she would have liked to give them. The report continues:

'When George couldn't get his medicine today I just got my Irish dander up and felt someone should speak out about what is happening in this country,' she said. Mr Woods had a colostomy operation five years ago and said suppositories, needed for his comfort, were no longer available on the free list. 'Pensioners just can't get everything they need,' Mrs Woods said. 'George has been in pain all weekend. The tablets the doctor prescribed for him today were \$14 for only 30.'

The Woods have been dogged by bad luck since arriving from Scotland 14 years ago. Apart from ill health, they have had a wheelchair and motor car stolen.

I know that much of this goes on in the community. Several similar cases have been brought to my notice. Only last week my elderly mother was staying with me. I obtained a tonic prescription for her at a cost of \$10, but only \$3 could be saved. My mother told me that she had the medicine prescribed for her in Melbourne but that she could not afford to pay for it. Honourable members know that this situation is prevalent in our society, especially since the last budget. Such matters have been brought to the notice of members of Parliament previously, and if I knew where Mr and Mrs Woods lived I would pay for the medicine myself. This situation should be directed to the Minister of Community Welfare. Will the Minister follow up this report and see whether he can contact the Woods so that his department can give these people some relief by way of money and support that they seem to need in their difficulty, if this press report is true?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The matter is clearly a health matter and is a question of payment for drugs. Obviously, it is a Federal matter. I will contact the other Ministers who may be involved and bring back a report to the Council for the honourable member.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I desire to ask a supplementary question. The Minister should not fob off that rubbish on me. These people are in need today. When the former Labor Government was in office, I brought such matters to the attention of the then Minister (Bud Abbott), and those people received immediate relief. These people do not want to wait until after Christmas, or until when we next meet in two weeks time—the Minister's reply usually takes a couple of months, anyway. Surely, community welfare facilities are there to provide for the welfare of people in need in the community. I do not want the Minister to refer this matter to Mrs Adamson—I want him to take up his responsibility as the Minister of Community Welfare and look after these people. Will the Minister do it or not?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will take the appropriate action. It is clear that the responsibility for the provision of drugs does not rest with the Department for Community Welfare. The only way in which my department could assist them would be in emergency financial relief, and that could not be provided on an on-going basis. It would be for one lot of drugs, if the money could not be obtained from any other source.

The honourable member who asked the question and every honourable member opposite knows well that there

is no funding available, and that there never has been, within the budget of the department, for on-going financial assistance to purchase drugs. There is a place where that is done, but whether it is done adequately or not is another matter. The appropriate place for that is with the Commonwealth Government. I have said that I will take appropriate action, and I will.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I desire to ask a supplementary question. I am going to ask the Minister again. I understand what he has said. Emergency relief is available. The Minister said that he will not obtain emergency relief—

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I did not say that.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will ask the Minister and put him on the spot: will the Minister investigate this matter and provide emergency relief to these people today—now?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: As I have said, the matter will be investigated and action taken.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Is the Minister so irresponsible that he cannot give a direct answer? Will he investigate this matter under his charter and provide emergency relief to these people today: will the Minister say 'Yes' or 'No'? Don't hide behind your glasses.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not hiding behind my glasses. I will take them off if the honourable member would like me to. There is no question of hiding behind anything. There are guidelines for emergency financial assistance. An application is made at the local district office and assessed by the district office there. I have said that I will take whatever action is appropriate, and that I will do.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Minister has still not answered my question. Will he take action today and have the matter investigated? This man is in pain with cancer. He does not want to wait two or three weeks. He wants help today.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have given my answer.

M.V. ISLANDER

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Can the Minister representing the Premier advise whether any State Government finance or guarantees are involved in the construction of the M.V. *Islander* or any facility used by the vessel at Kingscote or Cape Jervis? Is any State Government finance or guarantee involved in the operation of the vessel? Has any request for financial or other assistance been made by the operators of the vessel since its commissioning? If so, what is the nature of the request and what consideration has been given to the request?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Premier and bring back a reply.

POLAND

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs a question on the situation in Poland.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Honourable members will be aware of the difficult situation which has existed and which still exists in Poland. Honourable members will be aware of the considerable hardship in that community as a result of the shortages of food, medicine and clothing. In Australia there have been appeals for medical relief through the Medical Relief Fund for Poland. Recently a committee was established—the Australian National Committee for Relief to Poland—under the Chairmanship of Mr Frank Galbally,

this committee having been initiated by the Federal Council of Polish Organisations in Australia. The purpose of the committee is to raise money to purchase foodstuffs, medicine and clothing. Already relief has gone from Australia in the form of medical supplies and other relief to Poland.

The appeal has been launched in South Australia, and the South Australian Government I believe gave \$1 000 to that appeal. I have been contacted by some people in the Polish community who considered that contribution to be somewhat less than generous, although nevertheless welcome. It has been pointed out that one of the problems is the delay in getting material sent from Australia to Poland. The mode of transport of parcels to date, I believe, has been surface mail, and the material takes a considerable time (up to three months) to arrive. The suggestion has been put to me that the Government could assist further in this matter by providing assistance in the area of transporting materials to Poland that are purchased with funds raised as a result of the appeal. Will the Government consider increasing its grant to this fund? Further, will the Government consider other ways in which assistance can be given to the fund and whether assistance with sending foodstuffs and other supplies to Poland can be given?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand that two grants have been made. I shall get the exact details of that. I believe that the first grant was specifically for the medical cause. That appeal was launched and closed before the main appeal to which the honourable member has referred was launched.

We are considering at the moment other ways of helping Polish people. The recent letter which I as Minister received from the appeal committee has gone to the Ethnic Affairs Commission for processing. I expect to hear more of that shortly. I can assure the honourable member that the Government holds the Polish community in this State in high regard and respect and supports its cause totally as far as oppression in Poland is concerned. I shall obtain a report on the whole question from the Ethnic Affairs Commission and bring back answers to the questions that the Leader has asked.

STATUTORY BODIES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my question of 27 October on statutory bodies?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am advised by the Minister of Agriculture that the honourable member would now be aware that the Statute Revision (Fruit Pests) Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council on 10 November and that this measure aims *inter alia* at the repeal of those Acts which established various organisations described in his question.

MEAT HYGIENE LEGISLATION

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my question on meat hygiene legislation?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Government's policy for application of the slaughterhouse provisions of the meat hygiene legislation was clearly outlined in a Ministerial statement of 4 March 1981. As intimated in that statement any far-reaching legislative measure applying to a diverse and complex industry faces early problems, and for this reason the Government has been cautious in its approach to the matter.

At one stage it was felt there could be merit in the honourable member's suggestion concerning a pamphlet outlining the requirements expected of slaughterhouse operators but on reflection it was decided to maintain liaison with the industry on a 'needs' basis.

This has been effected by written communications with slaughterhouse operators and district councils, visits to individual works, and meetings with local government representatives throughout the State. The fostering of a close relationship with local government is in keeping with the view put forward in the Ministerial statement of 4 March, that councils should accept full responsibility for the regulations which they collectively drafted and which were subsequently incorporated in the legislation.

Monitoring of the situation has continued and the Minister of Agriculture informs me that in order to meet the further needs of industry it is proposed to:

- (i) hold a series of field days involving slaughterhouse operators and local government health surveyors at various slaughterhouse premises.
- (ii) establish a suitable course under the auspices of the Department of Further Education. However, full details of that course are yet to be determined.

FORESTRY MANAGEMENT

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Minister of Consumer Affairs a reply to the question I asked on 16 September about Forestry Management Proprietary Limited?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The matter has been investigated and details of the mailing of brochures have been obtained from Forestry Management Proprietary Limited. 150 000 new brochures were printed in April-May 1981 and distribution was commenced in June 1981. The first batch of new brochures has been exhausted and a new batch of 150 000 was delivered to the company during the week ending 9 October 1981. In the circumstances the company is unable to offer any explanation as to how the honourable member received an old brochure in August 1981. However, the company has undertaken to ensure that no further old brochures are distributed.

TAMPONS

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about tampons.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As honourable members would know, tampons are used by millions of women in Australia on a regular basis. I am sure that all women who use tampons would agree that they are very much a necessity of life and certainly not a luxury. It was with considerable amazement that I learned recently that, under the Federal Government's proposed sales tax arrangements, tampons would be subjected to the highest percentage tax increase because the Federal Government believes that they are luxury goods and, therefore, should come into the highest tax category. This is really quite outrageous, as I am sure everyone will agree.

Further, I was very shocked to learn that tampons are not subjected to quality control tests for sterilisation and so on. Presumably, this has contributed to the growing number of toxic shock cases that have been reported in the press in recent months. Will the Minister make representations to

her Federal colleague to ensure that the amount of sales tax on tampons is not increased and, secondly, will she make further representations to see that tampons are subjected to quality control tests as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

ABORTION PAMPHLET

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about an abortion pamphlet.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: My question is the next instalment of a very long saga: I have been asking questions about the promised pamphlet on abortion since 25 October 1979. I will not bore the Council with a detailed recapitulation of the questions, answers, non-answers and delays to which I have been subjected. I received the latest answer on 11 November this year, which stated that the draft pamphlet, which had been prepared by the committee appointed to report on abortion in South Australia, has been market tested and is now in the final stages of preparation.

The phrase 'market tested' strikes me as very odd indeed in relation to a pamphlet on abortion. Does this mean that the pamphlet has been tested by showing it to a random sample of women who are considering an abortion? What on earth does 'market tested' mean in relation to such a pamphlet? Will the Minister say on whom the pamphlet has been market tested—was it pregnant women, health professionals, or community groups and, if it was the latter, which community groups were involved? How many people in each category have been used to market test this pamphlet, and what was the result of the 'market testing'?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

ADELAIDE PERMANENT BUILDING SOCIETY

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to a question I asked on 30 October about the Adelaide Permanent Building Society?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Following the annual general meeting of the Adelaide Permanent Building Society held on 28 September 1981, it was alleged that there may have been some technical defects in the voting procedure for the election of directors. Although it would seem clear at this stage that the outcome of the voting would have been the same had these defects not been present, inquiries are being made by the Registrar as there is also a question as to whether the rules of the society conflict with section 58 of the Act. Different opinions have been expressed on this question, and the Registrar has requested a Crown Law opinion. However, I am informed that the society is already reviewing its rules with a view to introducing rules which provide that each member shall have one vote.

As regards the question of loans to two of the directors of the society, it is advised that one of the elected directors did apply to the society for a \$50 000 long-term loan on the security of a first mortgage. The loan was applied for on 14 July 1981, approved by the board on 23 September 1981, and only funded on 29 September 1981, one day after the annual general meeting of the society. This money could therefore not have been used for the purpose of buying shares in the society. The last loan approved to the

other director was on 20 March 1981 for the purchase of a commercial property.

As far as the question of whether land agents should be excluded from being directors of a building society is concerned, I do not consider that there is any reason why land agents should be specifically excluded.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to a question I asked on 17 September about Government employment?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Government has been keeping a central record of separations which would differentiate between resignations and retirements only since October 1980. The extensive search of the pay records of individual departments which would be required to obtain that information between September 1979 and October 1980 is not justified.

However, it is the expressly stated policy of this Government that there will be no retrenchment of weekly paid employees except for persons who are employed for a specific term or project or who are dismissed for malingering, inefficiency, neglect of duty, misconduct or other sufficient cause.

The number of employees dismissed under the misconduct provisions is very small, and no permanent weekly paid employee has been retrenched. The reduction in numbers has wholly been achieved by voluntary separations (whether resignation or retirement) including the retirement of 535 employees from the Engineering and Water Supply Department and Public Buildings Department through the voluntary early retirement scheme offered last year.

HOUSING

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: With reference to the reply to the Question on Notice concerning housing given on 1 October 1981, will the Minister advise:

1. The locations of the six houses awaiting demolition for roadworks as referred to in part IV of the reply?
2. When is it anticipated each of these houses will be demolished for this purpose?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) 42 Grand Junction Road, Rosewater.
- (b) 46 Grand Junction Road, Rosewater.
- (c) 57 Grand Junction Road, Rosewater.
- (d) 338 Port Road, Port Adelaide.
- (e) 784 South Road, Edwardstown.
- (f) 11 Liddon Place, Port Adelaide.
2. (a) Mid-November 1981.
- (b) Mid-November 1981.
- (c) Mid-November 1981.
- (d) Now demolished.
- (e) End November 1981.
- (f) End November 1981.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Housing) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorise execution on behalf of this State of an agreement between the Commonwealth, the States and the Northern Territory relating to housing; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The 1978 Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement expired on 30 June 1981. There have been numerous discussions at Ministerial and officer level since December 1979 on the subject of a new five-year agreement. The agreement as it has now been authorised by Federal Parliament in the Housing Assistance Act, 1981, is attached. Major changes from the 1978 agreement include:

- The objectives have been enlarged to include attention being given to energy conservation policies, to the needs of handicapped people, and to encouragement of tenant participation.
- A base level of funds for the five years of the agreement is provided for: \$200 000 000 a year.
- Provision has been allowed for non-earmarked grant funds to be made available under the agreement.
- The purposes for which funds may be used have been widened to include provision of rental subsidies for private tenants.

There has been considerable publicity of late concerning the fact that the Commonwealth has reduced financial assistance to the States for welfare housing significantly over the past few financial years. In 1977-78 \$400 000 000 was provided, and this excluded the Northern Territory, which is now included. The 1981 agreement provides for supplementation of the base \$200 000 000 from the Commonwealth Budget, and the Budget brought down by the Federal Treasurer in August provided \$50 000 000 for this purpose. Aboriginal housing grants of \$12 200 000 previously provided by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs have now been absorbed into the Housing Agreement. Thus, total funds provided by the Commonwealth under the agreement for 1981-82 will be \$262 200 000. South Australia's share is \$34 700 000; this compares with last year's figure of \$37 300 000, or \$39 700 000 if the Aboriginal housing funds previously provided separately are included.

Notwithstanding some unsatisfactory aspects of the agreement, South Australia seems to have little choice but to sign it. The agreement will have to be signed by 31 December 1981 or else the funds which South Australia has already been receiving since 1 July will have to be refunded, and further funding foregone. I am sure all members of the House will support this Bill. Some of the innovations in the provision of housing assistance which will be possible under the new agreement, such as providing subsidies to private tenants and help to private mortgagors in difficulties, are not activities which State legislation specifically provides for at present. Accordingly, the Bill also includes powers for those State instrumentalities which are allocated funds under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement to spend them in accordance with the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. I seek leave to have the explanation of the four clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 defines the agreement. Clause 3 authorises the execution of the agreement and requires the Treasurer to carry out its terms. It also authorises any necessary appropriation and ratifies acts that may have been done in anticipation of the agreement coming into force.

Clause 4 provides that loans or grants under the agreement are to be made by the Treasurer with the approval of the Minister. Subclause (2) provides that any body or authority to which a loan or grant is to be made under the agreement is authorised to accept the loan or grant and to

apply the moneys lent or granted in accordance with the terms and conditions on which the loan or grant is made.

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

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE BILL

Read a third time and passed.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 November. Page 1940.)

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill with considerable enthusiasm. The Bill is of considerable significance for the Savings Bank of South Australia and for the banking system in this State. It updates a number of provisions contained in the Savings Bank of South Australia Act. In particular, and most significantly, it also extends the bank's lending and investment powers and its capacity to compete in the market place for funds.

Labor completely supports any move to strengthen the State banking system and has done so ever since Labor was elected to Government in this State in 1965 after many years of Liberal Government. Unfortunately, some of the attempts made by Labor to strengthen the State banking system have been thwarted, particularly by the Liberal Party and its supporters in this State. I believe that it is somewhat ironical that a Liberal Government is introducing this legislation to strengthen the community banking system, which is represented by the Savings Bank of South Australia—

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: What is ironical about it?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Because in the past when moves have been made to strengthen the State banking system, the Liberal Party has opposed them. The Liberal Party branded those moves as socialisation, attempts to increase the public sector, attempts to decry the role of the private sector, and attempts to attack free enterprise in South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: The whole situation has changed with the demise of banks.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Laidlaw has made a very pertinent remark and I could not agree with him more: the whole situation has changed with the demise of banks. It is all very well for him to make that comment now. If he and his colleagues in the Liberal Party had had a bit more foresight 10 or 15 years ago they might have foreseen the developments that were going to occur in South Australia, in the South Australian banking system and in the economy in general, and they might have lent some support to the State banking system.

Instead of lending support to it, they tried to decry the attempts by the Dunstan and Walsh Governments to strengthen that system, and we all know that at one stage during the term of office of the Labor Government from 1965 to 1968 the Liberal Party organised a run on the Savings Bank of South Australia because of certain proposals that were suggested at that time by the Labor Government. I think the Liberals recognise (and it seems as though the Hon. Mr Laidlaw now recognises it) the foolishness and stupidity of the action that the Liberal Party took then.

It is for that reason that I say it is somewhat ironical that now a Liberal Government is introducing this legislation. I suspect that, had a Labor Government introduced it, that Government would have been condemned by the Liberal Party on the basis that it was another attempt to increase the public sector and interfere with private enterprise.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: A socialist plot.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. The Hon. Mr Laidlaw sits grinning in the corner. We remember the attitude that the Liberal Party adopted towards the State Government Insurance Commission, and I am sure that no Government in this State would now want to be without the commission and the benefit that it produces in terms of having in this State at least one insurance company where the decisions are made by South Australians for South Australians.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: At least I bank with the State Bank. With whom do you bank?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That is something that I will disclose to the member if need be when the disclosure of pecuniary interests legislation comes about. I do have an account with the Savings Bank of South Australia, although I should say that I currently owe the bank considerably more than it owes me. Also, just to show that I am not one-eyed about this, I have an account with one of the private banks. I believe in a mixed economy and give practical effect to it in my day-to-day decisions.

I still believe that, had this legislation been introduced by a Labor Government, it would have been condemned by the Liberal Party as being opposed to free enterprise. We clearly, unequivocally and without apology support the strengthening of the State banking system in South Australia. Two reasons for that have become evident to the Government in recent times. They were evident to a Labor Government earlier but were ignored by the Liberal Party.

The first is that there is now no private bank in South Australia with its base, head office, and major investors in this State. Since the demise of the Bank of Adelaide about 12 months ago, the only South Australian banks that have existed are the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank. They are the community-owned or State-owned banks, whichever way we like to put it. Surely that is sufficient reason for wanting to strengthen the system so that at least there is some capacity within the State to have investment decisions made here to ensure that funds are available at the South Australian level so that money can be invested in a way that the South Australian community considers beneficial, not in a way that may be considered beneficial by the controllers of the other banks, who have no particular interest in South Australia.

The second reason for having a strong State banking system is related to the demise of our private bank in South Australia and to the amalgamation of banking operations in this country in the past three years. There are now three big private banks, being the National Bank, A.N.Z. Bank, and the Bank of New South Wales, and in the public sector at the national level there are the Commonwealth Trading Bank and the Commonwealth Savings Bank. There has been a concentration of power in those three banks and there is not in any of them any direct connection in terms of decision making or allocating of investment funds with South Australia.

This trend, which is characterised by the situation with the take-over of the Bank of Adelaide, for South Australia to become a branch office State has accelerated considerably in recent times. One only has to refer to the take-overs that have occurred in the past two years to know that there has been a considerable take-over of South Australian business by interests from other States. I refer to Allied Rubber Mills, the Bank of Adelaide, Elders-G.M., John Martins,

and Quarry Industries. They are all South Australian industries that have been taken over by larger organisations, and the control of those companies has been taken out of this State and moved interstate.

I do not believe that we in South Australia can be over-parochial, nor should we be, about the take-overs that have occurred. I do not believe that any State in Australia ought to be over-parochial about that. In Queensland there is parochial legislation and it has interfered with some of the take-overs that have been projected in that State but I think we must accept that Australia is a nation, that it has a national economy, and that adjustments in the company control area and in the banking and finance system will occur on a national basis.

Whilst I do not think we can be unduly parochial, I believe it is important that at least some capacity remain in South Australia to influence investment decisions and the local economy, and that there ought to be companies in South Australia where the control rests with this State. One example of excessive parochialism is well known to the Hon. Mr Laidlaw. Adelaide and Brighton Cement, a South Australian company, was prevented, in effect, from expanding its activities in Queensland. The Queensland Government, allegedly a free enterprise Government, will not provide the South Australian company with the space on the wharves to enable it to unload products from South Australia. That is an example of parochialism that we must guard against. It is important that management and entrepreneurs in South Australia be sufficiently up to date to be able to compete on the national stage and to maintain viable South Australian companies with control in South Australia. It is also important that these companies are not kept in South Australia purely by some kind of protection or excessive subsidy, but that they are able to become strong South Australian companies in their capacity to compete on the national market.

The sort of action that the Bjelke-Petersen Government has taken against this South Australian company does not assist the general development of Australia. I say that in support of the proposition that we cannot be too parochial about these questions. We are a part of a national economy and we ought to primarily see things in that light.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: Hear, hear!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Laidlaw says 'Hear, hear'. Having said that, I point out that there are interests which South Australia does have and which must be looked at. It was important to South Australia that there was a private bank, as well as the State banks in South Australia, in the form of the Bank of Adelaide, so that there could be some local direction and control over certain investment decisions. That has now been lost. The loss of the Bank of Adelaide, combined with the increasing concentration of power and control in the general banking system, makes it more and more imperative that our State banking system be strengthened. I do not want today to go into ways that that banking system can be strengthened; that can be left for another day. Certainly, the provisions in this Bill go a considerable way towards freeing the strictures that previously existed on the Savings Bank of South Australia, and they therefore deserve the full support of the South Australian Parliament.

The second reason (and this may be a hypothetical reason at this stage) why I think there is a need to strengthen the State banking system is in relation to the possible ramifications of the Campbell Report, which was released two days ago. The general argument in the Campbell Report was for deregulation of the finance system in Australia. There are recommendations to allow foreign banks to open offices and to compete more openly in Australia. The general argument in the Campbell Report was for more open-

ness and competition and less protection for the existing financial institutions.

I do not know whether that report will be accepted by the Federal Government. Certainly, there has to be a lot of consideration given to the report before it is accepted, because considerable fear has been expressed that if that report is implemented there will be an effect on interest rates, particularly interest rates for home purchases, and this will have an adverse effect on the people of South Australia who traditionally have wanted to buy their own homes. This is an area in which the Savings Bank and State Bank in South Australia have been particularly prominent. If the recommendations of the Campbell Report are accepted, then that is a second reason for the need to ensure that there is a strong State banking system in South Australia, because the competition presumably will be tougher between existing major private enterprise banks and other financial institutions, such as credit unions, building societies and financial companies particularly, if foreign banks are allowed into Australia.

If that happens, then it is imperative that there be a strong State banking sector, based in the South Australian community. If there is not, then South Australians will completely lose control over financial situations in this State. I said earlier that the S.G.I.C., together with the State banking system, should in the future play an important role in ensuring that South Australian Governments have control over investment decisions and some control over social and economic priorities that are to be implemented in South Australia. For those reasons I, and the Labor Party, fully endorse this Bill in so far as it gives greater authority to the Savings Bank of South Australia. I believe that further consideration should be given to strengthening the State banking system in this State.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Like the Hon. Mr Sumner, I, too, think this is an important Bill because it widens significantly the powers of the Savings Bank of South Australia to borrow, lend and invest. The Savings Bank, as we know it, is by far the largest financial institution in this State. As at 30 June 1981, it held \$1 200 000 000 in deposits, and this was about 5 per cent of the total deposits held by savings banks in Australia. These deposits in the Savings Bank of South Australia enabled the bank to lend \$447 000 000 for housing, \$293 000 000 for loans with Government guarantees and to municipal authorities, schools and charitable bodies and \$135 000 000 for personal, rural and Bankcard loans.

During the past financial year, the Savings Bank made new loans of \$1 000 000 for housing, \$27 700 000 to statutory authorities, \$11 700 000 to municipal authorities and school councils, and \$10 700 000 to primary producers, charitable bodies, and for personal and small business loans. In order to provide these services, the Savings Bank maintains 157 branches with a permanent staff of about 1 900, and has about 617 agencies in South Australia.

Obviously, the Savings Bank can provide such facilities only if it continues to attract deposits. During 1980-81, deposits rose by 9.5 per cent, compared with 7.6 per cent in the previous year. This was regarded by the trustees as satisfactory in view of the slow economic growth and intense competition from other banks and financial institutions which are not subject to the same level of control as banks.

The Campbell Committee of Inquiry into the Australian Financial System has pointed out that, whereas the annual rate of growth in deposits of major trading banks and finance companies has been reduced significantly in the past two years, the growth rate of the savings banks and permanent building societies has dropped. This is a matter

of concern and, in addition, there has been a remarkable growth in managed cash trusts.

This concept was started last year by the merchant banker Hill Samuel, and now four other merchant bankers have joined in the fray. Deposits are accepted on 24-hour call and the funds are invested in bank-endorsed bills and Government guaranteed loans or promissory notes. The public obtains virtually the same degree of security as with deposits lodged with savings banks.

Interest rates at 24-hour call at 14.5 per cent have been offered, and during 1981 the managed cash trusts have attracted deposits of over \$500 000 000 throughout Australia. A lot of these funds have been diverted from savings banks and building societies. The trusts are managed in Sydney and Melbourne, which means that this money is being diverted from South Australia and certainly is not being allocated to housing in this State.

Up to December 1980, the Treasurer, through his powers under the Commonwealth Banking Act, put a maximum rate of 10 per cent on bank deposits up to \$50 000. As at 30 June, the maximum rate for savings bank deposits at one month's notice had been raised to 10.75 per cent, and 11.75 per cent for fixed-term deposits.

Since then, the Treasurer has removed the limit on interest rates for bank deposits, but has maintained control over the rates that savings banks can charge for housing and personal loans. As savings banks traditionally allocate a high percentage of their funds for residential housing, there is a practical limit to how much they can afford to pay for deposits; otherwise savings banks will operate at a loss. Therefore, if Hill Samuel and others can offer up to 14.5 per cent interest in their managed trusts, they obviously will attract money away from the Savings Bank which at present offers 11.75 per cent on one month's call and up to 12.5 per cent for fixed term deposits, but this varies.

In an effort to maintain the profitability of the Savings Bank, the Government has introduced this Bill. Clause 32 amends section 47 and provides that there shall be no limit on the size of deposits. In years past, there were limits on certain categories. Clause 25 creates a new section 31 with regard to lending. Hitherto the Savings Bank has lent in the main against mortgage security, but the trustees are to be given an unfettered discretion regarding security, so long as one-half of the total amount lent is directed towards housing.

Clause 26 amends section 32 and provides that the Savings Bank, in addition to its existing objects for investment, may also buy shares, debentures and other securities of another bank. The most significant change, however, is clause 30, which amends section 42 and empowers the savings bank to endorse and trade in commercial bills. This will allow it to participate in one of the traditional activities of the trading banks.

The Treasurer does not regulate the rates for commercial bills, and this would enable the bank to trade in bills at current market rates. Many municipal authorities, credit unions, trustee companies and solicitors and accountants administering trust funds traditionally buy bank-endorsed bills, and it is estimated that by this means many millions of dollars could be attracted to the Savings Bank and lent out within South Australia.

The Campbell Committee, in chapter 4 of its final report issued two days ago, applauded the recent decision by the Treasurer to abolish the ceiling on bank deposit rates. However, the committee noted that the power to reimpose control over deposit rates remains in the Banking Act, and that controls remain in relation to rates on savings bank housing loans to individuals for owner occupation, to bank personal instalment loans, and to the payment of interest on most current accounts with banks.

The Campbell Committee recommends that all official intervention in the determination of bank deposit and lending interest rates should cease, and existing controls should be abolished as part of this deregulation process, but banks should be permitted to pay interest on all current account balances at their individual discretion. Finally, the power to impose direct interest rate controls should be removed from section 50 of the Federal Banking Act.

If savings banks were permitted to lend at normal market rates for housing, it would cause a dramatic social upheaval. Nevertheless, if savings banks are to survive in competition with managed cash trusts and merchant banks with powerful backing, they must offer, at least in the short term, higher rates to entice deposits. It follows that they should lend at some margin above that for housing loans, because otherwise they will operate at a loss.

One way to offset the unprofitable housing loan business of savings banks is to allow them to step into the traditional role of the trading banks by offering bill finance. This is envisaged in this amending Bill and, for this reason, I commend the Government for introducing this measure. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 5)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 November. Page 1941.)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Opposition supports this small Bill, which does precisely what was stated in the second reading explanation: it takes under the wing of Parliament the areas adjacent to the Constitutional Museum and, more particularly, the access area to the side of Parliament House. There has been some difficulty in policing this area in relation to people parking their cars and blocking the side entrance. This has caused much difficulty for the staff of Parliament House, who have had to load and unload provisions from trucks, and the like. On occasions, the entrance has been completely blocked, necessitating employees carrying heavy loads around cars and over cars, a totally unsatisfactory and dangerous situation. So, we are pleased that that area is coming under the control of the Minister of Public Works.

Various questions were raised when this Bill was before the House of Assembly, and the Minister responded to those questions. The questions mainly related to access of members to the front of Parliament House and access by members' staff coming to Parliament House briefly to pick up and deliver goods for members. Assurances were given by the Minister that that practice would be allowed to continue.

Although police now have powers to issue parking tickets to people parked in front of Parliament House and around the Constitutional Museum, this will not be done in a manner that in any way offends members of Parliament or takes away the rights that we already have. Given these assurances, the Shadow Minister of Transport in the other place was happy to assist in the speedy passage of the Bill.

The member for Mitcham in the other place raised one query with which I have some sympathy, as I am sure does the Minister. When the House is not sitting the areas around Parliament House and the Constitutional Museum could be used by motorists in the city. That is not unreasonable. It seems a great pity to have these areas in the heart of the city which people cannot use. Whilst the member for Mitcham raised the question, he failed to supply a satisfactory answer, probably because there is not

one. I would be quite happy for anyone to use these areas when Parliament is not sitting and when Parliament does not require the area for its own use. However, how do we notify the population at large that Parliament is not sitting at 28 minutes past two in the morning or on certain days? The Legislative Council does not sit on certain days, because the Minister decides otherwise. While I have sympathy with the idea, there is no practical way in which it can be implemented. I certainly concede that the member for Mitcham had a point when he raised the matter. I cannot resist saying that the member for Mitcham constantly uses the area in front of the House, to the inconvenience of other members and the Parliament. He apparently has some objection to parking his car in the car park, as the rest of us do. Why he should object to that I have no idea. However, he is an individualist, and if it inconveniences everybody else it does not seem to bother the member for Mitcham.

The question of access by the general public to those areas was a valid point. It was a pity that he did not tell us what the solution was. Until, somebody comes up with a solution about how we can frame regulations that will provide for every possible permutation of the sittings of this Parliament, there is not great value in raising the question. I think his idea was to get a line in the paper, as he did. I am sure he will be satisfied with that.

A more serious point was raised during the debate in the Assembly when the member for Mitcham said that, irrespective of this Bill's becoming an Act and a law of the land, he would park his car out there quite illegally and knowing that it was illegal. If he was prosecuted, he said that he would not pay any fines. He did not go on to say that he would go to gaol, as would be the logical outcome of what he said. I am not sure what the Constitution says but, if he refuses to pay his fines and goes to gaol, what happens to the seat of Mitcham? Perhaps the Hon. Mr DeGaris can enlighten us. If the member for Mitcham finishes up in gaol, it will lead to an interesting situation in State politics.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It is only wishful thinking.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr Burdett says that it is only wishful thinking, but the member for Mitcham has made the statement in Parliament.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: He is a man of honour.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is yet to be tested. I should think that, when this Bill goes through, the Minister of Public Works will do what is necessary, the police will prosecute, the member for Mitcham, true to his word, will refuse to pay the fines, and the process of the law will go on. Whilst it is only speculation as to what will happen to the seat of Mitcham, it will be very interesting to see whether the member for Mitcham does as he said he would do, or whether he starts coming to work by bike so that the situation does not arise.

There is nothing of interest that one can say about this Bill. It is one of the most boring pieces of legislation that has come before this Parliament. However, in the interests of the staff of this place who have to wrestle with heavy loads outside the Constitutional Museum, the Opposition is happy for the Bill to go through as speedily as possible.

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

VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 November. Page 2005.)

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Opposition supports the general thrust and the intentions of this Bill, which are two-fold. The primary intention of the Bill is to institute a cost-saving measure. The Bill seeks to save the direct cost of sending out to landowners notices of revaluation. According to the second reading explanation, this would save a direct cost of \$28 000 per annum. In future, revaluation on a State-wide basis will occur more frequently, with the introduction of the computer technology. Eventually, the cost saving could be \$135 000 a year. The Opposition believes that this cost saving measure is highly desirable and we support that idea.

The second intention of the Bill is to repeal section 24 of the principal Act to enable landowners to object to the revaluation of their property at any time, rather than within 60 days, as the Act provides at present. This is a logical provision. If notices are not to be sent to landowners immediately after revaluation has occurred, they will not know that the property has been revalued until they receive a council rate notice or an Engineering and Water Supply Department account. It is clear that landowners will require more than 60 days in which to lodge an objection if they wish to do so.

I understand that this amendment also legitimates a practice that is already accepted, since the Valuer-General in the past few years has been hearing objections outside the 60 day limit. The reason is that many objections are lodged not after people receive a revaluation notice but when they receive an E. & W.S. Department account or a council notice. I presume that people do not recognise the full import of the revaluation until they see the extra annual cost of council and E. & W.S. rates. This provision seems to be sensible.

Our major objection to the proposed procedure is that in future landowners will not receive specific notification of the new valuation, nor will they receive information about the procedures under which they can lodge an objection. It seems to me that that fundamental right should be accorded to all taxpayers. I intend to move an amendment to provide that information be made available to landowners, not by way of a separate notification (which I acknowledge is costly and which is not always taken into account at the appropriate time by landowners) but by including such information on the next issued council rate notice or, particularly, an E. & W.S. Department account, which is likely to be the first account received after the revaluation takes place.

This procedure would require an adjustment to the computer print-out that is sent to the landowner, and would therefore be a comparatively cheap measure. An amendment of this kind would make the Bill much more acceptable to the Opposition, and in the Committee stage I intend to move an appropriate amendment. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Arrangement.'

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As I understand that the Hon. Miss Wiese has not yet been able to circulate the amendment of which she gave notice in the second reading stage, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

[Sitting suspended from 4.13 to 5.11 p.m.]

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I suggest that the Committee deal with the amendments in three groups: first, amendments Nos. 1 to 6 inclusive, which deals with the question of the constitution of the board; secondly, No. 7, which deals with the question of after-race pay-outs; and, thirdly, No. 8, which deals with the question of bookmakers being able to sue. If that is acceptable, I move:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendments Nos. 1 to 6.

The subject matter was widely and fully debated when the Bill was before the Council previously, I do not intend to expand on those matters.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I do not propose to expand on the matter, either, as it was fully canvassed last night. The reasons were given in detail as to why we moved those amendments and we certainly intend to insist upon them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am pleased that on this occasion the amendments will be put as separate motions. Although I voted for all the amendments on this occasion, the Hon. Mr Milne did not, and at least he can vote as he expressed his opinions during the debate as the Bill went through.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (8)—The Hons J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, M. B. Dawkins, C. M. Hill (teller), D. H. Laidlaw, K. L. Milne, and R. J. Ritson.

Noes (9)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall (teller), R. C. DeGaris, J. E. Dunford, Anne Levy, C. J. Sumner, and Barbara Wiese.

Pairs—Ayes—The Hons L. H. Davis and K. T. Griffin.
Noes—The Hons C. W. Creedon and N. K. Foster.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendment No. 7.

This involves the question of after-race pay-outs. I understand that at least one member of the Council indicated previously that he would not sustain his course of voting if the message came back in this form.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The Opposition intends to insist on this amendment. In doing so, I want to clarify our position, which, quite clearly, following a number of telephone calls that I received during the day and a brief report in this morning's *Advertiser*, has been misinterpreted by some of the night codes. Those codes gained the impression that we were trying to put the S.A.J.C. in a privileged position. In fact, our intention was quite the reverse, as anyone who reads *Hansard* will see.

We wanted to ensure that, in the first 12 months of operation of after-race pay-outs, the S.A.J.C. would not receive an unduly high amount of T.A.B. distribution. This was done on the basis that, quite clearly, if the amount of T.A.B. turnover is increased (and it is estimated that it will increase by about 5 per cent or 6 per cent), all of that increase—and I mean all of it—will accrue to the galloping code, because after-race pay-outs will apply only to T.A.B. transactions that are conducted during the afternoon. As honourable members are well aware, the T.A.B. closes at 8 p.m., so there cannot possibly be any direct benefit in terms of increased turnover to the night codes.

Quite clearly, if the projections of a 5 per cent to 6 per cent turnover increase are achieved, all of that increase will be achieved by the galloping code. We are attempting to ensure that those people who work very diligently to keep greyhound racing and trotting going are not disadvantaged. We did this consistently during the second reading stage in both chambers. We tried to get an assurance from the

Minister that some arrangement would be made in the first 12 months to guarantee that greyhound racing and trotting would not be disadvantaged, prior to the Minister's reviewing the position at the end of 12 months operation. We tried by amendment ultimately to ensure that that occurred.

At no stage were we able to obtain an undertaking from the Minister of Recreation and Sport, nor from the Minister's representative in this place, that the Government was prepared to do that. We moved this amendment because we were highly desirous of protecting the night codes. That is still our position. It may be that that amendment is not the ideal way to do it, and I will be quite prepared to concede that, but I believe very strongly that it is important that we go to a conference on this clause. We must sit down with the Minister and try to hammer out an arrangement which will ensure that trotting and greyhound racing in this State are not disadvantaged in that first 12-month period.

I repeat that, if the arrangement is allowed to go through as the Minister and the Government currently propose, greyhound racing and trotting in this State in the next 12 months will inevitably be placed at a disadvantage. For that reason, although, as I said, perhaps the amendment is not perfect, it is important that we go to the conference table with the House of Assembly to try to reach some agreement to protect the interests of the night codes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am very sorry that the Government has not accepted this amendment, because I believe it is perfectly reasonable and produces some justice in the situation. When the amendment was moved I said that, if the Government did not accept this amendment, I would change my mind when the Bill came back from the other place. I believe that the Government is taking action for which it will be sorry. When the trotting and greyhound codes realise what has happened, there will be quite a serious confrontation in the racing industry. This amendment will overcome that confrontation. However, if the Government wants it that way, I am quite prepared to let it be. I believe that the amendment I moved was reasonable, rational and did something to overcome the difficulty that may occur if the Bill goes through in its present form.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Are you copping out?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I said that I would take that action.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: This is a somersault. You can't help yourself.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I made quite clear that I was prepared to move an amendment to the Bill but, if the Government did not accept it in the House of Assembly, I would not insist when the Bill came back to this Council. The Government has made its decision on this matter, and I believe it is a wrong decision. I also believe that the Government is foolish not to accept the amendment.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It is the night codes that will suffer, not the Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I realise that. We are all assuming that there could be a difficulty: there may not be a difficulty. Most certainly this amendment would have overcome that difficulty. If the Government wants to wear that difficulty and run the risk, I am prepared to let it.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (9)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill (teller), D. H. Laidlaw, K. L. Milne, and R. J. Ritson.

Noes (8)—The Hons. Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall (teller), J. E. Dunford, Anne Levy, C. J. Sumner, and Barbara Wiese.

Pairs—Ayes—The Hons. L. H. Davis and K. T. Griffin.
Noes—The Hons. C. W. Creedon and N. K. Foster.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendment No. 8.

This amendment deals with the right of bookmakers to sue for bets made on the nod.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The Opposition intends to insist on this amendment. I believe that our argument supporting this measure was well canvassed last night. We almost unearthed some interesting facts about the T.A.B. and its inability to sue, particularly in relation to the \$350 000 at Riverton. The Opposition does not believe that bookmakers should be given the right to sue and be sued. The existing situation has been quite satisfactory for more than 100 years. We are taking the classical conservative stance on this matter and we see no reason for any change.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (7)—The Hons J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, M. B. Dawkins, C. M. Hill (teller), D. H. Laidlaw, and R. J. Ritson.

Noes (10)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall (teller), R. C. DeGaris,

J. E. Dunford, Anne Levy, K. L. Milne, C. J. Sumner, and Barbara Wiese.

Pairs—Ayes—The Hons L. H. Davis and K. T. Griffin.
Noes—The Hons C. W. Creedon and N. K. Foster.
Motion thus negatived.

[Sitting suspended from 5.43 to 5.49 p.m.]

The House of Assembly requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on the Legislative Council's amendments to which it had disagreed.

The Legislative Council agreed to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 10 a.m. on Wednesday 25 November at which it would be represented by the Hons J. R. Cornwall, R. C. DeGaris, J. E. Dunford, K. T. Griffin, and D. H. Laidlaw.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.56 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 1 December at 2.15 p.m.